

**Ways &
Means Committee
Special Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: November 23, 2021 – 4:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID: 853 3697 3525
PRESIDING OFFICER: John Gavaris, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Lynn Archer, Tracey
Bartels, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter; and
Legislative Chairman David B. Donaldson
ABSENT: Legislator John Parete
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislator Brian Cahill, and Peter Criswell; Commissioner
of Finance Burt Gulnick; Deputy County Executives Marc
Rider, John Milgrim, and Johanna Contreras; Comptroller
March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco;
Senior Auditor Randy Boughton; Sheriff Juan Figueroa;
Deputy Director of Budget Chris Kelly; Financial Analyst –
Budget Tosca Sweeney; Legislators-Elect Phil Erner, and
Joseph Maloney; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman

- **Chairman Gavaris called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM**

Motion No. 1: To approve Budget Amendment No. 1 - Assistant District Attorney Salary Adjustments

Amendment Summary: This Amendment adjusts the salaries of three (3) Assistant District Attorney positions to reflect recent changes in staffing.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, 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. 2: To approve Budget Amendment No. 2 – DA CSEA Personnel Adjustments

Amendment Summary: This Amendment reclassifies three (3) CSEA positions within the District Attorney’s Office.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated that without a desk audit of these positions, titles, and duties, he cannot support the amendment. Legislator Bartels confirmed that the District Attorney was not opposed to completing the Desk Audit in the 2022 fiscal year. Legislator Walter vocalized support for the amendment, arguing that the District Attorney is able to identify the appropriate job titles based on the duties being completed.

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

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, Archer, Maio

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 3

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 3: To approve Budget Amendment No. 3 - Office of Violence Against Women Grant

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds an Office of Violence Against Women Grant to improve criminal justice response to domestic violence in response to notification of the receipt of the grant award.

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

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, 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 Budget Amendment No. 4 - Deputy Director of Environment

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds a salary increase for the Deputy Director of Environment due to compression issues which resulted from a labor union contractual settlement.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Ronk explained his opposition, informing Committee members that he opposed the creation of the position which caused the compression issue. Legislator Bartels noted additional compression issues within the Department, asking if there is any intent to change the Director of Environment’s salary in the future. Commissioner of Finance Burt Gulnick noted that all CSEA positions contain longevity within the recommended annual salary, explaining that the Executive Office was looking to alleviate compression issues only above entry-level salaries, not above the total annual salaries. Deputy County Executive Marc Rider stressed that longevity is not included in management, non-union salaries, asking Committee members to consider only the entry-level salary comparison. Legislator Bartels questioned how the members of the Legislature can consider this information as it is not provided to them and asked if it’s possible to separate out base-level salaries in the proposed budget in future years.

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

Voting Against: Legislator Ronk

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 1

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: To approve Budget Amendment No. 5 - Sheriff Personnel Upgrade

Amendment Summary: This Amendment upgrades an IT Specialist to grade 17 from grade 15 effective January 1, 2022 and reduces Patrol Part Time Pay to cover the increase in salary.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Legislator Ronk praised the Sheriff for completing a desk audit to reclassify the included positions.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, 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 Budget Amendment No. 6 - Sheriff Port Security Grant

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes the Port Security Grant project in response to the grant not being awarded.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, 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 Budget Amendment No. 8 - ARPA Positions

Amendment Summary: This Amendment reduces three (3) ARPA positions to the 2021 annual salaries approved by the Legislature at the August 2021 session, adjusted for the quantity of days in 2022.

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

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson informed Committee members that he requested the resumes for the individuals hired into these positions. Deputy Director of Budget Christopher Kelly answered that past practice is currently being reviewed, questioning when resumes were provided to the Legislature in the past for positions which are not subject to Legislative approval. Legislator Walter noted that it is a choice to provide a 3% raise across the board to all management, non-union positions, arguing that it is not necessary for this award to apply to positions which are newly created and recently hired with start-dates which are post-budget adoption. Further discussion pursued on the purpose of the

Legislature reviewing the resumes and how they related to the salaries proposed, the decision to award 3% raises to all management, non-union positions, and the option to hire a consultant in place of the three positions.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Maio
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 8: To approve Budget Amendment No. 7 - Sheriff UCSEA Union Settlement

Amendment Summary: This Amendment adjusts the budget according to the adopted Memorandum of Agreement between Ulster County and the Ulster County Sheriff Employees Association Contract 2020-2024, Resolution No. 538 of 2021.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, 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. 9: To approve Budget Amendment No. 9 - Clerical Pool

Amendment Summary: This Amendment defunds all vacant clerical positions with the intent of following up with a Policy requiring the creation of a Clerical Pool as recommended by Capital Markets Advisors, LLC (CMA).

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated he's not opposed to the establishment of a Clerical Pool but that he will be a no on the amendment unless the amendment to remove the Constituent Service Navigator Division fails, emphasizing that he respects the intent behind the amendment. Chairman Gavaris said he's willing to withdraw the

amendment but wanted to begin the discussion on it, expressing desire to expand on the concept so that Department have access to additional help when needed. Legislator Bartels stated that it is excellent concept worthy of further discussion and expressed interest in exploring this wholistically in the upcoming year with the involvement of the Departments. Legislator Walter emphasized support for shared services but informed Committee members that there are positions included on this amendment that she feels protective of and would not support defunding.

Voting In Favor: None
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 0
No. of Votes Against: 8
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 10: To approve Budget Amendment No. 10 - Energy Consultant

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds a contract with an Energy Consultant as recommended by Capital Markets Advisors, LLC (CMA).

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels
Discussion: None
Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, and Walter
Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, Haynes, and Maio; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 4
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 11: To approve Budget Amendment No. 11 - Inflationary Adjustment

Amendment Summary: This Amendment establishes a budget to account for a 2.6% inflation rate.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson
Discussion: Chairman Gavaris explained the 2.6% inflation rate was projected by the Department of Treasury. Commissioner of Finance Gulnick

informed Committee members that inflation was considered in the bulk of their estimates, such as those for gas, electric, fuel, and professional service contracts. Chairman Gavaris clarified that there are some areas where inflation has not been accounted for but he feels the magnitude of this is small enough that it will be absorbed without the need to increase the budget further.

Voting In Favor: None
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 0
No. of Votes Against: 8
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 12: To approve Budget Amendment No. 12 - Information Services Evaluation

Amendment Summary: This Amendment increases the Legislature's Professional Services Accounting/Auditing line to allow the Audit Committee to contract with a consultant during the year to complete an evaluation of the Information Services Department, including personnel and current Information Technology systems, equipment, and software as recommended by Capital Markets Advisors, LLC.

Motion Made By: Legislator Archer
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Walter underlined strong support for this amendment, stating that Information Technology demands increase constantly, and efficiencies can be achieved if appropriate assessments are completed. Legislator Walter further emphasized that this could result in cost savings, as well as improve how well the department serves the County.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislators Haynes, and Maio
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 2
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 13: To approve Budget Amendment No. 13 - Unsettled Labor Union Contracts

Amendment Summary: This Amendment establishes a budget for increases for unsettled labor union contracts as recommended by Capital Markets Advisors, LLC.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislator Maio
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 1
No. of Votes Against: 7
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 14: To approve Budget Amendment No. 14 - Communications Specialist Position

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes a Communications Specialist Position from the County Executive’s Office which became vacant in July of 2021 and was requested by the Legislature not to be filled prior to discussions on the 2022 Operating Budget.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated he believes this position is not necessary for County Government and he feels a lot of self-promotion comes from this, reminding Committee members that it was requested the position not be filled until budgetary discussions were complete. Legislator Archer confirmed that an individual was hired into the position.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Maio; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 4
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 15: To approve Budget Amendment No. 15 - Communications Specialist Salary

Amendment Summary: This Amendment reduces the annual salary of the Communications Specialist position within the County Executive’s Office which became vacant in July of 2021 and was requested by the Legislature not to be filled prior to discussions on the 2022 Operating Budget. The reduced value is equal to the 2020 adopted budget, adjusted for the quantity of days in 2022 and the proposed 3% management, non-union raise.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter noted the 2022 Recommended annual salary doesn't feel right considering the nature of the position, what the individual's duties are, and the position's recent history of an increase above \$20,000. Legislator Walter further noted that an increase of this quantity should be for a heightened skillset but that the individual is the same person with no new qualifications. Legislator Bartels recollected the circulation of a salary analysis and comparable positions, stating that this information was compelling to support the proposed decrease.

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

Voting Against: Legislator Haynes

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 1

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 16: To approve Budget Amendment No. 16 - Constituent Service Navigator

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes the Constituent Service Navigator division from the Information Services Department which is newly proposed in the 2022 County Executive Recommended Budget.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Walter stated support for the concept but emphasized that this is an ideal opportunity to utilize American Rescue Plan (ARP) funding, suggesting the addition of employees who are specialized in Social Services issues since this Department is a highly demanded and specialized service. Legislator Bartels stated that she is supportive of the amendment in concept as this budget proposes a large increase in spending and the revenue estimates are still in conversation and it is still very uncertain that the County is where it needs to be to take on some of these newly proposed initiatives. Legislator Ronk vocalized concern that this is an unnecessary layer of County Government, pointing out that data from Deputy Director of Budget Kelly shows only 2% of calls are non-COVID-related. Legislator Haynes expressed support for the service center, stating that she believes this will make the Government more efficient and effective. Legislator Archer vocalized support for the application of ARP funds, as these create an opportunity to build the unit based on how it's utilized and

needed in the future. Legislative Chairman Donaldson argued that what seems like a good idea might not be in actuality.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Haynes
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 17: To approve Budget Amendment No. 17 - Director of Budget & Innovation

Amendment Summary: This Amendment defunds the Director of Budget & Innovation position which is newly proposed in the 2022 County Executive Recommended Budget.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Ronk reminded Committee members that the creation of this position was previously requested, saying that he does not support the position. Legislator Bartels responded that she is struggling with the increases to the Department through the proposed permanent alternative work week for all employees. Legislator Walter requested specific information as to what the benefit of this position is, stating that she would feel differently on the creation of this position if the three (3) ARP positions were not approved, emphasizing that right now the Budget & Innovation team is managing the ARP projects. Further, Legislator Walter informed Committee members that she was told this position will be charged with improving the County's budget, but that the request by the Legislature to improve the budget was made years ago and it doesn't require the establishment of a new position to contact department heads, create a 5-year plan, and involve the Legislature in the creation of performance measures. Legislative Chairman Donaldson asked if this is intended to be a transfer of a current employee, and if so, if the other position be removed. Deputy Director of Budget Kelly answered that this position existed as the Director of Innovation in 2019 and is being recommended to reflect the Department's current organizational structure. Committee members confirmed that the position is intended to be filled by Chris Kelly. Further discussion pursued on the elimination of the Deputy Director of Budget position and the removal of the proposed permanent alternative work schedule.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Bartels
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 18: To approve Budget Amendment No. 18 - Commissioner of Finance

Amendment Summary: This Amendment increases the Commissioner of Finance's annual salary.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Legislator Ronk said the Commissioner of Finance's work is commensurate to that of a Deputy County Executive, pointing out that other surrounding counties pay their Commissioner of Finance much more.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislators Archer, and Bartels
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 2
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 19: To approve Budget Amendment No. 19 - Mental Health Personnel

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes the Commissioner of Mental Health, a newly proposed position, and replaces it with two Mental Health Specialists to actively take on clients and serve the public.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Legislator Walter said she feels this is especially important at this time, this is a huge department, a lot of grants, data, highly complex department; not in favor of removing this position. Bartels said when she heard all the work that's being done and is going to be done was compelled to keep this; looking forward to the expansion of services; privatization of mental health appears to have been a bad decision that resulted in a diminishment of services. Ronk said this is not un-privitize; this is just adding

services to the already privatized mental health. If the deputy is not already empowered to do what has to be done, that's a management issue with the commissioner of mental health and the county executive that will not be resolved with a title change and a raise. Dave inquired as to how this position is going to help deliver mental health services. Walter expressed concern that the County failed to not coordinate, manage, and match services to people in need; saying we need to be the people assuring the services are provided and the coordinators but not the clinicians; feels there already are great programs available.

Voting In Favor: Legislator Ronk
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 1
No. of Votes Against: 6
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 20: To approve Budget Amendment No. 20 - Social Services Contractual

Amendment Summary: This Amendment increases Darmstadt and Family Inn contractual rates and funds additional contract increases for outreach centers due to the living wage law.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels
Discussion: None
Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 21: To approve Budget Amendment No. 21 - Facilities Space Study

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds a Facilities Space Needs Analysis within the Buildings & Grounds Administration Department which shall include a review of all leased properties currently housing County services.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: Legislator Ronk clarified this amendment is to fund a Space Utilization study, saying he would be willing to raise it to \$150,000 if deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works. Legislator Bartels said she's happy the Executive's Office is in support of the amendment, emphasizing that the completion of the study will save the County money and that there are a lot of leased properties that need to be considered in short order. Legislator Ronk noted that this budget significantly increases the size of the government when the County is already struggling to find places for the Departments that already exist which heightens the need for this analysis. Legislative Chairman Donaldson reminded Committee members that in 2008 there was a Space Committee.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 22: To approve Budget Amendment No. 22 - Personnel Contingency

Amendment Summary: This Amendment moves select newly proposed positions to a Personnel Contingency line for further examination and discussion.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Chairman Gavaris clarified this amendment moves some of the recommended new positions to a contingent account for approval as the year goes on and revenues are better known. Discussion pursued as to why the included positions were selected, the committee's level of confidence in the sales tax revenue estimate, and the supplemental amendments for other recommended new positions.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Motion No. 23: To approve Budget Amendment No. 23 - Crisis Stabilization Center

Amendment Summary: This Amendment reduces the scope of the ARP- Mental Health and Addiction Recovery Center Project to a single project: the build out of the Department of Mental Health; and adds the ARP - Crisis Stabilization Center for the creation of a Mental Health and Addiction Recovery Center to provide residents a single location that provides the full

continuum of care for people dealing with mental health and addiction related illness, as required by Resolution No. 424 which was approved in October 2019, approving the policy of Ulster County to have a Crisis Stabilization Center and that requiring that any project established in furtherance of this policy be paid for from the \$5,000,000 of ARPA funding allocated for the purpose of addressing the need for enhanced Mental Health and Addiction Recovery services throughout Ulster County.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Walter explained that this amendment does not change the total American Rescue Plan (ARP) funding for mental health, that this Capital Project is in fact multiple Capital Projects which have been consolidated into a single project as if they're connected or contingent on each other when they may be complete separate facilities which should not hold up each other's progress.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Ronk, Archer, Bartels, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Haynes
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 24: To approve Budget Amendment No. 24 - Respite Houses

Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds a Capital Project for the addition of two Respite Houses based on Resolution No. 425 of October 2021, which established the Policy of Ulster County to have 7-10 day Respite Houses in Ulster County, geographically spread out across the County, providing a minimum of eight beds overall, available to any resident of Ulster County ages 18 years and over, with staffing for each home to include: administrative staff, crisis specialists, case managers, and administrative support.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Legislator Walter noted that this Capital Project was missing from the Capital Improvement Program but that the Legislature adopted a policy requiring the houses.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Haynes
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 1

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 25: To approve Budget Amendment No. 25 - Sheriff Personnel

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds raises for the Corrections Supervisor and the Undersheriff through the removal of a Deputy Sheriff position and a Mental Health Specialist position, and adds an URGENT stipend pay which will be dedicated to a Sheriff's Office employee, currently the Chief Civil Administrator.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Walter provided a brief explanation of how these positions have been affected by compression, explaining why the positions proposed for removal are not necessary and providing an explanation of the AVERT program.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 26: To approve Budget Amendment No. 26 - Human Rights Commission

Amendment Summary: This Amendment adjusts a Part Time position within the Human Rights Commission to a Full Time, Benefited position.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Walter informed Committee members that the Human Rights Commission is already managing a great deal of calls without the advertisement of the recently approved helpline, stressing that call volume will undoubtedly increase as news of the helpline spreads. Legislator Bartels said she is more comfortable with maintaining the two (2) part-time positions at this time and discussing this change once the actual call volume is known. Legislator Walter articulated concern about how important the office is, how current staffing levels affect the office's outreach, and how important to stand behind human rights. Legislative Chairman Donaldson agreed with Legislator Bartels saying the demand should exist and be assessed prior to the decision being

made. Legislator Walter argued that the quantity of calls is not an adequate metric to assess this Department's staffing needs as there is a lot of hand-holding, follow up, and investigation. Chairman Gavaris noted that it is always easier to step things up than it is to scale things down. Legislator Archer expressed interest in re-visiting the subject after the first or second quarter.

Voting In Favor: Legislator Walter
Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, and Haynes; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 1
No. of Votes Against: 5
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 27: To approve Budget Amendment No. 27 - Enterprise West CIP

Amendment Summary: This Amendment reduces the Enterprise West Redevelopment Project to the amount approved by Resolution No. 399 of 2020.

Motion Made By: Legislator Archer
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Archer explained the intent behind the amendment and what it does. Legislator Bartels confirmed that current commitments will remain in tact and that the amendment will be reviewed at against all approved Resolutions for technical accuracy. Legislator Cahill further confirmed that all current commitments will be honored and that no additional expenditures will be requested for this Capital Project.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, and Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislator Haynes
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 1
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 28: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 28 - Buildings & Grounds Administration

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes one of the newly proposed positions within the Buildings & Grounds Administration Department.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Archer specified the Committee has received backup information from the Commissioner of DPW which she feels sufficiently details the need for the included positions.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Motion No. 29: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 29 - Maintenance of Roads & Bridges

Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes four newly proposed positions from the Maintenance of Roads & Bridges Department.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Archer

Discussion: Legislator Archer stated the Committee has received some backup information from the Commissioner of DPW and she feels this information sufficiently details the need for the included positions.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Motion No. 30: To approve Budget Amendment No. 30 – Cornell Cooperative Extension of UC, UC Soil & Water Conservation District, & UC Libraries Association

Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds the following contracts for consideration by the Legislature during the month of December: Ulster County Soil & Water Conservation District, Cornell Cooperative Extension of Ulster County, and Ulster County Library Association.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 31: To approve Budget Amendment No. 31 – ARPA Assistant to the Director of Recovery & Resilience Error

Amendment Summary: This Amendment corrects the salary of the Assistant to the Director of Recovery & Resilience due to a data error.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Commissioner of Finance Burt Gulnick confirmed that this is intended to correct an error.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 32: To approve Budget Amendment No. 32 – County Clerk Account Clerk

Amendment Summary: This Amendment defunds the Account Clerk position within the County Clerk's office based on conversations with the County Clerk at the Special Ways & Means Committee meeting on November 22, 2021 stating the position is no longer necessary.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 33: To block Resolutions No. 541, 542, 543, and 544

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and
Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 34: To approve the Following Resolutions:

Resolution No. 541 – Ratification Of Tax Rolls

Resolution Summary: This Resolution ratifies and confirms the tax rolls of the several Towns of Ulster County, as signed by the Chair and Clerk of the Ulster County Legislature and directs the Collectors of said Towns to enforce the collection of taxes as required by law.

Resolution No. 542 – Levy For Unpaid Sewer Rents

Resolution Summary: This Resolution levies and assesses with penalty added to the properties liable the several amounts of unpaid sewer assessments in the several Sewer Districts in the Towns of the County of Ulster appearing on the returns by the Collectors of said respective districts.

Resolution No. 543 – Levy For Unpaid Water Rents

Resolution Summary: This Resolution levies and assesses together with ten percent of the amount in addition thereto, upon the properties liable the several amounts of unpaid water rents in the several Water Districts in the several Towns of the County of Ulster appearing on the returns by the Collectors of said respective districts.

Resolution No. 544 – Approving Completed Tax Rolls And Directing The Execution Of Delivery Of Warrants

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the tax rolls as so completed, determines that the taxes so extended against each parcel of property upon the said rolls are to be the taxes due thereon as set forth therein, and resolves that there be annexed to each of said rolls, a tax warrant, that such warrants shall be in the respective amounts heretofore, authorized to be levied upon each of said rolls.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Gavaris, Archer, Bartels, Haynes, and Walter; and
Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None

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

Motion No. 35: To approve Resolution No. 545 – Authorizing Commissioner Of Finance To Make Transfers Of Funds And Budgetary Amendments

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the Commissioner of Finance to make transfers of funds and budgetary amendments as are required, with the exception of any funds designated in contingency or relating to American Rescue Plan Act funding, to properly close out the 2021 financial records of the County, and to file a list of said transfers and budgetary amendments with the Ways & Means Committee as soon as possible thereafter.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Haynes

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 36: To approve Resolution No. 546 – Adopting The Ulster County Budget For Fiscal Year Commencing January 1, 2022 And Making Appropriations For The Conduct Of County Government, as Amended

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the Ulster County Operating Budget for 2022, as on file with the Clerk of the Legislature, as changed, altered, and revised by the Ways & Means Committee, and appropriates for the objects and purpose specified effective January 1, 2022 the several amounts as set forth in the “ADOPTED” column of such budget.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 37: To approve Resolution No. 547 – Adopting Ulster County Capital Program For 2022 – 2027, as Amended

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the Ulster County Capital Improvement Program for 2022 – 2027 as on file with the Clerk of the Legislature, as changed, altered, and revised by the Ways & Means Committee.

Motion Made By: Legislator Haynes
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

New Business: None

Old Business: Legislative Chairman Donaldson stated that if the resumes for the ARPA positions are not received he would like to put in a budget amendment to remove the positions and hire a consultant for the delivery of the professional services.

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson
No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 6:01 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: December 21, 2021

**Ways &
Means Committee
Special Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: November 23, 2021 – 4:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing: 1-646-558-8656, Meeting ID: 853 3697 3525
PRESIDING OFFICER: John Gavaris, Chairman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Lynn Archer, Tracey Bartels, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter; and Legislative Chairman David B. Donaldson
ABSENT: Legislator John Parete
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislator Brian Cahill, and Peter Criswell; Commissioner of Finance Burt Gulnick; Deputy County Executives Marc Rider, John Milgrim, and Johanna Contreras; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Senior Auditor Randy Boughton; Sheriff Juan Figueroa; Deputy Director of Budget Chris Kelly; Financial Analyst – Budget Tosca Sweeney; Legislators-Elect Phil Erner, and Joseph Maloney; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman

Chairman Gavaris: I'm calling this Special Meeting to order.

Budget amendment number one is Assistant District Attorney salary adjustments. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson. Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Walter. Discussion? All right. All those in favor then.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Anybody opposed? So carried.

Budget amendment number two, CSEA personnel adjustments. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second? Can I have a second? Chair Donaldson. Discussion? Legislator Bartels. No? Okay. All those in- Legislator Ronk?

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I'm just, you know, for the record, I'm going to be a no on this. You know, the, the DA, I think came with some compelling arguments, but without a, without a desk audit to determine that these are the proper titles for, you know, for these particular positions, I just can't support it. You know, there, there's like I said too many times, like I said, in the first meeting too many times, I feel like, you know, these, you know, personnel changes are done willy nilly without the Personnel Department doing the proper, you know, desk audits and procedures for them. And I just, I can't support them outside of that any longer.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: So, um, to refresh my memory, did the, the District Attorney when Legislator Ronk, you brought that up, the District Attorney did consent to doing desk audits, correct?

Legislator Archer: I thought so.

Legislator Ronk: I think that he said he wouldn't be opposed to doing them but once you change the position, what's the purpose of the desk audit? You're not going to change the positions back? To me, it's cart before the horse if we, if we approve this amendment.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Um, yeah, I mean, I, I, I think my understanding was that he was seemed as supportive overall in, in that process but in terms of these, I feel like he does understand what these people are doing and what the appropriate titles are for what they're doing and, you know, I think he, he knows when a Legal Secretary is doing legal secretary work and so I feel comfortable with these changes.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I mean, you know, due respect to Legislator Walter, but that equates to taking the District Attorney's word for it, which, you know, is just not, it's a bridge too far for me to reclassify a position under that, under the auspices of essentially taking somebody's word for something, respectfully.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Respectfully, we do that all the time in the Executive's Office.

Legislator Ronk: I oppose those ma'am.

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

Legislator Ronk: I'm opposed.

Chairman Gavaris: Two votes? Three opposed. All right. I'll be in favor.

Number three, Office of Violence Against Women's grant.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So Carried.

Number four, Deputy Director of Environment. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson. Second, Legislator Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I'm just going to be brief. I'm gonna be a no on this, not because I don't understand that there's compression there. But I was against the position that was created that created the compression. So you know, to be consistent with that, absent the new position being created, there wouldn't be the compression there.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, so um, I'm sorry, I just have to look it up, because I have too many computers. I'm looking it up on hard copy right now. So my one question I have about this. Is does this create, where are we at? Maybe somebody can look it up for me quickly. Deputy Director here, Deputy Director of Environment right now, \$61,771 going to \$70,271, the Director of the Environment gets 76,859. But that to me, you know, I just feel like we're moving, I'd like to know what the, what the Executive's Office has to say about that compression issue, because this compression issue that they're talking about is the Environmental Planner's at \$75,300 so they're moving this 61 and the Senior Environmental Tec's at 64. But we've got, it's a very, it's there's a lot of compression in that office already. So I feel I just I, I'm curious about the, the Director of the Environment position, and if there's any intention to change that salary

Chairman Gavaris: You, John, Burt, you guys want

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah, Tracy, you're first referred to the Environmental Planner at 75, you have to remember that has steps included in that.

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Commissioner Gulnick: Um, and not at this time, will we entertain, you know, to increase the Director, but I think, you know, looking at management throughout is kind of a priority going into this year.

Legislator Bartels: And so the compression issue that you're correcting with this

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah,

Legislator Bartels: is the compression with the Senior Environmental Tech is that

Commissioner Gulnick: It is the Environmental Planner, and actually, there's a couple of them, that would be a base over the \$61,000. So kind of found a space in between, and that, again, didn't want to reach all the way to the Director of Environment.

Legislator Bartels: Okay, I mean, I know that the director of the environment did not get the salary increase last, last year.

Commissioner Gulnick: Correct.

Legislator Bartels: And I know I mean, that was my resolution that kept those increases from going forward. Despite the fact that that was the one position I felt really was overtly deserving of it, knowing how many millions were brought into the county by the, the person who held that position at that time. But I feel like we're, you know, we're facing a another compression issue pretty quick by moving the Deputy Director up to 70, and having the Director only at only 76.

Deputy Executive Rider: So if I could just add one thing. Anytime we're talking about compression issues, it's important when you're looking at civil service and other positions that you're looking at the entry level, Burt said that, but I just want to clarify that you're not looking at steps because with management, longevity is an added, it's added in the beginning of the year, it's not part of their salaries. So you don't see it in here. So you got to look at entry level, we don't believe that there's compression between the Director and the Deputy Director.

Legislator Bartels: But how am I supposed to look at it when this is what I've got? You're not provide, you're saying you're supposed to look at information you're not providing me?

Commissioner Gulnick: Well Tracey, you're right. But the Director, no, the Director salary is \$76,859. And we're proposing \$70,271. So there is a difference roughly of \$6,500.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah. Okay.

Commissioner Gulnick: I mean, there is, there is a gap there. I guess, down the road, it would be if the Deputy continued to get an increase, then you'd have a compression issue right now there wouldn't be.

Legislator Bartels: What's the gap between that you're, so what's the gap now between taking into consideration what Marc just mentioned between that \$70,251. And the position you're trying to create the, the, the distance between?

Commissioner Gulnick: Right, I'm looking up what that base rate is, give me a second here, gotta make sure I'm in the right year. It would be \$66,575. So that, you know

Legislator Bartels: Is that the Environmental Planner?

Commissioner Gulnick: That's the grade 17, yes, the Environmental Planner.

Legislator Bartels: \$66,575, you said?

Commissioner Gulnick: Yup, yeah.

Deputy Executive Milgrim: It's just overseen by the Deputy.

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah, that would be the entry level of that position.

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: I'm a little confused. I'm seeing here that it's being, that Environmental Planner is being proposed at \$75,300.

Commissioner Gulnick: That's because they have steps included in that salary. If it was entry level, it would be \$66,575.

Legislator Archer: Oh, got it. Okay.

Legislator Bartels: Maybe,

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels, go ahead.

Legislator Bartels: Maybe just one suggestion for Innovation and the idea of transparency in the budget, maybe there's a way moving forward where we can separate that out so we can see base level salaries, when we're looking at the budget, separate from the steps and the longevity.

Commissioner Gulnick: Tracey, I hear what you're saying. It's probably a good idea that way, yeah, it would just take a little work, but we can get it done.

Legislator Bartels: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Legislator Ronk. Thank you.

Number five, Sheriff personnel upgrade.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Can I just clarify, just one no to the last one?

Chairman Gavaris: One no.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Sheriff personnel upgrade. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Legislator Ronk: I'm just pleased that the Sheriff did a desk audit here. I'll be happy to support it.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? So carried.

Number six, Sheriff Port Security Grant. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels. Second? Archer. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

Number eight, ARPA positions. Can I have a motion? Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk. Discussion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: What are we voting on, at this point?

Chairman Gavaris: This is to reduce the positions back to the salary of 2021, which they were just hired.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah.

Legislator Archer: You forgot the number seven.

Chairman Gavaris: I did. I'll go back in a second [inaudible].

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I requested the resumes of, or the information now I think somebody else did earlier. I'm yet to see those, and I you know, I mean, these are supposed to be specialty positions.

Oh, there goes, somebody is coming to the house, apparently. Anyway, what I'm doing is, I requested the resumes of these people that are hired, and I've not gotten them.

Deputy Executive Milgrim: [inaudible] started working here or aren't here for confirmation.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: So what I mean by Burt, or somebody, can they be sent to the Legislature, I mean, these, this is supposed to be specialty type of positions. And I would like to know, you know, the qualifications of the people that they're putting in there.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So we sent over the names, I don't know that we've typically sent over resumes of those who have been hired for other positions, if they're not to be appointed by the Legislature. So in terms of past practice, I'd just be curious to know, when this has occurred in the past.

Chairman Gavaris: [inaudible]

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I don't think we've hired specialty people in this in this matter before, this is for a special program. And the whole point was, we want to make sure that, you know, the people that are hired are not basically political acts, but they're actually people that are, you know, educated towards this or has background towards this type of work.

Chairman Gavaris: See, the difference here is it sounds like the Chairman has also said he requested the information and hasn't received it. So I don't think we're asking for that as a common practice. But he, he says he requested it. So he should have received it.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So we, we sent over the names. And that was an earlier request. And we're still reviewing the request for resumes. So we can review past, past practice, because it's not something that's commonly requested when we hire for other positions. So we're confirming.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Your your, you know, I don't need to be double talked. The point was, I asked for the resumes, it's all I want, was the resume, I think that's a reasonable request.

Legislator Ronk: Sounds like [inaudible] Chairman.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: [inaudible] being hired.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter, you had your hand up?

Legislator Walter: So is this, is this a, the, the 3%, across the board increase thing? So, you know, I understand that the concept is you give a 3% across the board, and it could be that they're hired the day, the last day of 2021, and they still, but like that's your choice. You don't have to give the 3% increase to everyone. And it seems kind of silly to be giving a raise to a group of people who haven't actually gotten hired yet. Or if they have they just started so you know, I, I get that you want to give a 3% across the board to these confidential management positions, management confidential, or whatever they're called. But again, I don't, it's not law. So I just, I just don't see why you would be doing this.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels, then Ronk, then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Bartels: I'm confused. Isn't this, isn't this lowering the salaries based on the number of days, what, what's happening?

Chairman Gavaris: Its keeping it, it's keeping it at the, the hired salary, which was just recently for some, I don't really know if all that been hired, but this is to keep it since we're close enough to the end of the year, they would keep that salary. It's, it's bringing it back down to what they made when they were first hired recently.

Legislator Bartels: Their salary that was approved by the Legislature.

Chairman Gavaris: Correct.

Legislator Bartels: So what is the 3% we're talking about, that Eve was raising.

Chairman Gavaris: The amount that it's increased.

Legislator Walter: I'm saying, I'm agreeing with this amendment, because I don't see the reason to give them a 3% raise already.

Chairman Gavaris: Hold on, Legislator Ronk then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk: No, I was just, I was gonna be a pain in the rear end, and it's not necessary today. It's fine.

Chairman Gavaris: Wow, okay, Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Can I get back to the qualifications of these people that were hired? I'd like to see what they are.

Legislator Ronk: I think the answer was no, Dave.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: If the answer is no, then maybe we need to take the organization's out of the budget. I mean, if we don't know what they are, they're hiring them and what, what their qualifications are? Why would we do that? I mean, my mindset is this is a certain qualification should have been met and I'd like to know what they were. I have no idea. All I simply did was ask for the resumes and I'm a little aggravated that you couldn't get them to me. I don't care what past policy is and there are past policies, if they're, we often get resumes of people that are being hired. In this case, where I requested it, I don't think it's a big request. I'm a little aggravated that that's not, not given to me. I mean, it makes no sense not to hand it over. I mean, if the if these people are meant to be they're that good. That's why they're hired. And we should be able to see the resume.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Haynes, and then Chris, you guys can go. Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Just to be clear, this was, I got a little bit confused, like Tracy, actually, this is to give them a 3% increase from the salary. Go ahead, John.

Chairman Gavaris: No, no on, it's to back it back down from the 3% that was proposed in the budget it was

Legislator Haynes: Okay, got ya.

Chairman Gavaris: to keep it at what they were hired at most recently.

Alright, and Chris, you guys go ahead.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So to the first point, the raise goes to the position, not the person. And this happens universally, whether it's CSEA, or management. So when we're going through the list, if there's vacant titles, they also got the raise, and that includes every single union we've negotiated with. To the second point on the resume, we did not say no to the request, we said we're reviewing it, because it hasn't been part of our past practice. So we're evaluating the request, and we'll get you an answer. We did not say no.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: All right, well, then-

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson, hold on, hold on, Chair, Legislator Walter go first, then your next, then Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Walter: So I understand it's the policy, but are you mandated, mandated to give a five, a 3% increase to management confidential? Is that what you're saying? Because I understand with unions, and they negotiate, but whose, whose decision is it to give a 3% raise either, even if it's to a position the positions brand new, and so I mean, I would agree even if the position was old, and the person was brand new. But isn't it your choice to give a 3% across the board? I mean, at a state level, they don't give a 3% across the board to every management confidential position. So it's just your, it's your choice to do it. Right?

Deputy Budget Director: So we manage a workforce of 1,300 employees. And when we're looking at these and broad categories, we apply the 3% raise to all management, whether it was vacant or not. So that was the approach we take and that's the approach we take with CSEA, UCSEA or any of the other unions, it's consistency. So I get what you're saying, Yes, I guess it would have been our choice, but we are trying to have consistency across the workforce so that's what we put in. The state will do the same, yeah.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson and then Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well this is, I think Legislator Walter pointed out, this is a new, new position. These are special positions that we're hiring. So why would we okay it one number then give a 3% raise you know, two weeks later?

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: So I agree with you, I support the amendment but if I don't get a resume, I'll just put, I'm going to put in an amendment now let you know Chair Gavaris that I, to eliminate the three positions.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I'm sorry. It just took me a minute to just untangle and understand this. But I guess I just want to say thank you for identifying this, whoever identified this because it doesn't make any sense to me to give someone who hasn't even, had hadn't even taken a position, a raise when the legislature just approved this salary. So I definitely support this amendment. That's it.

Chairman Gavaris: [inaudible] Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: I would just say that if the Chairman of the Legislature is interested in seeing the resume for the people that we're hiring for this important position, and you're evaluating whether or not he can have their resume, it really gives me great pause. Are we working together? Or are we not? I mean, we have gotten resumes attached to other resolutions where people are being presented, I am unclear as to what the big issue is with present, to giving a, unless there's something you're hiding, and you don't want us to see it. I'm a little baffled by this and disappointed.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk: Probably, you know, this doesn't happen very often, I don't know that Lynn could have said it any better than then than I can. I'm not sure I could say any better than Lynn just said it. Is what I'm trying to say. I, my question was going to be exactly how long does it take to evaluate a request from the Chair of the Legislature? I mean, I mean, we're evaluating it and we'll let you know, our answer is kind of, you know, I don't know that. That seems a little odd coming from the administration. But it's an odd stance to take to me.

Chairman Gavaris: Chris.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: But typically, resumes are sent over when positions are up for confirmation by the Legislature. These positions were created by the Legislature, but they're not up for confirmation by it. So in terms of running the operations of the County, we do try to have some consistency in how we apply that. I understand the request. We are certainly looking at it. But that's pretty much all I have to say on that today.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, Legislator Bartels then Archer, then Donaldson.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I, I hope, I hope that that you send over all the resumes. I mean, this is this is definitely a unique situation. I appreciate the idea of precedent. But you know, the County is receiving \$34 million, and the Legislature, in partnership with the Executive Office is tasked with directing those funds. And these are the people that the Executive's Office has said are going to be working directly with the Legislature. So it would just be very helpful to just see the, see their resumes. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: It's already been addressed. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: What I find it all pretzel logic. Because it's a simple thing. You're saying you're evaluating whether you're going to give the information to the legislature about people that you're hired for a specialty projects, that we okay'd. So I mean my mindset is I can like I said, I if I don't get the resumes and I'm just going to put in an amendment on the floor with a budget to eliminate the three positions. We probably should do it anyway. And hire a consultant and then we'll know what we got.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: [inaudible] enough from me on that, so if you want to call the vote on this Chair.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, any other discussion then? All right. All those in favor? Opposed? One opposed. Legislator Maio.

Legislator Archer, I'm sorry, Bartels, go ahead.

Legislator Bartels: Oh, thank you. I was just gonna ask, did we skip over the?

Chairman Gavaris: We did I have to go back to number 7.

Legislator Bartels: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. Okay. Number seven. Sheriff's CSEA contracts. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Moved. Second? Legislator Bartels. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

Number 9, Clerical pool. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

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

Legislator Ronk: I'm not sure how I feel about this, that it's odd because I, I'm not necessarily against the clerical pool, if the, you know, constituent navigator amendment, you know, to remove it fails, but absent that, I'm not so much in favor of it. I feel like if I had clairvoyance, and you know, knew what was going to happen with the later amendment, I would, I would know what to do in this one, I'm

probably going to be a no but I respect where it's coming from. And if we do hire these four people, um, you know, for the, you know constituent navigator I, I would be in favor of doing this because I think that we're going to need less staff at the department level if we're going to hire staff to do all of the departments.

Chairman Gavaris: And thank you and as the sponsor of this you know, I, I was willing to withdraw it, but I figured just let it go through for discussion purposes, I would like to just impress upon the Exec team that, you know, we should be looking at this as a common practice of being able to share staff and I understand that that is being done in some respects. But I think we need to maybe expand it and come up with an actual pool that people can, can go to and know where to request additional help when they need it.

Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I was just going to echo that. I mean, I think it's an, it's an excellent idea that that is deserving of further investigation. I'm not sure. I'm not sure about moving it right now, in terms of these vacant positions, I think I would like to look at it holistically across all county departments, and in all those positions, and I think it's something in the coming year that we should spend some time on with the Executive's Office.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I'm just gonna say that I agree. I mean, I'm glad you brought this up. I think looking at shared services in general is an interesting thing. And there might be other places besides just clerical cool. But there are certain positions, especially on this that I feel particularly protective of, I think the issue is not to merge them, but make sure we figure out how to fill them.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All those in favor? All those opposed? All right, all opposed and the motion fails.

Chairman Gavaris: Caller at 845-768-2308. Can you identify yourself?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Star six to unmute.

Chairman Gavaris: Apparently, they didn't want to identify themselves, okay.

Alright, um, amendment number 10, energy consultant, can I have a motion? Legislator Walter, second, Bartels.

Legislator Bartels. Legislator Bartels do want to speak on this or you just were seconding it. Okay. Any comments? All right, all those in favor? All those in favor? Opposed? One, two. Two oppose, three opposed, four opposed. Okay. Motion is defeated.

It's Pat Doxy. She's saying that she can't figure out how to make herself heard.

Number 11, inflationary adjustment. Can I have motion? Legislator Archer. Second? Chair Donaldson. Discussion? Legislator Archer, you just?

Legislator Archer: Sorry, I'm working two computers here and I keep grabbing, grabbing the wrong mouse. Um, can you just explain your, your rationale here and you came up with a 2.6? Where did that come from? I'm just curious. I don't think it's a bad thing. I'm just curious as to your, your, your rationale here.

Chairman Gavaris: That was the projected 2022 projected inflation number from the department treasurer, I believe it was.

Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I'm so I really appreciate that you're, you're examining this. I mean, I, I know that Burt spoke to some, at some point suggesting that inflation was considered in the, in their estimates. I don't know, Burt, if you want to kind of say any more on that?

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah, just as I spoke before, in terms of the, the bigger lines that are here, like gas and electric, legal services, all of those things were taken into consideration. Auto fuel, any department that had auto fuel, I know UCAT, Highway, we took into account the fuel prices currently and we did increase their budget in those lines. So as I, I think we have budgeted for these inflated costs.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. And just to give some context and historical information about this was originally, you had said that it wasn't, when we first got present presented the budget, that that wasn't take into account. I think what you meant by that was for non-contractual items. And then you clarified that at one of our earlier meetings. So it is a smaller number while there is still some things that inflation was not accounted for. I think it's small enough that now it's not going to have such a huge effect, because most of our, our expenses are contractual. Any other discussion? All right, all those in favor? Opposed? All right, motion is defeated.

Number 12, Information Services evaluation. Can I have motion? Legislator Archer, second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Walter, then Bartels.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. I, it's kind of funny. I mean, I'm saying this only collegiality that that Legislator Gavaris, you spoke of saving more money doing stuff out, outsourcing IT stuff. But this is sort of looking at how we can beef up our IT. This, this I strongly support and agree. I think that there's a lot that we, first of all, IT demands increase all the time. But there's so much, so much efficiency I think we can achieve if we really assessed what we have in place built from that. I think there's a lot of systems that we outsource that we probably could do internally. I know in many major organizations, they have these strong internal IT departments that really handle, not only handle things that we hire other companies to do, but can often operate in real time for demands, like creating software that communicate between different departments, for example, and so, you know, when when our when CMA brought this up a year ago, I felt very strongly like this, this can be a true cost saver for us, while improving how effective we serve.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All right, all those in favor? Opposed? One, two opposed. All right, motion is carried.

Number 13, unsettled labor union contracts. Can I have a motion? Legislator, Chair Donaldson. Second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Legislator Haynes and Bartels. You're opposed? Chair Donaldson and Ronk, Archer. Okay. I'm opposed as well. Motion is defeated.

Number 14, Communication Specialist position. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter. Second, Ronk. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? One, two, two opposed. Okay, motion is carried.

Budget number 16, sorry, number 15, Communication Specialist salary. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll withdraw that.

Chairman Gavaris: You'll withdraw it? Okay. Motion has been withdrawn.

Number 16, Constituent Service Navigator. Can I have motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Excuse me, can I ask a question on 14?

Chairman Gavaris: Yes.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That was eliminating the position wasn't it?

Legislator Ronk: Affirmative.

Legislator Walter: Sorry, I'm changing my vote. I didn't realize that was eliminated.

Legislator Ronk: Oh. Then if, if that one's gonna fail, I don't withdraw the other one.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It did fail.

Legislator Walter: I forgot he had two up there.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, let's reopen number 14. Can I get a motion to reopen number 14?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll make a motion to reopen it.

Chairman Gavaris: Second, Bartels. Now, discussion. Legislator Ronk, you just want to clarify, your, you put this in? Correct?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I did. Um, you know, I, I don't think you know, as I said in the first meeting, I don't think that this is a necessary, you know, position for county government. I think that that's partially

evidenced by the Facebook posts that I saw from the government Facebook page of the County Executive's Office, which I assume was done by the Communication Specialist, you know, which, you know, highlighted a letter from a young man who was vaccinated the site to the County Executive thanking him for setting up the vaccination site. Again, I think that there's a lot of self-promotion that comes from this. And this position, I thought that the whole time, it's why I suggested to the County Executive that he not hire somebody. Because, you know, I know that people get big feelings when there's somebody in a position. Not, don't necessarily when the position is vacant. Um, you know, I don't, because I had that conversation with the County Executive several months ago that I was planning on having this discussion at budget time as well. Um, you know, I, I think that communicating with the public is great. But I think that this position in particular, comes really close to straddling that line of what's political and what's government and I think that there's quite a bit of political brand building and self-promotion that comes from positions like this.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I mean, they have other people that do the same thing at this point. So I mean, I'm not sure how many of them he needs, I, I will support the amendment.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All right just to be clear this time, if you're voting yes, it's to eliminate the position. All right, so, Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Someone is currently in the position, correct?

Legislator Ronk: Affirmative. They were hired two days after, they were hired in the system two days after the legislative meeting where we didn't eliminate this position a couple months ago.

Legislator Archer: But this is the one where we were clear about the salary, correct? Yes?

Legislator Ronk: I'm sorry.

Legislator Archer: We were concerned about the salary change this we were very clear.

Legislator Ronk: That was, that was part, yeah, that was part of this. I mean, you know

Legislator Archer: I just, I'm just trying to put it in. Yeah.

Legislator Ronk: previously increased.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor of eliminating the position? Aye.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: 1, 2, 3, 4, I'm going to be in favor of that as well. So it's four - three. Now, so opposed?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: 5, 5-3.

Chairman Gavaris: Hold on. Opposed? 1, 2, 3, 4. Yeah, so it's 4-4, the motion is defeated. All right, um, Legislator Ronk, do you want to revisit 15 now?

Legislator Ronk: I do, yeah, I, I, I will not, you know, the only reason that I had said that I was going to withdraw it is because it would be moot if the previous one passed.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, so motion to open [inaudible].

Legislator Ronk: I'll move that.

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

Legislator Walter: So, you, I, I guess for me, and I'm not really that personally informed about what this position universally should be getting. I just know from what I'm hearing from, from people within my own caucus, and, and from the examples that we've seen from other places. And so it just doesn't, it doesn't feel like it's the right size salary. I, but I'm, you know, I would really encourage the Executive's Office to, to support why this level of salary is the appropriate one, because it, it given the nature and I, I asked the questions about what this position does, and how it, how it works differently from the others, and how it is an increased heightened level of responsibility, skill set, etc, of \$20,000 over what this individual did in their previous position, which also, incidentally, was one another one of those positions where the person was put in as an accountant, even though they weren't an accountant. And so, but to, to then shift them over here at this higher rate, that would mean that there was a higher skill set needed. But they were at that other position, they're the same person, they didn't go to graduate school, and between that position and this that all of a sudden, you know, would put them at this heightened skill set level and so I just, you know, I'm willing to be compelled, but I, I haven't been yet.

Chairman Gavaris: Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I do you recall to at the time of the the time of the discussion, I think it was you Legislator Gavaris that circulated a salary analysis. So we all did have in our hands at that time comps, both in the, in the region in Hudson Valley, and an even broader comps. So it was a compelling argument that was being made at that time.

Chairman Gavaris: Any discussion? All right, all those in favor of the reduction? Opposed? Legislator Haynes. All right, I'll be yes. And the motion is carried.

Let's see, number 16, Constituent Service Navigator. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter? Second. Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairman Gavaris: Discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So, you know, I'm, I'm so supportive of the concept. I just as I stated before, on Monday, and several other times, I, I feel like it still needs baking. And I know that Chris,

you you know has expressed that this is sort of level one of level of two levels. I think that this is an ideal opportunity, as I stated on Monday, to move this, take this out of our budget, make it an ARP project, let the ARP team that's there probably a couple of different ARP groups that would be appropriate for talking about this, how it should work, what should be the skill sets, I had mentioned how, you know, having someone who has specialty in DSS would be very, very useful, because that's a very challenging thing to navigate. Most oftentimes, individuals need multiple things. And so what I would request is that we, you know, that we do take it out of the budget, I'm supportive of removing it, but that we then move it into a potential ARP project, which would cover it for two years allow it to grow and build, allow the Legislature and Department Heads to have their input as to what would be really needed by this so that we do it right. So I'm not supporting this amendment because I'm against this. I'm supporting this amendment because I'm for doing it as well as we possibly can and I think the ARP funds allow us to really do this right.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I would echo some, some of what Legislator Walter said, I mean, I'm in, in concept I'm supportive of this, but I don't, you know, this, this is kind of the case with many, many, many things in this budget. It's been a hard one for me to fully wrap my head around, given that, you know, there, I think you may have removed it, Legislator Gavaris, but it may still be there, we've had some discussion about the sales tax revenue estimates and concern about whether or not we're going to come in where we're anticipating, you know, I personally feel a little more confident about that than I did earlier, as I've looked into the numbers and run '19 numbers out, you know, on 6% increases to today. And, and I have, you know, confidence in Commissioner Gulnick and, and his track record. But that said, some of these newer initiatives, I, I'm not sure that I yet have the confidence that we are, we are where we need to be. So if I support this resolution, like Legislator Walter, it wouldn't be to have it be the end of the conversation, but really, to be have it to be the beginning of the conversation, moving forward into next year's turns. If the money is moved into contingency, we continue to have that conversation in committees and be, you know, be compelled to do this in the most appropriate manner. So that's, that's where I'm at as well.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I, I somewhat agree with both Legislators Walters a, Walter and Bartels. Sorry I put the s on the end of the wrong legislators' name. I, I don't necessarily agree with it in, you know, in theory, the concept, I think that it's, it's, again, great for PR, but I think that for the operation of county governments, it's an unnecessary layer. You know, that having been said, I do think that this is a good place for ARP funding to be used, especially since the data that Mr. Kelly sent us shows that almost no calls, comparatively, a statistically insignificant number of calls are non COVID related right now. So we, we could be hiring these people, you know, to handle general government calls. And, you know, we're hiring more people than the number of calls we get per day that aren't COVID related. So, um, you know, I, I think that perhaps, you know, if that's the will of the committee, we pass this amendment and then amend, you know, the budget to include money for this in the ARP, you know, and I'm sure we can get information from the Executive's Office on what the Recovery Service Center, you know, costs so we can figure out how to allocate the ARP money for that, because, you know, of course, the Recovery Service Center was never something that was envisioned by the Legislature nor passed by the Legislature nor really understood I think completely by the Legislature.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Yeah, I actually, really, I 100% support this position, these positions. I believe that anytime we invest in better communications, especially in the form of communicating with our constituencies, and making it, navigating easier, as for the information that came through regarding the Recovery Service Center being COVID related, it's really hard to capture data when the position hasn't been created yet, of course, you're only going to see, you know, the type of data that's related to those calls for the services that they were currently providing. So that's my thought on that. And I'm, I'm 100% behind making something even better, more efficient and more effective for the taxpayers.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Leg, I think Legislator Haynes forgot the last part, you know, efficient, effective and expensive. But I'll also I also like to say that, you know, the logic that Legislator Haynes just, you know, utilized sounded more like we need to, you know, we need to pass the bill before we can read what's in it, we, you know, really what we're saying what you're, what she's saying is that we have to spend this money before we realize how it's going to be utilized. And I just, I can't, I can't possibly agree with that logic.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes

Legislator Haynes: It's okay, Kenny doesn't have to agree with my logic, I don't always agree with his logic. However, when you're asking for, to capture data based off of a system that already exists, that data is going to show you whatever comes out of how it's currently functioning, not how it's going to be functioning in the future.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: And then to build on that Legislator Haynes, I think that's the opportunity by moving it into an ARP project where you start to capture data necessary to then justify why you build a unit and what the value of that unit will be for the organization down the road. So, you know, I think there's real opportunity. But I think, again, putting it in ARPA gives us the ability to structure it to inform and to help us in the future. If, if this is something that pans out.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk, and then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I mean, you know, again, due respect to Legislator Haynes, you know, the the information was given to us by the Executive's Office to justify the positions. So to then say that we can't really judge it by the data. I feel like it's counterintuitive to their whole argument.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, it's, I have to agree with the maybe moving into ARPA money, or I don't think even make the move. I mean, ARPA money is open ended, and in a sense, not totally open ended, but there are a certain amount of the being open ended and as a result of, you know, I don't know how this was really justified, what's the data that we have right now? So I, I'll have to agree

with my colleagues that point out that we're not sure. We, I mean, it, it seems like it might be a good idea. But it seems like it's a good idea. I'm not sure if it is and I think you know, better data to prove that it's a good idea might be a better a better way of going on it and maybe using some ARPA money to investigate that.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carried, 1 opposed. Legislator Archer. How are you, you're in favor or opposed?

Legislator Archer: In favor, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Okay.

Number 17, Director of Budget Innovation. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter, second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Could you fill in what this is actually doing?

Chairman Gavaris: This is to create the position of Director of Budget Innovation, no.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: To defund.

Chairman Gavaris: Oh, this is defunding one. Correct. Okay. This is to defund that position. I believe Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's what I thought. I mean, I think so the, I mean, I was pretty sure that's what it was. But I think some people that are listening in may not know exactly what it is. So you might want to you know, just you know, very briefly point out, you go to be these other ones where you what exactly they're doing.

Chairman Gavaris: But I don't have all the information, in hand Chair Donaldson, but I can try, hopefully their sponsors themselves can speak up on it.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yea, I, I'd be happy to speak up on it. This is a new position that's being created. Um, you know, I'm not in favor of creating the new position. It's also something that the County Executive tried to do mid budget that the Legislature was not in favor of doing the budget. So that's basically what it is. I, I don't agree with the creation of this position. So I put in a amendment to eliminate it.

Chairman Gavaris: Other discussion? Legislator Bartels?

Legislator Bartels: It's not exactly, totally on, on point, but it's sort of um, so, you know, I, in thinking about this division, I'm I really struggle with the increases to the rest of the division, the, the switch we discussed yesterday, the switch in the hours, to 35 and 30, from 35 to 37 and a half and to 40. You know, in management positions, I mean, I appreciate that. I mean, I appreciate that most management positions are working more than the hours that they're, that they're clocking or that they're, that they're paid for. I mean, I just know, that's, that's how management works. So I struggle, and while I'm, I

struggled less with the creation of this one position, then with all those changes within the department, and I'm just putting it out there. I have not put in an amendment to that effect yet. But I do after yesterday's conversation, it's something that I, I'm having a hard time with.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk, then Walter.

Legislator Ronk: I just want to make, I just want to be clear, Legislator Bartels, this is not a salary increase. This is a brand-new position and the, you know, again, in the realm of well, we're not saying who it's going to actually be we're gonna have a nationwide search, and then we all know it's going to be who we all know it's going to be.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And then we won't get their resume.

Legislator Ronk: So the, the position that that person would vacate would then be hired for. So it's, it's a complete addition of, you know, what, \$164,112?

Legislator Bartels: I'm aware, yeah.

Legislator Ronk: I've I've, I've heard I've heard people suggest eliminating the other position that would in theory be vacated, rather, and, and just leave this position. If, if Legislators would rather support that than this, then that's something I could see. I could get myself on board with supporting but I can't support both positions staying.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson, I'm sorry, Legislator Walter then Chair Donaldson. Chair Donaldson, I'm sorry, Legislator Walter was before you, you're up after.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Oh I'm sorry, go ahead.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. No problem. So you know, I had requested some more information to understand the benefits of this. I, you know, I've I've heard two things. One is sort of improved, you know, that we have a lot going on and we have all these innovations and things that are happening, but we have three new ARP positions, specifically and much of the innovations that we're going to be doing, you know, I think I'd feel very different if we didn't hire those three people who I was very hesitant to, I didn't support that, because I felt like until we know what we're spending our other money on. Why are we jumping in and taking, hiring three whole people to, to manage it. But you know, I feel like much of the great work that Innovation is doing is ARP related, right now. And and if we got three complete other people to do that, then I don't see that point. And then the other thing I heard was this whole thing of improving our budget. And this relates to what Legislator Bartel's had spoken about, of the changing the salaries. I you know, the request to improve the budget was made, like years ago, and it, it was kind of felt like it was ignored for quite a few years. And then there were some shifts that were made last year, and then we're hearing because we kind of ignored it for a few years. And then we started to try to do it. Why don't you give us a whole new person and give us more time when I, I just feel like, the fact is, it's not that complicated to create a five-year plan, to reach out to department heads, on where they see we should be, reach out to legislature, involve us and performance metrics, and and then connect budget items to performance metrics. I don't think it's that crazy. And I know it was proposed many, many years ago. And so the truth is, is if it hasn't been done, it's not because it's not because you don't

have enough people or enough time it hasn't been done because you haven't done it. As I just, that's how I feel. And so, I would say that, in addition to supporting the idea of the amendment that Legislator Bartels suggested of, of not accepting those changes in time. You know, I just have trouble seeing what the added benefit how will this job save us money? Is what I would like to know and I don't see it. I will say a last point is I would be supportive of for Legislator Ronk sake, if if we did have this position in eliminate so they're not backfilling the other position, that if you know, I feel like the work that Chris you do is great, I think I met, a lot of it's going to be handed off to these three ARP people. But, you know, I, I would be willing to support that other amendment.

Legislator Ronk: But not necessarily Chris.

Legislator Walter: But not necessarily, Chris. But the idea of, of having one person in this role at a heightened level would be my second choice. But I would, I would certainly support that.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson and then Chris.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I wasn't sure. I didn't know who was getting the position. It's not, in other words, it in other words, we have rumors that this is what's going to happen. I don't know exactly what's going to happen and so in that mindset, I mean, it's a new position, I don't understand it, they are, if they have somebody in mind and then he said, digital, what's it called, they're going to do and they're moving over there that we could eliminate the other position. And then that would make sense. But I don't, I don't know that.

Chairman Gavaris: Chris, and then Legislator Bartels.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So I just have to kind of make a major point of clarification. The Innovation work is an internally face unit, internally focused unit, they are not working on ARP. So, they are internally focused, looking at processes procedures, instilling KPIs, health metrics. Currently, our basis for measurement is called OKRs. Objectives and key results, which we've deployed throughout eight departments. So there's a key distinction, the work that I do in budget is more related to that ARP work, where that is something that is separate from what the Innovations main focus is. In terms of the last 18 months. So when COVID hit, the unit had just been formed in the 2020 budget. They were allocated to work on COVID, as was most of the county staff. So they were integral in developing the COVID-19 hotline and RSC, and I've been working that whether part time or whatever else, the entire duration. So some of that performance measurement work did get delayed, there was a reality that we all had to work COVID and certain innovations or certain improvements even to the budget, they had to get pushed aside because we were dealing with other things at the time. I think that as we've normalized somewhat, or have been able to better balance the workloads, we're now able to get back to a lot of that work. And that's what we've done. The last point is, this position existed as the Director of Innovation at \$97,000. So we defunded it as part of cost saving measures going into 2021. So what we've done is now that it's a combined unit, it is now the Director of Budget and Innovation to reflect how the Division or as the Department looks today. That's all.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels then Ronk.

Unidentified Speaker: What?

Legislator Bartels: Couple of things

Unidentified Speaker: Oh no, I won't.

Legislator Bartels: was a Deputy Director? Sorry, was it Deputy Director of Innovation or Director, it looks like it said Deputy Director of Innovation prior. Is that correct? That's for Chris.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: No, it was Director.

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So this restores it to the same size that it was prior to COVID.

Legislator Bartels: Okay. In the budget book that I'm looking at it said Deputy Director, I see a Deputy Director. It's very confusing, but okay. First of all, do I know Legislator Ronk is being a little bit facetious in terms of the idea of the, the search for this person? Don't we know who this person is going to be? I mean, I'm not-

Legislator Ronk: I'm being a moderate amount of facetious about it,

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Legislator Ronk: but I'll accept your [inaudible].

Legislator Bartels: I mean, aren't we talking about this being, being your position Chris Kelly?

Legislator Ronk: Chris Kelly.

Legislator Bartels: Correct?

Legislator Ronk: Okay, they're gonna admit [inaudible].

Legislator Bartels: Okay. I'm seeing a nod, I'm seeing a nod. Thank you.

Commissioner of Finance Gulnick: That's correct, that's correct.

Legislator Bartels: Okay, thank you. Okay. So that's, I mean, it's helpful because because like Legislator Walter said, I, I do think that, that you're doing a great job and when we're thinking when we're creating a position for an unknown, it's different than defining a position within a department for the work that you're doing, and therein might be the pull to Legislator Ronk's earlier point about not backfilling the second position. I go back to the idea of still being uncomfortable with these change in hours. I know that departments have used that as they've used the alternative work schedule sometimes as ways of increasing salary. We had that, we don't have to revisit the past with another division, another elected division, but we had that happen in the past and I know that that's come up before. I do have a question about this division. I'm sorry. I know this is not necessarily what's exactly on our plate at this

moment but I have been looking at part-time pay, overtime pay, trying to make sense of all these things in a crunch over the last couple of days, and I noticed that the Innovation Division has \$10,000 in new expense to part-time pay, in addition to the proposed additional person and the additional hours, what is that for?

Commissioner Gulnick: We were going to use interns to help with the, the innovation part of that.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So we were looking at like SUNY New Paltz and Marist for, on the data side.

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Chairman Gavaris: Leader Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Is that step two in the volun-paid workforce?

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: We have stricken paid volunteers from the record Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Understood. Thank you.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: You're welcome.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I mean, I guess I would like to hear from the Executive's Office, you know, we have two options on the table. We could support getting rid of this, or we could support this and get rid of the Deputy position. And so I mean, do you want to just leave it to a lottery? Or do you want to? I mean, chime in on this, if you?

Deputy Executive Rider: We'll, we'll take it back to the County Executive. I mean, he proposed the budget as we felt like we needed the workforce that we needed. So we feel like we need both positions.

Legislator Ronk: So why don't you does the committee want to hold this? And maybe they can get the County Executive on the line and you know, work it out before the end of the meeting, or?

Deputy Executive Rider: I mean, feel free to pass this or not through this committee. I'm, we're not going to bring it back to the Executive during this meeting.

Legislator Ronk: Fair enough. Let's move forward.

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

Group: Aye.

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

Legislator Bartels: Um, this is okay. I just, um, need clarification. So right now, what we're voting on is removing the

Chairman Gavaris: To eliminate the position.

Legislator Bartels: Director position, eliminating the Director.

Legislator Walter: It's the only one we have in front of us. So we don't have the other options.

Legislator Bartels: Right. But I mean, we can put another option in front of us, we can even put the intent in front of us before, you know, we can if we're having that discussion, if that's where the consensus is, you know, we can have resolution drawn up for the day that we're voting on the budget as well. So-

Legislator Walter: Right, either way, this is going to go forward. So I mean, and be voted on by the Legislature. So I just, I feel like without having that, you know, the other situation, Legislator Ronk had both right there but because it doesn't, I feel like we have just this to deal with now and we can always vote differently on the floor.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean,

Legislator Ronk: After the if, after the, the County Executive staff presents him with the other option that's been raised by this committee, if he chooses to, you know, be, you know, comfortable with that, then we can maybe have a different discussion. But you know, again, I'm, I'm coming in the spirit of what it feels like compromise.

Legislator Bartels: Yes and I appreciate that. And again, it's like I don't want to, I realize it's not officially on the table yet. But again, I am I'm not comfortable. I'm not comfortable with the hour changes in this department either. These are significant. They, they come they come across as significant. I'll call them raises, but increases in salary across this whole department in a way that's more substantial than, than almost anywhere else in the organization.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Archer: I am uh, uh, yes on this. But if we put the other resolution in, I am in support of keeping this and not filling the deputy position. So I'm just being clear that if there we have options on the table and we put in an amendment that's where I would come out on that.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson and Legislator Haynes.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I, I agree with that Legislator Archer. I mean, I think that would make sense. I also agree with Legislator Bartels and I think that perhaps Amber can draw up a, an amendment to address this.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes and then Bartels.

Legislator Haynes: I agree with Legislator Archer as well.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Thanks. I was gonna say, Yeah, I mean, that's that's where that's where I'm at also. So I would ask Amber to write that resolution because I would feel more comfortable with that than with this.

Chairman Gavaris: Do you want to make an amendment now for to this resolution? Or?

Legislator Bartels: We could do that. That would be to, that would be to remove the remove the Deputy Director of Innovation position, correct?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: No. I don't think you, I don't think you, I'm sorry. I don't know if you want to do that. I think they can do that. We can do that prior to, you know, after a conversation with the Executive, but I meant for your, what you were brought up was to return them to the 35 hours.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think that was the amendment

Legislator Bartels: We could do it as a holistic resolution, though. I mean, that's possible too.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Walter and then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: No, I'm just, I'm just

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I just want to be clear, you know, I, I feel like I'm coming here in the spirit of cooperation, if the Executive's Office, you know, if the Executive decides that he's planning on opposing both this and the, you know, not backfilling of the previous position. Um, I, I would prefer us 44feel like a compromise is that, you know, that is going to be criticized is a compromise. I just want to make that clear for everybody.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think that's, I think that what we were doing isn't it?

Legislator Ronk: I, I just want to make sure [inaudible]

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: [inaudible] if, if after their conversation, did they want to make that change? We'll be open to making the change to just eliminate the Deputy in the budget and then put this one in. So I think I think that's we're all in agreement with that. And what we're trying to do is the other issue is the increasing the salary by increasing hours, that Legislator Bartels brought up. So I think that that needs to be amended here. And, you know, I mean, we could do it right now that that matter, I think, Amber how long's it take you to draw that out.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: I can absolutely draw that up. So the, the just to clarify, the request would be to defund the Deputy Director of Innovation, which is position 1017, leaving the Deputy Budget Director, and then we're leaving the Director of Budget in Innovation.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: No, I think, no, no, right now, we are just doing, where we, we eliminated that position, basically. And that that will change. Its, you know, in the future, possibly what I'm talking about is the hours that Legislator Bartels brought up. That's what I'm asking for.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Yeah, I can absolutely do that.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And then do well, I mean, so you could have that in the numbers, and then we could vote on the concept of that, what, you know once she has it up. It'll be a more concrete, but I mean, I think we would be able to vote on that here. Right?

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I'm okay with, I'm okay with, doing them as two separate resolutions. And I'm also okay, for waiting for to hear back from the Executive's Office, about whether or not there is a spirit of compromise. And doing this on, on the day that we vote on it, whatever, whatever the committee's, whatever the committee's pleasure is. Can I ask a question of, of Mr. Kelly for a moment through the Chair? So the Assistant to the Deputy Director of Innovation, the proposed position that's that's changing from, what was the previous position that is that? Is that a new position or a new title for an existing position?

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: New Title. It's a new title for an existing position.

Legislator Bartels: What's the existing position that it's replacing?

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: Eval analyst I.

Legislator Bartels: Eval analyst I, and what, and can you just tell me what that, what that position is exactly, what that position is doing?

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: So its gonna be combination of type of like, we need a business analyst skill set, and hopefully some experience in the performance measurement side at least experience in KPIs or health metrics and organizations so the business analyst is really an important part of that role.

Legislator Bartels: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Can we just so you're going to basically split the two? Remove one? Can you explain that again?

Chairman Gavaris: So far nothing has been presented yet. But there's a couple of things happening at once. It sounds like there's one option is to keep this position and remove this res, this amendment, and instead change it to removing the Deputy Position,

Legislator Ronk: The Deputy Director, the Deputy Budget Director, which is a position that Chris is currently.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, and that's in the spirit of compromise. That's what Legislator Ronk is proposing. The other part is, Legislator Bartels is discussing is about changing the number of hours that people work to, which effectively becomes an increase in salary.

Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Ronk: The compromise is to grow the size of government, but only by us a much smaller amount.

Legislator Haynes: What will the salary remain at?

Legislator Ronk: \$114,000.

Legislator Haynes: But it's only going to be, performing one function.

Legislator Ronk: I, I mean, no. Yes and no, I mean it's the Director of Budget and Innovation. So

Legislator Haynes: But if we

Legislator Ronk: It sounds like two focuses already. It sounds like two focuses already. It doesn't sound like just innovation. It's the Director of Budget & Innovation.

Legislator Haynes: But if we remove the one component, you're left with just one position

Chairman Gavaris: No, no, no, they're are two different positions. There's a Deputy Director of Budget,

Legislator Ronk: Which is the position Chris is currently in.

Chairman Gavaris: So instead of backfilling that position, if, if this is correct, it's already been said, Chris would be the Deputy Director of Budget, or he would be the the Director of Budget Innovation and instead of backfilling his deputy position right now, we would not have that position, that position would get eliminated. So he would move up, but that back position would not be filled in.

I think Legislator Bartels you had your hand up?

Legislator Bartels: No, you, you explained it.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Thank you. Alright. So we still haven't voted on this yet. So, is anybody going to make an amendment? Or do you want to do that later?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: We did vote on this.

Chairman Gavaris: We didn't go the follow through. I only asked for a favor. And we stopped because Legislator Bartels had a question on it, so we, we stopped.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I thought we voted actually on it and did the vote.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I'm, I'm confident in moving forward on this until such time as the Executive accepts some sort of a compromise, which has already been proposed.

Chairman Gavaris: All right. Legislator Bartels

Legislator Bartels: And I would just clarify, with Amber, if she could write up the other the compromise, if you want to write it as two separate resolutions, one, just removing second position and one addressing salaries. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: All in favor of eliminating the position of Director of Budget & Innovation.

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: All those opposed? One opposed? One opposed.

Legislator Bartels: I'm sorry, I'm on I'm on the fence because I really, I guess I guess for the moment, I'll be in favor. But I but I want to say that I really, I really would like to see the compromise.

Legislator Ronk: Me too.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I don't

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: This makes it open to edits, it's still open for that. It's not we're shutting the door, or anything of that nature. We just voted on this. We can make a change on, very easily.

Legislator Bartels: I'll remain I'll remain a no but I but I strongly in support of of seeing the compromise that we've discussed.

Chairman Gavaris: And just correct me if I'm wrong. Legislator Ronk you're the, the sponsor of this, if the compromise passes as well, you could and probably are willing, I'm assuming to withdraw this.

Legislator Ronk: I am I mean, quite frankly, if the Executive staff, which is with us tonight, we're willing to bring it to the Executive tonight, which they've made it clear they're not. You know, I would

be you know, we could have this handled by tonight. But they've taken it under advisement kind of like Dave's request for the resumes.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. So this is a, this is in case it sounds like Legislator Bartels, the other amendment does not go through.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I'll remain a no for now. I mean, I'll have the opportunity on the, this is all coming to the floor. But, but like I said, I, I prefer to see the alternative.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay so have one opposed, all right, motion is carried. Thank you.

Number 18, Commissioner of Finance, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks, I

Chairman Gavaris: You want to make a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, I, I think that you know, the work that the Commissioner of Finance does is worth salary commensurate with a, you know, Deputy County Executive which that which is what this does, and commissioners of finance in, in the surrounding counties are paid more. You know, I want to make it abundantly clear again, I didn't even talk to him about this before putting it forward. You know, but I just, you know, to me, this is a position that's, you know, when many positions in the Executive's Office have gotten large salary increases. This is one that hasn't been talked about discussed, considered, you know, to my knowledge, and I think that we should move forward on this.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? One, two opposed. Alright, motion is carried.

Mental health personnel, Resolution 18. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

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

Legislator Walter: So this is removing the Commis, yeah, so I'm, I'm just gonna reiterate not take too much time. I feel like this is six is especially important at this time. I want to see our mental health services be at a caliber that they even beyond what they were, before we privatized it so poorly. So I just, I feel like it's, this is a huge department, it manages a lot of money, a lot of grants, a lot of services,

a lot of data, that this is probably one of a highly complex department. And so I just stating that I am not in favor of this.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels and then Ronk.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I want to echo Legislator Walter comments, you know, I really was compelled when hearing the description in the earlier Ways and Means meeting of all the work that is currently done and is going to be done. I think it's important. I mean, I, I think it's important, as well to just even signal that we're taking mental health that seriously by creating the Commissioner it's it sends a message. And I look forward to the changes in the department and and expansion of services. I agree that, and I was here for it, the, the privatization of mental health appears to have been a, a bad decision that resulted in, in a diminishment of services.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, thanks. I'm not going to belabor this either. I, I respectfully disagree with Legislators Walter and Bartels, um, you know, this isn't un-privatizing the mental health services, this is just adding to the administration, while the services stay privatize, which to me, is, you know, throwing good money after bad if if your argument is that the privatization hurt the mental health system in Ulster County. So now, we're just going to go back to having a commissioner who's going to oversee something that's not run by county personnel. You know, we, we have somebody who's in charge of mental health, you know, from a county perspective on the administration side, if that person's not being empowered to do what has to be done, you know, making \$15,000 less, you know, you know, then that's a management problem for the County Executive between him and the Commissioner of Health, not necessarily a problem that can be solved with a title change. And, you know, a couple more staff members again, I, you know, respectfully, I don't know how you solve a clinical problem with administration, and that hasn't been made clear enough to me, I support it, but I'm, I'm certain it's gonna fail anyway, so.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'm a little confused about what this amendment actually is. Because the mental health personnel, I mean, they're creating a new mental health czar or whatever. I think it's what you're doing here. Is that correct?

Legislator Ronk: Me? Negative. So the County Executive's office has decided to, you know, re re hire a Commissioner of Mental Health. And then leave the Deputy Commissioner, as well, that's already in there and then creates a couple more positions too, in analysis. What this does is it eliminates the commissioners position, which is being newly created and instead invests in Mental Health Specialists because if there is a clinical problem, I think you'll you solve that clinical problem with clinical staff.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's what I'm trying to get at, how this position is going to help us deliver mental health services.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Um, from my personal perspective, the problem with the privatization that occurred was because the county failed to maintain a sense of coordination over these services. We have a lot of really great private mental health services. We don't need to be the clinicians, there are great programs. But what we did is, as a county is, we washed our hands if the whole thing, we just sort of outsourced it and never really stayed on top of all of it. I mean, there are obviously elements, we still continue to stay on top of because we got OMH money. But you know, it, the the failure was, was to not, coordinate, manage assure that all individuals who needed the treatment, were getting it to assure that all individuals who can provide the treatment are matched with those people who needed to identify strategic plans in terms of enhanced programming that we can implement in the county, that that's what our failure was, and this responds directly to that failure, because it is saying that we need to have the oversight over how mental health is being delivered in our county, we need to have the coordination of how mental health is delivered in our county, we don't need to be the clinicians, that we need to be the coordinators, we need to ensure the services are provided. And so in this case, and I'm generally the person who supports the people on the ground over the people in the air, but this is the solution to what we did wrong. In my mind. I do highly support having Mental Health Specialists, also on the ground. And I know that that is a part of the budget to have, you know, there are people already and they'll be you know, that's that is there. She does care management, care navigation. I think with the ideally, if we move the constituent outreach to ARPA, we'll find the utility of having another person who's really specializes in mental health, possibly as in constituent services, but I really feel like this responds very well to what we did wrong all those years ago.

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

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? I oppose as well. Alright motion defeated.

Number 20, Social Services contractual. Can I have a motion? Chair Donaldson. Second, Bartels. Discussion? All right. All those in favor?

Legislator Ronk: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Legislator Archer, your opposed or you're okay, no. Got it. Thank you. All right. Motion is carried.

Number 21, facility space study. Can I have a motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it but [inaudible].

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter. Second, Chair Donaldson. Discussion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Can you explain this one?

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk, go ahead.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks and I don't want to speak for Legislator Bartels so, if she'd like to go first. I'm fine with it. But, um, this would be for a space utilization study to be done

Unidentified Speaker: What are we thinking? Oh, well,

Legislator Ronk: There we go. You know, this would be for a space utilization study to be done. I understand that, you know, Public Works, thought it would be quite a bit more expensive than that, then this, I would be willing to amend the amendment, if Legislator Bartels would to a commensurate amount. I think that they said, what, \$115?

Legislator Bartels: I think they said 100 I thought they said \$150. But I don't want-

Deputy Executive Rider: 1-5, 1-5-0.

Legislator Ronk: 1-5-0. Okay, um, you know, I'd be more than happy to increase this. I don't know if we want to do that tonight or if we want to move it to the floor, and then figure out, you know, because we're not going to take \$150,000 out of contingency. So

Legislator Bartels: Right.

Legislator Ronk: We're gonna have to, we're gonna have to find a, a, a better place to take that money from, you know, perhaps, savings from the compromise if that goes through. But I would be willing to move this forward now. Um, you know, as it is, and then amend it on the floor, if that's what you want, Tracey.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I'm, I'm open to whatever way the committee wants to proceed. I think it's long overdue. And I mean, we've, we've talked about this amongst ourselves and in various committees over time, and I'm happy that the Executive's Office is supportive. You know, I think ultimately, ideally, we're going to save money as a result of it. And, and, you know, not a day goes by where we don't hear about space needs. Space, you know, we're talking right now about the potential of moving certain departments to Empire West, we have OET lease coming out, we have BOE. So I there's there's a there's a lot to do in short order. So yes, so I'm, I'm fine with, with moving it as is and then amending on the floor for the correct number or however the committee wants to proceed.

Chairman Gavaris: All right, Chair Donaldson then Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think, when was the last time they did a space study?

Legislator Ronk: 2007.

Legislator Bartels: Seven, and it wasn't a full one.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's what I thought it was. I was going to say, 2007, I think. But who, who is, who are you proposing that's going to do this study?

Legislator Ronk: We'll do an RFP, Dave.

Legislator Bartels: Yes.

Chairman Gavaris: Any other discussion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And they're thinking that it's going to be 150?

Legislator Bartels: That's what Buildings and Grounds, that's what the off the cuff estimate that they gave at the Way that Means meeting [inaudible].

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: What do you have in this one right now?

Legislator Ronk: Right now its at 45.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. Um, you know, I just to piggyback on some of the things that Legislator Bartels said in addition to the current space needs, this budget significantly grows the size of government again, and includes creation of new departments, which are going to need space when we're clamoring for space for the departments that currently exist. So I just I think that they're that as, as we move forward, it gets more and more necessary to, to do a study to examine all this space in the county.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: To add to that, and this goes back to the whole improving transparency in the budget cycle, a five year plan will add tremendous value to an understanding of directionally where we're going and what we should be considering as we're building budgets.

Legislator Ronk: Chair Donaldson.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think actually, was it 2007, there was actually a space committee.

Legislator Ronk: There was, that was 2008, but yeah, I was on that.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, so any other discussion? All right. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? All right, motion carried.

Number 22. Personnel contingency. Can I have a motion? Chair Donaldson. Second, Legislator Walter. Discussion? I'll just quickly say this was, you know, several positions that we were going to move to contingency and seeing how the first quarter would go.

Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, I, I think I may have forgot to ask you this. But could you just share it because I know some of, some of the new positions you didn't include in here? Was there a thought process in determining what would go into this and what wouldn't? Cuz I know I had put a resolution and to offset what you didn't put in, I think for DPW. And so I just wanted to get a rationale from you on that.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. Cuz then you backfill the ones that I did, because I was leaving ones that I was told others were putting in. But it turns out, they didn't. So I didn't want to step on anybody else who said something to me ahead of time, I left them off with my list, but they didn't actually submit so that you did it instead, so.

Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Just to be clear, this is going into a contingency account. So basically, we have more time to gather information to make a better and informed decision as to why these positions need to be filled, why we're adding new positions back and have a better understanding of directionally where the various departments are headed. Correct?

Chairman Gavaris: Correct. And this was also done at a time where at the time, Legislator Ronk brought it up earlier. You know, I had a strong belief that the the budget, the number for sales tax was completely out of whack. And after looking at it, or maybe it was Legislator Bartels who said that earlier, but I thought it was out of whack. And then after looking at it again, realizing that it's not. I have a softer stance on these positions than I did originally. But I left it in for discussion purposes. And, you know, that was the reason I left it on there.

Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. And I appreciate the idea behind all of this. I guess for me, what's hard is, is the lumping because some of these, and I'll just you know speak kind of more personally in the Sheriff's Office, Mental Health, like some of these have gone through a lot of vetting and, and, and they, they were chosen for specific reasons and they need to hire them. There might be other ones which really could use taking time and thinking about what that, what's the utility of it. But you know, I, I only have them all on this. And so, you know, I have to sort of argue against, at least for those two areas that they don't need more time to figure out why they're needed. We know.

Chairman Gavaris: And feel free to make an amendment to it. If you'd like to remove positions from this list, again, I put them all in there trying to not pick and choose. And that's why everything was on the table, so to speak.

Legislator Walter: Well, I mean, it all depends if it's not going to pass. Or what it's also on you, because you know, the information is different now that, you know, the sales tax revenue you feel more comfortable with, you also have the option to withdraw this, perhaps put in some of you know, another one that has because, I, I'm hesitant, because I know which I know, a few I would take off, but that doesn't mean, I wouldn't take off another one. It's just that I'm less informed about it. So it's not like I would leave it because I agreed. I would just leave it because I didn't know the answer. And so I, I feel less comfortable doing that. Then if you make and you don't have to withdraw, but you know, if you did, or if you made amendments, but you know, I can only speak to the ones I know about.

Chairman Gavaris: I think that's a practical approach. I will withdraw the amendment and then if between now and the the actual vote, there are positions that we want to put in, we can make on the floor. I'll withdraw that one. Thank you.

Number 23, crisis stabilization center. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Was this yours, Legislator Walter?

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I mean, I already explained why I've, if anyone's still not sure. I'm happy to do it again. But you know, I don't I know, we have a lot to still cover. So if anyone feels on the fence on this, and you want me to reiterate what, why I'm putting this forward, please let me know. If you're all in favor of it, then great.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I'd like to hear it, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Sure. So the, this doesn't change the ARP total amount for mental health. My concern was taking the crisis stabilization center and lumping it with the idea of a mental health hub, a single building worried me because the two are not requiring each other. I want the, the crisis stabilization is on its own and the hub, and maybe the crisis stabilization center will be in the same building as the hub, but maybe it won't be and so I just separated them out from each other within the ARP. So no added money or anything like that. It's just separating the two so that we can proceed with the crisis stabilization center as they explore what the hub should look like. Or the hub you know, that one doesn't hold up the others work I'm perfectly fine if it turns out that the right building supports it all. But maybe it doesn't and I don't want to limit us to that so it's just separating the two.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Okay I'm good , thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Gavaris: Opposed? Legislator Haynes, you're opposed? One opposed. Thank you.

Number 24, respite houses. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: Move it.

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

Legislator Walter: Just to again reiterate because Legislator Donaldson, wasn't, Chair Donaldson wasn't at the previous one. So, I brought this up when we went over the Capital Plan. The respite houses, houses even though we approved the resolution, never made it into the Capital Plan. So it's just putting them in there. They are currently not under ARP because the ARP subcommittee hasn't talked about it but there's every reason to believe that you know, this could be covered with ARP also.

Chairman Gavaris: All those in favor? Opposed? Legislator Ronk you're in favor?

Legislator Ronk: Yes.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Motion carried. I'm sorry, Legislator Haynes were, were you were you a yes, I couldn't see. No, you're not okay. Sorry. One opposed.

Number 25 Sheriff personnel. Can I have a motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

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

Legislator Walter: Again, I'll just remind people so this was an issue again, a compression issue for three managerial type positions and I just realized as I'm talking, Amber that I never got you the backup, but I will provide the backup showing what the salaries basically it's the same situation where the individual just beneath them are either making about the same or in some cases higher. And, and but to offset it, I have removed a Deputy Sheriff that's not a filled position. And if and I also removed the mental health person for AVERT, and just to explain that, there are, there were three. First of all AVERT and speaking to Tara, that there is a person in mental health who is helping a AVERT at this moment. And so we have, you know, there is already a person there, but also under mental health, they're adding a court advocate person, a liaison with mental health and criminal justice. So that person can also be supportive of AVERT, if needed. And the Public Defender added a mental health person who will be working with courts and criminal justice. And that person, which is covered by Office of Indigent Legal Services. So there are basically three mental health people to do very similar types of jobs, when, you know, AVERT is already getting some support for mental health. So it just seemed very redundant. And the sheriff was supportive of this, Tara was supportive of this. And it more than offsets the cost to improve those supervisor's positions to respond to both compression and just sort of right sizing their salaries. If you wanted to compare to other counties.

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

Number 26, Human Rights Commission. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: So this is also just to clarify, originally, this was, we were going to put this person in as a part-time, which would leave the commission with two part time people. They already have a tremendous amount of demands, even without the helpline, and there was support, there was a request from Tyrone, support from the Executive's Office that there should be one and a half people helping his

department. But rather than take the current part-time person and move them full-time, they can't, they can't go full time. So that would really make them not be able to stay in that position. So it was a much cleaner thing to make this helpline person also full-time and obviously be more than the helpline they would be supporting the work of the Commission, as well.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels then Haynes.

Legislator Bartels: So, you know, after having heard the Commissioner at our Laws and Rules Committee, you know, there was, there was a kind of consensus in the Committee to entertain the idea but, but I for one would be a little more comfortable going into the year with the two part timers to start and then get a sense of how many calls he's fielding and how much work he's feeling and then if he needs to extend the second, you know, the one of the part timers to, to a full-time to run it throughout the year. That would make me a little more comfortable. But I'm, I'm open. I'm open to the discussion.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes and then Walter.

Legislator Bartels: I found my answer in Tracy's response. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you, uh, you know, I appreciate that, I have to say, I've heard for over a year, how much pressure he's been feeling in that office to manage the, the types of requests they're already doing. It's, it's, you know, it's it's a very important office and being operated with one full time person and one part time right now. And, and we're, we're going to be putting more on them with this. I just, it it seems like we're not, it's important to stand behind Human Rights by saying that, at the very least, you should have a, you know, this is not a huge step that he's looking for. And and I have to say that he's, I heard it over a year ago, the pressure he's feeling trying to do this, you know, maintain this office. And you know, he's not doing some things he probably could be doing. It's a it's a skeleton staff to say the least. I mean, it's not even a whole skeleton.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Actually, this, this office been increased over the years because at one point, the person had held this position and another and then it got changed. Just the Human Rights Commissioner. And then we increased that with a, with a staff member. So now we were increasing with another full staff member and I kind of agree with Legislator Bartels, I think, let's find the numbers and see what the numbers are. You know, that's what the, the you guys should be doing the following year, is you know looking at those numbers, see what those calls are. See, you know how they're solved. And so I think it would make more sense to do the part time at first and then, you know, with the idea that maybe increase it to full time, if, if it seems to be warranted.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. You know, you all can do how you feel, I just want to say it's not just simple counts of calls, when a call comes into the Human Rights Commission, they, if they're, if they're guiding someone to get the help they need, they hold their hands, they actually support them, they may

go on to go into the meeting with whoever they needed to go on to. And then if it seems to be it's deemed a human rights violation, they fully investigate it. So I'm just cautioning you that number of calls alone is not the metric as much as how much time and energy they put into each call and the work that they do behind it. So if you do want metrics, just you know, I urge you to get the right one.

Chairman Gavaris: And I'll just agree with Legislator Bartels and Chair Donaldson you know, I think it's always easier to step things up, they try to pull them back in. And, you know, stepping into this slowly might prove to be prudent in the end, and it may not, but we can always add it's harder to take away positions and half positions later. So any other discussion? All right, all those in favor?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Now, okay.

Chairman Gavaris: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: What are we actually voting on in this point?

Chairman Gavaris: On the increased position.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: To increase it, okay.

Legislator Walter: Wait. Yeah, okay. Yes, the increase from a part-time to full-time.

Chairman Gavaris: Yes. Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Can, can, can this be one of those that we would put in contingency under that personnel contingency so if the money is at least captured and if in the first quarter, second quarter, they can come back and, and highlight the kind of work they're doing and why it's critical that, you know, we've got the available funds and we don't have to draw down from anywhere else.

Chairman Gavaris: I'll let Legislator Walter first, but go ahead.

Legislator Walter: I would not be okay putting the whole position in there because he needs the position right now. I mean, even as the part-time, at the very least, he needs that right now.

Legislator Archer: I'm, I'm referring to the part-time.

Legislator Walter: Right, right. I'm saying he needs the

Legislator Archer: Put, take half the job and the benefits and all of that put it in contingency and have this person be a part-time person until we can better assess the the type of activity.

Chairman Gavaris: You went on mute Legislator Archer but I think you were done. So I guess I'll just say quickly before Legislator Bartels goes, we could do it that way. But in reality, that money is going to come out of contingency is going to come out of the you know, fund balance anyway. So whether we actually put into contingency or we just add it later, either way, it's sort of this six of one half dozen or the other but we can do it either way.

Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: That's what I was just gonna say.

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. All right. So all those in favor as it stands right now, adding the half position to a full timer. All those in favor, aye. Opposed? All right. Five opposed, motion defeated. Thank you.

Number 27, Enterprise West CIP. Can I have a motion? Legislator Archer. Second, Legislator Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, um, I had a conversation with Tim on this and and just so we're clear, and Amber's not here, but I will follow up with her. Oh, there she is. Um, we just want to make sure that the funds that we have already committed to through resolution, um, is, is either accounted for in the in in this and I do defer to the finance team just to make sure what what we're basically saying is future investments zero'd out. And so we'll commit to what we've already through resolution agreed to. But any new funding of capital projects for that facility just doesn't make sense at this juncture.

Chairman Gavaris: Amber.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: Um, that's correct. Anything that any technical amendments that need to be done can easily be done. So if there's a purchase order that's outstanding, or an invoice that hasn't yet been processed, we can easily amend the budget amendment to account for that.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I think just to be clear, not just in terms of a purchase order that's out but again, you know, rectifying it with resolutions so that if in fact we've approved something that hasn't even gone out to, to bid or to purchase, to purchase order, or to the point of having a purchase order yet. I think by clarifying for Legislator Archer, she can correct me if I'm wrong, saying that those commitments would remain intact, but nothing new moving forward. So it would be it would be more about be more about justifying it against the resolutions that have already passed in terms of the figure approvals.

Deputy Clerk Feaster: So this, as it's written is just the actual expenses. It's not the budget that's been approved through resolution.

Legislator Bartels: I think that what Legislator Archer was saying was that she was looking to honor what had been approved through resolution, but not anything further. So even if it hadn't gone yet gone out to bid or there, there wasn't a current PO that was waiting to be justified. So it's a involves a little more, I think, detail than then the technical coordination of the POs, but actually going against the commitments by the Legislature so far.

Legislator Archer: Yeah, some of the encumbrances may not be captured in New World and so that's why he wanted to ensure that we follow up with Finance, just to make sure we've got everything.

Legislator Bartels: Just if I may, just some may not even be encumbrances yet, because there may be portions of projects they just for whatever reason that we've approved, but that for whatever reason they haven't gone out, gone out to bid or or made any expenditures. Who knows. But again, I think it's it's looking against the commitments made by the Legislature through resolution honoring those commitments, but nothing further.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Cahill, then Chris.

Legislator Cahill: Well, thank you very much, Chairman Gavaris. I just want to make sure that I understand that clearly. So we're going to honor the commitments that we made in this current Legislature and fund those, but the resolution will not fund any other additional expenses at Enterprise West. Is that what we're saying?

Chairman Gavaris: Mostly the answer is yes. What it does is we would have to, nothing's been approved yet. So their funding was in there for potential future projects, which we haven't even voted on yet. The idea is that we would honor anything that we previously agreed to, but nothing going forward in would be in the budget.

Legislator Cahill: So we're not going to renege on anything we already approved on basically. Is that what we're saying, okay.

Chairman Gavaris: Correct. All right, Chris.

Deputy Budget Director Kelly: I just want to say that if Amber, or anyone needs help, or on getting the numbers together, we're all happy to help.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. Any other discussion? All right. All those in favor? Opposed? One opposed? Legislator Haynes. Motion carries.

Number 28, Buildings and Grounds Administration. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Legislator, second, second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator, Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: What is this one on?

Chairman Gavaris: I believe this is Legislator Archer's, isn't it? Yeah, Legislator Archer.

Legislator Archer: Yes. Thank you. Um, the Buildings and Grounds, a three positions are, actually one position that was not captured in the withdrawn personnel contingency. At this juncture, I'm, I'm on the, Buildings and Grounds, I've, we've gotten some backup information from the, from Brendan Masterson and I feel pretty good. I'm willing to withdraw this one as well. Unless someone else wants to take a second look at some of these positions. But I'm gonna go ahead and withdraw.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, thank you.

Number 29, Maintenance of Roads & Bridges. Motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Archer. Discussion?

Legislator Archer: Again, these were the positions that were left off the personnel contingency. I'm if everyone was satisfied that, you know helping to build the, the cross training and strengthening the in house staff and their skill set so that they have more mobility. I'm willing to go ahead and withdraw this. I mean, I felt they gave us sufficient information, unless someone else has some concerns.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. Number 30. Cornell Cooperative Extension. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, Bartels. Discussion? Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: I did miss this. I wasn't here the other day, are we now moving this into an actual line? Okay, great.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Just for clarification, it's not, it's Cornell Cooperative Extension, Soil and Water, and Library.

Chairman Gavaris: Yep. All right. Any other discussion? I don't know if Legislator Parete had submitted anything to Amber or Natalie. Any comments? Did he contact either of you? No. Okay. He just would like, I spoke with him last evening, this may not be related exactly, but last night, it was mentioned that there's things that we have to be contracted through, through the Legislature not the Exec. Can somebody provide him, and I think the entire committee the actual law behind that, that sort of justifies the that statement because he, he was confused by it and I to be honest, it does. It sounds a little strange to me as well. But if we could just get that back up. All right. All those in favor? Opposed? All right, motion carried.

Number 31, ARP Assistant Director of Recovery & Resilience. Can I have a motion? Legislator Bartels. Second, Legislator Walter. Discussion? Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: This was, this was an error that was fixed, is that correct?

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah, whose was

Commissioner Gulnick: YYeah, that was that was me. Yes. We are correcting an error, Dave.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Alrighty. Very good. Thank you.

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

Number 32, County Clerk Account Clerk. Can I have a motion? Legislator, Chair Donaldson, Second Walter. Discussion? Legislator Bartels. No? All right. All those in favor? Opposed? So Carried, okay.

Chair Donaldson

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I make a motion to put 541 through 544 together, it's, you know, basically, you know, maintenance in a sense.

Chairman Gavaris: 541 I'm sorry I didn't hear the second part?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: 541 through 544.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Motion to block it. Second? Okay, all those in favor? Opposed? Okay, blocked. On the block. All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

545, Authorize the Commissioner of Finance to make transfers of Budgetary Amendments. Can I have a motion? Legislator Bartels. Second. Legislator Haynes? Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

546: Adopting the Ulster County Budget fiscal year commencing January 1 2022. Can I have a motion? Legislator Walter. Second, second, second. Legislator Bartels. Any discussion? All those- Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: We're voting on the budget as we're as our amendments show? Is that correct?

Chairman Gavaris: Yeah. Any other discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried.

547, Adopting the Ulster County Capital Program 2022 to 2027. Can I have a motion? Legislator Haynes. Second?

Deputy Clerk Feaster: As amended.

Chairman Gavaris: As amended, yes.

Chairman Gavaris: I need a Second. Chair Donaldson. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? So carried?

Any new business? Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes, if I do not get the, it's [inaudible] resumes for the ARPA money I'm gonna put an amendment in to eliminate the positions then we would be able to do a, to go out to bid for a consultant.

Chairman Gavaris: You're making that as motion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes I did.

Chairman Gavaris: Alright, can I get a second? Legislator Walter. Discussion? Okay. So, Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: You're doing an if then amendment? Like, how

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Actually, I don't need to go that far with it

Legislator Bartels: Yeah.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: but I just want to make sure that I want to get the resumes and I think we should have them. I think the body should, you know, have that type of information on people that we're hiring to do this specialized work, you know, no different than when we, you know, hire others, when we actually confirm people, we get that. We also get them often when other people are hired, we find out what the resume is or what their resumes are. So, I mean, I think it's a reasonable request. I just casually asked it, and then when I find out what we're reviewing whether we're going to give you that information or not and I find that very troublesome.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Bartels and then Haynes.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I, I think it's a reasonable request. And I'm going to be hopeful that we get the resumes. I'm seeing nods in the Executive's Office so I'm hopeful we're gonna get the resumes and we'll go from there.

Chairman Gavaris: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Yeah, I, I agree with Chairman Donaldson. I think I'm going to remain optimistic that we're going to get those resumes very quick. Thank you.

Chairman Gavaris: Thank you. All right. So you're going to withdrawal Chair Donaldson?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well I'll withdrawal for now.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll do it on the floor.

Chairman Gavaris: Okay. Any, anything else? Can I have a motion to adjourn? Legislator Walter. Second, Chair Donaldson. All those in favor? Opposed? So carried. Thank you all.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Have a, have a nice Thanksgiving everyone.

Legislator Bartels: Goodnight, Happy Thanksgiving.