

**Ways &
Means Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: November 17, 2020 – 5:15
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID 993 3004 0398
PRESIDING OFFICER: Lynn Archer, Chairwoman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John Gavaris, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Bruno, Corcoran, Criswell, Heppner, Petit, and Uchitelle; Minority Counsel Nick Pascale; Victoria Fabella, Clerk of the Legislature; Legislative Counsel, Christopher Ragucci; Deputy County Executives Marc Rider, John Milgrim, and Evelyn Wright; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Christopher Quirk; Tim Weidemann, Director of Innovation; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman; Ben Nandy, Spectrum News; Jen Messier, Prospect Heights Street Tree Task Force; Rebecca Martin, Kingston Citizens; 1 unidentified caller

- **Chairwoman Archer called the meeting to order at 5:18 PM**

Motion No. 1: To discuss Resolution No. 328 - Approving The Deviation By The Ulster County Industrial Development Agency Relating To The Terms And Conditions Of A Certain PILOT Agreement To Be Entered Into Between The Ulster County Industrial Development Agency And Kingstonian Development, LLC In Connection With The Kingstonian Development, LLC Project, And The Undertaking Of The Project Under The Agency’s Housing Policy, as Amended

Resolution Summary: This Resolution (1) acknowledges notification of the proposed deviation from the Agency’s Policy, (2) waives any formal notice from the Agency of the proposed deviation from the Agency’s UTEP Policy, (3) approves the payment terms and other conditions to be contained in the PILOT Agreement, as substantially described therein, and (4) approves the Project by the Agency.

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

Discussion: Legislator Bartels thanked the Committee for the time to review the third-party report, acknowledging that there are variances between the report and the plan before the Legislature. Chairwoman Archer stated that she is grateful for the third-party review, that she is in favor of moving the Resolution to the floor, but that she will be a no during the vote at Session.

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

Voting Against: Legislators Bartels, and Walter

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 2

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 2: To approve Resolution No. 392 – Authorizing Purchase Of Buses, For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$1,749,092.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$1,749,092.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$1,749,092.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 529 for the purchase of replacement of to fund a project for three (3) 35' electric buses and five (5) UCAT buses.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson asked if any portion of this is grant reimbursed. Deputy County Executive John Milgrim confirmed that it is reimbursed by either Federal or State funding.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 8

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 3: To approve Resolution No. 399 – Amending The 2020 - 2025 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing Capital Project No. 576, Ulster County Enterprise West – Amending The 2020 Capital Fund Budget – Department Of Public Works

Resolution Summary: This Resolution establishes Capital Project No. 576, Ulster County Enterprise West, to redevelop the formerly known Bank of America Building in the Town of Ulster into a hub for small-scale manufacturing and arts-related uses and to return the property to productive uses in the amount of \$399,282.00, and amend the Capital Fund budget accordingly.

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

Discussion: Legislator Bartels thanked Tim Weidemann for his time touring the building, but stated that she will be a no on the Resolution, that while she appreciates the idea and the vision, she objects to the County acting as a lessor and a property owner. Legislator Walter recognized that she has received a lot of conflicting information pertaining to the Capital Project, asking to understand the real path that is planned before the Project is pursued. Legislator Gavaris stated he does not believe the government should be in the real estate business but that he is more comfortable with the Project upon receiving assurance from the County Executive that no Departments will be moved into the building. Chairman Donaldson discussed similar attractions and pursuits and how they became economic drivers in their communities. Chairwoman Archer stated she is impressed with the condition of the building, questioning the level of safety standards the County is looking to achieve. Chairwoman Archer also contended that there is no reason the building can not be brokered for sale without spending another dime of taxpayer money, arguing that a developer can make the changes the County is looking to pursue at a lesser cost. Legislator Gavaris asked if County Executive staff would consider pursuing lease agreements that contain maintenance and repair clauses. Legislative Chairman Donaldson argued that having properties already leased out would make the property more appealing to a developer. Legislator Walter asked what other agreements or assurances have already been entered. Director of Innovation Tim Weidemann informed Committee members that a potential tenant was informed that the earliest possible timeline for occupancy would be February, acknowledging that plans relating to repair have been confused with conversations about ownership. Legislator Cahill stated he believes this Capital Project is the first step in a long journey but that the pursuit of the Project emphasizes the County's position and commitment to the property. Legislator Bartels encouraged County Executive staff to request proposals for the development of the property. Legislator Corcoran emphasized that the Economic Development Committee passed the Resolution. Legislator Bruno asked if an independent party has already reviewed the property, so the County truly understands the work required. Deputy County Executive Rider confirmed that the list of work was put together by the Ulster County Commissioner of Public Works.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, and Walter
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 3
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 4: To approve Resolution No. 400 – Authorizing The Preliminary Reconstruction Of The Enterprise West Building, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$399,282.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$399,282.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$399,282.00 Bonds for the establishment of Capital Project No. 576, Ulster County Enterprise West to redevelop the formerly known Bank of America Building in the Town of Ulster into a hub for small-scale manufacturing and arts-related uses and to return the property to productive uses.

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

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, and Walter
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 3
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: To discuss Resolution No. 402 – Authorizing The Reconstruction Of The Maltby Hollow Bridge In The Town Of Olive, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$1,330,000.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$1,330,000.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes the issuance of \$1,330,000.00 Bonds for the amending of Capital Project No. 533, Maltby Hollow Bridge construction and inspection.

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

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, and Walter
No. of Votes in Favor: 5
No. of Votes Against: 3
Disposition: Approved

Resolution No. 427 – Authorizing And Appropriating A One-Time Compensatory Time Payment To Certain Employees Of The Ulster County Board Of Elections, as amended

Resolution Summary: This Resolution authorizes and appropriates a one-time compensatory time payment to eight employees at the Board of Elections.

Discussion: Chairwoman Archer noted that the sponsor of the Resolution did not consent to the changes made in Laws & Rules the night prior. Legislator Ronk questioned the consent of the sponsor on the amendments in Committee.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Resolution No. 345 – Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 13 Of 2020, A Local Law Amending The Ulster County Charter, (Local Law No. 2 Of 2006), And Amending The Administrative Code For The County Of Ulster, (Local Law No. 10 Of 2008) To Further Clarify Budget Modification after Adoption, To Be Held On Tuesday, December 8, 2020 At 6:10 PM

Resolution Summary: This Resolution sets a public hearing on Proposed Local Law No. 13 Of 2020, A Local Law Amending The Ulster County Charter, (Local Law No. 2 Of 2006), And Amending The Administrative Code For The County Of Ulster, (Local Law No. 10 Of 2008) to further clarify budget modification after adoption on Tuesday, December 8, 2020 At 6:10 PM.

Discussion: Chairwoman Archer noted that the Resolution was postponed in Laws & Rules the night prior.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Old Business: None

New Business: The Committee agreed to schedule a Special meeting of the Ways & Means Committee for the purpose of voting on Budget Amendments on Tuesday, November 24th at 4:00 PM.

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Gavaris
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 1 (Legislator Ronk)

Time: 6:03 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster
Minutes Approved: December 8, 2020

**Ways &
Means Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: November 17, 2020 – 5:15
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID 993 3004 0398
PRESIDING OFFICER: Lynn Archer, Chairwoman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, Amber Feaster, and Jay Mahler
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John Gavaris, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter; and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Bruno, Corcoran, Criswell, Heppner, Petit, and Uchitelle; Minority Counsel Nick Pascale; Victoria Fabella, Clerk of the Legislature; Legislative Counsel, Christopher Ragucci; Deputy County Executives Marc Rider, John Milgrim, and Evelyn Wright; Comptroller March Gallagher; Deputy Comptroller Christopher Quirk; Tim Weidemann, Director of Innovation; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman; Ben Nandy, Spectrum News; Jen Messier, Prospect Heights Street Tree Task Force; Rebecca Martin, Kingston Citizens; 1 unidentified caller

Legislator Bartels: I appreciated the, the week to be able to speak to NDC about their report and to have some of the questions answered. I do still have remaining questions that aren't answered considering the fact that the PILOT that's before us to approve does not exactly reflect NDCs recommendations but is an agreement that was reached, you know, based on those recommendations, but outside of the recommendations, but again, I'll, I'm going save most of my comments for the floor.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All in favor of, of moving this to the floor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed?

Okay, so, we have Bartels, Walter. Gavaris, were you motioning to the floor or no? Yes. Okay. And, and I've just wanted to make a couple comments.

I'm going to move this to the floor as well, even though we, I had been previously accused of postponing for no good reason. And again, to the point that Legislator Bartels made, we do appreciate having the meeting set up with the third party review. But all of our essential outstanding questions have not all been answered. So, we will be moving to this to the floor.

And I'm I am thankful for a couple of things. One, the, my suggestion of third party was acted upon by the County Exec. I appreciate that he, you know, did engage a third party to do the review. I think the, the current proposal, while we haven't had it validated by that third party reviewer. There is an additional \$2-\$2.5 millions that, dollars, that originally would not have been submitted had this review not occurred. So, I am thankful for that. So, I will be moving it to the floor. But I will be a "no" on the floor, so, thank you. All right.

Legislator Gavaris: And Chair, may I just say something real quick?

Chairwoman Archer: Please.

Legislator Gavaris: So, I initially was a no, I was not really that in favor of it. I will say what is changing my mind slightly, although, I have a lot of concerns, please don't get me wrong, I am very concerned about this building and this, this us owning it. Mr. Weidemann and I had a long conversation about this.

Chairwoman Archer: We're talking about the PILOT, Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Oh, I'm on the wrong thing, completely. Sorry.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes.

Legislator Gavaris: Wrong one!

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. So, let me confirm your vote on the PILOT. You're a yes. Okay. All right. So, we had two noes, Legislator, Walter and Bartels.

Okay, now we're on to 392: Authorizing the Purchase Of Buses, For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$1,749,092.00, And Authorizing Bonds Of Said County To Pay.

Move?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Second? Any questions? All in favor?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: These are

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: These are all 90% reimbursed, are they not?

Chairwoman Archer: I believe so. Can we can we get a confirmation from the administration?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Marc?

Legislator Ronk: This is a bond.

Chairwoman Archer: It's a bond.

Deputy Executive Rider: This is a regular bond. This is just for, well this is the bond for the buses, right?

Deputy Executive Milgrim: Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah.

Deputy Executive Milgrim: To purchase busses.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah.

Deputy Executive Rider: There, there is grant funding associated, John, correct?

Deputy Executive Milgrim: It's all, well, everything with the buses is grant funding. It's either, it's federal and state.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right. We have to bond for it, and then they

Chairwoman Archer: Reimburse.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: reimburse the money and we pay off the bond. Is that correct?

Deputy Executive Milgrim: Yeah.

Chairwoman Archer: Well, okay. All in favor?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I was pretty sure that's what it was, I just wanted to make sure that that was clear with everybody else.

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor? Opposed? Unanimous.

Okay. Resolution 399, The Amending The 2020 - 2025 Capital Improvement Program – Establishing Capital Project No. 576, Ulster County Enterprise West – Amending The 2020 Capital Fund Budget - Department of Public Works.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any questions? Legislator Bartels

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, and I'm going to reserve probably the bulk of my comments for the floor but I want to, I want to first thank Tim Wiedemann for taking the time, I know taking us out there today, and I know he was out there yesterday because I was supposed to out there yesterday. And I, and I very much appreciate getting to see the building in-person after, after a very long time because it's been a long time for me. I am going to be a no on this resolution.

Although I have to say I do, I appreciate very much, many of the proposals that I've heard. even in, even in passing today. The idea and the vision behind this as a possibility for an economic driver for the county. And I believe it, it can be.

I just very firmly believe that this is something that needs to be handled, not by the county, I, I do not want the county to be in a position of, of a leasing, of owning, of occupying this building. I, I believe we need to expedite getting it off the county rolls. And my hope really is that we can have an RFP process, or some kind of process whereby we actually really test the, the market interest and see what's out there.

I've said before, publicly, and I'll state again, I think a partnership with the county, even in the form of the county contributing the building to a great idea with certain claw backs, and certain provisions, and certain guarantees, is something that I could strongly get behind.

But in this moment, my no vote is going to be a no vote of caution. I, I really, I do not want to head down a slippery slope of spending more and more money on this project in a time when I think we can least afford it.

But after today, I'm very optimistic that this building has a, has a future. And I should actually say these buildings in this property. So thank you, Tim, for allowing me to see that.

And again, maybe I won't have to speak very much on the floor since I spoke more than I intended now. But my no vote is a no vote with optimism. And it's, it's a no vote of again, of fiduciary caution in this extraordinary financial time.

Chairwoman Archer: Any other comments? Legislator Walter?

Legislator Walter: Actually Chairman Donaldson had his hand up first.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, I didn't see it.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It's okay, she can go ahead. I'm not.

Go ahead, Eve.

Legislator Walter: So, I've, I'm, I'm also, well, I'm not sure. I am going to be a no vote for this on the floor. And I and I want to just sort of repeat, similarly, I'm very optimistic about what can

happen in this space. I think what bothers me the most was the feeling of, I, I received so much differing information, and contradictory information, that made it very challenging for me to really understand what was really going to happen with this space.

I, I really appreciate, Tim, having that tour yesterday. But at the same time, at that tour, you made it very clear that this was not about moving anyone in this was really just about the space. I wasn't sure. I got two messages, one that it was necessary for safety. But then I got another one that it was just, it was a way to improve our ability to sell it. And so I'm not sure which one that is.

And as much as it was not about leasing it. You know, I spoke in length to Jim Hyland, who, was basically told that if all goes well, he could expect at least from us in February. And so that, that, it just there's so many different messages I'm getting, that it makes me very uncomfortable. And that my sense is not that I'm against this, but that I would prefer to hold it and wait and see what the real path is that we're going on and then make that decision.

And in terms of it being for security sake, the building is in very good form. I'm happy to see that I'm happy to see that despite it being mothballed. is there's been no mold, there, you know, that that it has been held up very well. And so, I do feel safe that it's it has the safety and security, that if we did pause on this, it would be okay for a few months.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson and then Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, I think I think Legislator Gavaris had his hand up from the very beginning. So.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm, I'm sorry, it's hard get, everybody's hand up, so why don't we do Gavaris then Donaldson and then Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I know it, I know it, that's why I said

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Sorry, John.

Legislator Gavaris: That's quite all right. At least this time. It's been a very long day. And unfortunately, that's why I couldn't make it for the tour today because I had a lot of problems at work. So, I'm a little bit frazzled. So, but I did want to say some things on this.

So, initially, I was a no. I, I still believe firmly that government should never be in the real estate business. But we are unfortunately in this position. But after speaking Mr. Weidemann, and his commitment from the Exec's Office that they will not move any county departments into this space without legislative approval. I'm, I'm willing to take a chance here in order to move this forward.

I do think though, to what Legislator Bartels had said, we need to come up with a, a direction of what we want to see at this building, come up with an RFP or an RFQ, and we need to get this back on the tax rolls quickly. I'm not looking for a fire sale either. But I do want to see this, has to go in the right direction for the county. So, I'm going to be optimistically, a yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I yes. I mean, I support this. And there is a certain amount of security still being taken care of along with improving the building. And they are both going to enhance. The building, if that can get into and we can have a rental on there that's going to pay until we have a sale on this building. I don't think that's a bad thing.

You can, in other words, I don't know of any developer that where we did LDC and put it out, gave it to them. And then the RFQ goes out, similar to what we did with Golden Hill, we could do something similar that. And I don't know of any developer who's going to say, "Oh, no, I don't want to building that 60% occupied and giving me rent right now." I think that would be a very positive thing, actually. You know, once we go out to do this.

And I mean, I don't agree with a long-term process of us being, you know, leasers, you know, leasing to somebody. I don't think that's good. But I think, on a short-term basis, you know, while we working through this, the repairs in the buildings and things of that nature, I think it makes sense.

I know, some places, I mean, the City of Kingston, for instance, they own the Bulk Head down in the Rondout and they lease that out. And they've been leasing that out. And in fact, the process, I remember, I think, possibly 36 years ago, when the people that were leasing, for commercial property in, on the bulkheads and around that area, we negotiated with them and forced them to build a fixed bulkhead and put in more docks. And as a result of that, if you were down there in the Rondout area, 36 years ago, you would see almost nothing there. Today, it is a booming spot that people all summer it is, you know, there's people coming from all over the country, they come by boat. And it is the only place between New York City and Albany, where you can get off your boat and go to various restaurants. It's been an attraction. And that is from the City of Kingston leasing. So, I mean, it, it's not the best scenario, many times. But it doesn't mean that it's always a bad scenario. And I think for the short-term, it could be a good scenario with that Tech City building, until we actually work through what we're going to do with that for the RFQs, what we want in the future. So, I'm a yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. Yeah, I'm just going to, you know, I'm just going to keep my thoughts to myself.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, I do have a couple comments that I'd like to make. And while I do appreciate the tour yesterday by Tim, I really was impressed with the condition of the building given everything we have heard, but I do kind of want to take us through a timeline.

I mean, I'm looking at the fourth, whereas in, in, in the resolution, and it and it reads about the Phases A and B outlined in the Capital Plan for 2021 and 2026. And the fact that, you know, which will secure the building and further, and prevent further deterioration. As well as complete necessary repairs to meet minimum building occupancy standards to building 201. If the statement had stopped at further deterioration, then it would be clear that what we're trying to do is preserve the building. But it didn't. It went on to speak to minimum occupancy requirements.

We then had a conversation about, you know, we're being asked to improve systems before, you know, a, a structural soundness. We back in June, when this first came up, we said, let's get a

structural engineering report. Let's understand, before we bring the building online, does this make the most sense? We were assured. We were spending \$350,000 or approximately there about. And, you know, that's all they were going to be asking for.

Yet, here today. We're being asked for another \$400,000. Approximately bringing total expenses for just this year alone to three quarters of a million dollars, not including making towns whole and the school districts whole.

You know, then we've had the conversation we heard about safety issues requires the improvements that, you know, the current upgrades are being done to obtain what is called a temporary occupancy is determined by our own safety department. You know, are we setting safety standards for showing the building or for occupancy, I think the later.

Yet there's room and, and, and this we saw when we were going through it, there's a room approximately maybe the half of the size or three quarters the size of Legislative Chambers, filled with sound equipment that look like sound boards, musical instruments, a number of those hard cases, and quite a few of them. I don't know how many. But, you know, if we're concerned about liability, you know, supposedly they signed a waivers, then why couldn't anybody visiting to purchase a potential for a potential sale do the same? You know, there's no reason the building can't be brokered for sale, in its current state without spending another dime of taxpayer money.

I have reached out to developers I know in the city, people in the industry, I've had many conversations about the potential of this building and putting a tenant in the building, having them have to spend money for a build out of the space, so it meets their needs is not worthwhile unless you have a long-term lease and a long -term lease is not always prudent when you're trying to sell it to a developer.

Likewise, improving systems for occupancy without knowing use is a waste of taxpayer money. What if there's a, if a developer wanted to do something different, they could do it more cost effectively and efficiently without the taxpayers putting another dime in here. For all those reasons I just mentioned, I really thought long and hard about this, and what is the best use of taxpayer money? And I, I just don't believe that this is.

Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: So you, thank you, for you just said I just actually brought in sort of an idea to mind. And this is probably to the Exec's team there. Is there a way that this can be, we approved this potentially tonight, but your conversations with the various tenants that you're already in discussions with, that they as an abatement for their rent, in the same one for one relationship cost wise, they would do these upgrades, because they can do them far less expensive than we can do them for. So, if there's issues with HVAC, if there's issues with plumbing, stuff that you're already planning on doing, can that be done in lieu of their rent?

Chairwoman Archer: Deputy Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: It's a building owned by the county, it has to go by prevailing wage, regardless. They, they can't do it for any cheaper than we can do it. It's, it's a county owned asset. So,

that even if the, even if they're leasing it, and they're doing the work, it still has to be done under prevailing scale.

Legislator Gavaris: Is that a county? I'm sorry,

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead.

Legislator Gavaris: Is that a county law/rule or is that municipal in general?

Deputy Executive Rider: That's, that's general municipal law as far as prevailing wage.

Legislator Gavaris: Well, then I can tell you the Village of Ellenville must have done something illegal then because the fifth floor of their property when they leased it out to the Nevele Project. They did all the renovations, and none of it was done at prevailing wage.

Deputy Executive Rider: I'm just going off of what I

Chairwoman Archer: That's an Ellenville issue.

But here's what I would say. I mean, you know, again, this, this is the conflicting information. No, we're not, we're not talking about occupancy, maybe we are, before we move forward. I mean, we got assurances that in, in our tour yesterday that there were it was not being, this was about safeting in the building and allowing people to walk through the building. It wasn't being, the improvements were not a for the county to become a landlord.

Listen, there is a lot of money happened and a lot of development money coming out of New York. We all talked about how this area is been a target for people exiting the city coming here with these individuals and their entrepreneurial spirit. There's also development dollars out there, we have not even explored that. And we're being asked to put taxpayer money, in a very difficult time, into another building when we haven't even explored all the avenues.

What we have is some great ideas and opportunities. But you know, at a time where we have no idea what the state cuts are. We're, we're, we're putting money into something that may or may not pan out or be worthwhile to whoever purchases the building. I feel like we're putting the cart before the horse here. And, and if it were your money, would you be doing it this way? I don't think so.

Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: If it was my money, I would be doing it, because it has to be done. That's the way I kind of look at it is we own the building, it's ours, we have to clean it up to the point where it's usable, or at least safe enough that it can be shown. And I believe that that makes sense. And I don't have again, for everybody else has a problem with a rental. I don't have a problem with short-term rentals, even long term-rentals, I do not know of a developer that would be upset that they had renters in the property, I really don't see that. I mean, they're a that means they automatically have income. If I'm going to buy a piece of property and somebody says, well, I got 60, 50 percent of it rented for you, or whatever it may be, 20 percent of it rented for you already, they say, "Oh, that's great."

But you could actually do that when you deal with the LDC. When you put together a RFQ, you put that together and you make that understandable with that RFQ that you're going to do certain things. And whoever the developer is, would have to say that if you have somebody, and then whoever you lease to into once, that you can easily add them knowing exactly what those terms are, that we are going to be selling this property in the spring, or whatever, we're going to start the process from that. And so, therefore, we create certain contingencies in there when you do that, I mean, that's doable. And I don't see that as something that can't be accomplished because it can.

So, my mindset is, this is a piece of property in this part of the county. And it's it has a lot of effect on this part of the county. And I really don't feel that you, that it should be blocked from going to the body as a whole. So other members of the legislative body can also vote on this. So, they can weigh in on their vote, the ones that it affects, like people in Saugerties.

Chairwoman Archer: We haven't taken a vote, Chairman. So, we don't know if that's the case. We haven't taken a vote yet. So, let's take a vote before you start assuming.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'm not, I didn't assume anything. I'm just saying, I don't think it should be blocked in that, in that manner when and it should be allowed for other people to vote in on this particular issue because it has a lot of effects for people in Kingston. It has a lot of effect for people in Saugerties, Ulster, Esopus. Maybe not so much in the other, in other some of the other areas, but it does have a lot of effect on us.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Back to my point, and it's just a question for Tim or Marc. So, when, when Jim Hyland was assured that if all goes well, he'd be able to sign a lease in February. Were there other, other changes or renovations that were went along with that assurance?

Director Weidemann: Other changes and renovations to the building?

Legislator Walter: Other than what you're asking for here. Were there other, we didn't know that there was this promise, you know, with soft handshakes, that February, he'd be able to start the process of the lease. Were there in that conversation, had you identified other things that the county would do to the building to allow him to begin? I mean, because I know, not only does he think it starting February, he's already started working with an architect and other people. And so, was there a, a promise, or an assurance, that other changes would be made to the building prior to him signing that lease in February?

Director Weidemann: I just want to set the record straight to say that there wasn't a promise that there'd be a lease in February. There was, there was an explanation that if he was serious about pursuing use of this space, the earliest that any lease arrangement could happen is February, based on the assumption that the property would need to be surplusd in order for that to happen. So, that's the timeline that we laid out in conversation with him. There was no discussion about any other commitments, any commitments at all, on behalf of the County.

Legislator Walter: Okay, and, and just to also let you know that he also did inform me that he would prefer to have conversations about purchasing the property and I encouraged him to reach out to you and let you know that.

Director Weidemann: He did and, and happy to have those conversations. As we talked about yesterday, I think you well, are good, you've you've pointed out clearly that we have confused this issue by merging the conversation about disposition and ownership of the property with the conversation about today's Capital Project. And so, eager to get through this conversation and then shift into that conversation about ownership.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I guess then my ask is if we approve this, there is a whereas that refers to this being about maker space. And I feel like that, that ties into that confusion, because it's referring to an actual lease or use. And that just seems inappropriate if we're really just talking about improving the boilers.

Chairwoman Archer: Which, which speaks to what I said earlier. If it's about deterioration of the building, then that's what it says. But it doesn't. It goes a step further and says about minimum occupancy standards, which really indicates exactly where we're headed with this.

But Any other questions? concerns? Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you, Chairman Archer. I just want to emphasize that I believe that this is just the first step in a, in a long journey for this property. This is, we're talking about some of this probably going to take us years to, you know, get off of our books and get into a private developers hand. And this is the first step.

And I want to just re-emphasize that I think it's crucially important that the county shows that they're a willing partner in trying to develop this site, initially. That will send a good signal to the people out there to developers who may be looking at it, for the folks who may want to purchase it, for a private development corporation. Just to show that you have a willing partner, with the county, to say, yeah, we're going to do as much as we can.

Everybody understands the financial restraints we're under right now. You know, and that would just to me, emphasize how seriously we're taking this. You know, economic development, in my opinion, has been a little bit lagging in the county. And to me, couple this with the Kingstonian, and the Golden Hill housing, those three things in a, in a year we're going to be doing here, those are three tremendously positive things for the county right now, in my opinion. And they send an excellent, excellent message out to anybody who's looking to come to the county and build something or invest in the county. And I think that this is just one small step in that direction. And I would encourage everybody on this committee to please consider that and support it for that reason. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yes. You know, I, I, I certainly respect Legislator Cahill's comments. But I also want to say that I, I hope that this doesn't take years to get off our books. You know, walking through the building today, it, you know, I was very impressed with the condition it's in. And I would, again, reiterate, and strongly, strongly encourage, if not, potentially, by resolution eventually, that we go out to an RFP to actually see what interest is out there.

Because when we talk in the absence of actually testing those waters, now I know, or I assume, just even based on conversations that I overhear in these committees, or that I listened to in these committees, that there is a level of conversation happening with different groups, different organizations, different makers. One, one was present at the at the walkthrough today. And there was a lot of great ideas out there.

But we should, we should really formalize that request and see what comes back. You know, Tim Wiedemann today mentioned that over the years, the county has received multiple requests on this property when it was not in our ownership. In terms of use of the property, rental of the property, purchase of the property. Again, when we speak about these things in, in the abstract, there's not very much to, to sink our proverbial teeth in. But I would like to actually get the facts. Put out an RFP and see, we can craft that however you want, but see what comes back.

And I hope but strongly suspect that it will not take years to move this property. Not based on what I saw today, I think there is a lot of opportunity and we could certainly craft a, a very strong and compelling partnership. And when I say partnership, again, I, I simply mean in terms of the building itself. You know that the minute this building is off our rolls, the county's begins to save essentially \$500,000 a year in taxes that will then be taken up by the private sector, by the developer, by whatever organization takes this on. And I, I suspect they're out there but let's find out. Let's go ahead to that next step not lock into one thing in advance of knowing what all is out there.

Legislator Cahill: So, I just want to clear up. When I said multi-year, I didn't mean just that site. I meant both sites. Because I live, I've been living with this for 20 years. So, you know, I know that it's going to be a big long project to get this whole thing put forward. Thank you.

Legislator Bartels: Yes. No, thanks for the clarification too.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Legislator, Legislator Corcoran had his hand up.

Legislator Corcoran: Yes. Again, I respect everybody's opinion and Legislator Cahill beat me to the punch, but I respect everything he said. We did look at this in the Economic Development Committee. And, you know, I, I would put my money into it. So, again, we did pass it through Economic Development. And I would just like the opportunity for this to get to the floor so a full legislative vote could happen. Thank you for my time.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, Legislator Bruno.

Legislator Bruno: I got a question and a comment. One. I, I think, that I mean, I looked at the proposals that came, came to me yesterday, I was looking at the dollar signs on, you know, the systems that are being replaced. And I kind of question a lot of the proposals, whether they were for a temporary C of O, or whether they were just a minimum that we need to do to the building to make it winterized. There's a big difference. To winterize a building you have to make sure that the heat and the plumbing infrastructure and the electric is taken care of. That I get. But spending thousands of dollars on ceiling tiles and floor tiles and things of that nature, I don't think fall under the winterization.

I'm all for saving this building and putting money into it to prevent it from deteriorating to the point we can't market it. That being said, had we looked at, and again, this might be my own ignorance

about reading enough maybe. But an independent engineering study of the building to see what it really needs versus what would be a wish list to make it more marketable. There's two different things if you understand what I mean. I'd like to see something along those lines. So, we really know what we're getting for our money. \$400,000 is a lot of money to sink into a white elephant.

I hate to see us become permanent landlords. But at the same time, I don't want to take a building that's, you know, worth several million dollars and turn it into a pile of rubble because we didn't want to maintain it. It's probably one of the most difficult decisions all of us have.

And, and I hear Chairman Donaldson, and I hear Brian Cahill, Legislator Cahill, and, and Legislator Corcoran. And I, and I kind of agree, as well as with Legislator, Bartels, with all of you. You know, they all have good points. But I think we need to have a baseline. And I think that baseline comes from an independent, not from our Public Works Department. Because I'm not saying that they that they have an agenda or don't have an agenda, but I think an independent study to have it looked at to see what it really needs.

Based on, I haven't done the walk-through, you guys have, some of you haven't. You have described it as being in really good shape. Now, again, that's, that's from an amateur eye, on the mechanical side of it, I come from the professional side of the mechanicals. And that's what I do for a living. So, I just want to make sure that we're getting the most for our money.

Chairwoman Archer: Deputy Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider: So the, the proposals that have been put together have been put together by Bob Buser who's been our Deputy Commissioner of Public Works and, and done magic in many of the buildings. And, and so, he put together the list of work that needs to be done. If you were looking at a true engineering study, the type that you're talking about, Legislator Bruno, and that's been raised before, you're talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars in a study alone. And, and so, this is the work that needs to be done to bring it up to a minimal level of for a temporary C of O, which is required by our Safety Department, in order to get people in coming in and out of the building on a, you know, to show it to do other things, for a temporary C of O. And, and also to do some winterization but the type of study you're talking about is, is very expensive.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. You know, I've, I've heard a lot of, I've heard a lot of, you know, what's been described as confusion from several legislators in the committee about the goals and, and you know, and what this is going to do and, you know, Legislator Bruno's comments, I feel like compelled me to, to speak up. You know, I don't know that any of those things are mutually exclusive. I don't know if, you know, we would do one thing for you know, making sure that we don't lose the property for the winter. Another for the temporary C of O and others, you know, in order to be able to show it to potential, you know, folks who might want to purchase the building, or rent the building, or to rent it out.

You know, regardless if, if we're going to do anything with this building, either as the county as a landlord, or with the county, putting offices in there, or with the county, you know, selling it to a private developer, you know, all of this work needs to happen. It's not like we're putting money into

something that, that's going to, you know, depreciate and lose value. Any money that we put into this is going to make the property appreciate, either in terms of rentals, or in terms of final sale.

Now, yes, as a as a municipality, we're going to have to pay prevailing wage, which, you know, means that, you know, the appreciation and value of the property is not going to be that of, you know, at which a private, you know, developer would be able to do it, because they would be able to do it without prevailing wage.

And I'll put aside the fact that, you know, most of the people on this committee who, you know, have had concerns with that talk about living wage and wanting prevailing wage to be, you know, more prevalent across all industries, including private industry, but I'll put that aside.

You know, I really feel like we're getting lost a little bit in the final use of the building and not appreciating the fact that, you know, this is work that needs to get done, no matter what the end result is. You know, I'm sure that we'd all like to know what the end result is right now. But we don't. That's not where we're at right now. Right where we're at right now is this is an important investment for the county to make no matter what we do moving forward.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Is the Commissioner of Maintenance, who is advising you on whatever upgrades are necessary repairs needing to take place in that building?

Deputy Executive Rider: I didn't catch your question. I'm sorry. Can you?

Legislator Haynes: Is the current Commissioner of Maintenance advising you? Is that where you're getting your advice from regarding the upgrades and whatever needs to occur in that building?

Deputy Executive Rider: Yes, Bob Buser, the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, who's in charge of Buildings and Grounds.

Legislator Haynes: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, on the resolution 399. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: And opposed?

We have three opposed: Archer, Walter and Bartels, everyone else is a yes.

Resolution 400 which is the bonding for the enterprise West building a \$399,282. I'll take a motion.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Second? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Three opposed: Archer, Bartels and Walter.

Resolution 402: Authorizing The Reconstruction Of The Maltby Hollow Bridge In The Town Of Olive, In And For The County Of Ulster, New York, At A Maximum Estimated Cost Of \$1,330,000.00, And Authorizing The Issuance Of \$1,330,000.00 Bonds Of Said County To Pay The Cost Thereof

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Unanimous.

Resolution 427. The sponsor did not consent to the amendments made last night and so we'll be taking no action on that tonight.

Resolution 345. Again, that was not discussed in Laws and Rules last night. And so, we're going to hold, that's going to be postponed, taking no action tonight.

We have a Special Ways and Means; we have to have a Special Meeting on voting on the Budget Amendments. The way it's looking now, we're going to be looking at a Wednesday and Thursday as the day for hearing about all the amendments. And we're proposing, either look at for Ways & Means, for looking at Friday, the 20th, do you feel that gives you enough time? We had that day set aside because we thought we were going to do amendments as well. But I think we'll probably be able to get it done in the two days. So, I wanted to take temperature. Do we want to use that Friday for decisioning of the amendments? Or do we want to look at Tuesday, the 24th? So, I put that out to members of Ways and Means.

Legislator Bartels: Can you state the two days again? And it would be Friday or Tuesday?

Chairwoman Archer: It would be Friday the 20th which we had already set time aside because we thought we might need it for amendments. Or it could be Tuesday the 24th. I'm not sure, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Legislator Walter: What time on Tuesday?

Chairwoman Archer: It would be Tuesday, like five o'clock.

Legislator Bartels: Can you clarify what time it was set aside on Friday?

Chairwoman Archer: Friday's started at one in the afternoon.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I can tell you that I personally would rather not have the third day in a row where I've got to take the afternoon off of work. If we were able to do something in late afternoon or early evening, on Tuesday, I would much prefer that.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I concur with the Tuesday. I think it also gives us time to get any questions answered that weren't answered and so on so forth, and so, you know, I would prefer the Tuesday also, late afternoon or whatever is, you know, doable for others.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Walter, and then Haynes.

Legislator Walter: Same, prefer Tuesday. Thanks.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Yeah, I prefer Tuesday also. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Good. So it sounds like everybody is agreeing on Tuesday. Great. What, what time? Do we want to get started? What, how early can people get started? I want to be sensitized to everybody's work schedule. What's the earliest?

Legislator Gavaris: I think we need to start at like four or three o'clock, because if we're not going to do Friday, we're, we're always bogged down in these meetings. So, we're going to have to start early enough.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, what if we say three? Does that work with folks? Can, can everybody accommodate that timetable? On Tuesday, the 24th, three o'clock. Raise of hand if you can.

Legislator Haynes: I'd rather be closest to five as possible. But I mean, that's better than 1:00, you know, I'm missing work for it, so.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Why don't we compromise on 4:00?

Legislative Gavaris: I could do 4:00.

Chairwoman Archer: 4:00. Okay, so let's say we're going to do it Tuesday, the 24th at four o'clock. That's when we'll decision all the amendments that we review. Tomorrow and Thursday. All right. Great. Thank you, everyone. I'll take a motion.

Legislator Ronk: Chairwoman, may I, may I have a question?

Chairwoman Archer: Please.

Legislator Ronk: On a resolution 427 which sponsor was not in consent of the of the amendment?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I was not. And my understanding is I am now on the sole sponsor.

Legislator Ronk: Okay. I just, you know, from a rules perspective, you know, the rules say that, you know, we can amend the resolution, if the sponsor is present, which you were. You know, if the sponsor is not present, then the process to not approve the amendment moves forward.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, but she did not agree with the amendment. Is that correct?

Legislator Ronk: That's not the way the rules read, but I'm just going to, I'll, I'll you know, I'll leave well enough alone. But the rules, I mean, the rules, say, resolutions may be amended or passed in any committee by a vote of the majority, the total members of such committee so long as the sponsor, if present consents. You didn't not, you didn't fail to consent last night, you voted against it, but you didn't not consent to the amendment. I just

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, common sense says that not consenting.

Legislator Bartels: I had a cosponsor for last night and you know the issues

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's not consent if you voted against it.

Legislator Ronk: That's not, that's not the way the rules work Dave. The rules, I, I would be willing to bet if you press control, find on our rules, you wouldn't find the words common or sense in there. But that's, you know, fair enough.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: You just got finished saying if they consent. They didn't consent. They voted against it.

Legislator Ronk: It doesn't say if they vote for it, Mr. Chairman, it does not say if they vote for it. Again, you know, it's going to save the taxpayers a whole lot of money at this point. So, I'm not necessarily opposed to it. I just think that, you know, we do have a rule subcommittee, perhaps we should clarify that, you know, common sense dictates is a new part of the rules.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: No, it's consent.

Chairwoman Archer: All right. It, where it, it

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Legislator Bartels, did you consent to that amendment?

Legislator Bartels: I did not.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Okay.

Legislator Ronk: I, I, I, I'll, I'll go back and

Chairwoman Archer: Let's, let's move on. I'll take a motion.

Legislator Ronk: Oh let's move on, fair enough.

Chairwoman Archer: Excuse me?

Legislator Ronk: That's fine. But let's move on you.

Chairwoman Archer: You've raised your concern.

I'll take a motion to adjourn.

Chairwoman Archer: Gavaris. Second?

Legislator Walter: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

Legislator Ronk: I'm a no on the adjournment, just for the record, please.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry?

Legislator Ronk: Thank you Chairwoman I'm a no. I'm a no.

Chairwoman Archer: You hit, you hit mute. Sorry, I didn't hear.

Legislator Ronk: I said I'm a no on adjournment. So, just for the record when the vote is taken on the motion to adjourn, I'm a no.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, motion to adjourn, we have one no, but the rest

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Are you going to stay on all night?

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you, Thank you everyone.

Legislator Haynes: I may have to stay on, I can't get off of this thing.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh no.

Legislator Haynes: So, somebody kicked me out please. Thank you.