

**Ways &
Means Committee
Special Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: November 24, 2020 – 4:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656, Meeting ID 990 7237 9754
PRESIDING OFFICER: Lynn Archer, Chairwoman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, and Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John Gavaris, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter (teleconference 4:00 – 4:35 PM); and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Cahill, Criswell, Delaune, Litts, Parete, and Uchitelle; Commissioner of Finance, Burt Gulnick; Deputy Budget Director, Christopher Kelly; Clerk of the Legislature Victoria Fabella; Comptroller, March Gallagher; Christopher Quirk, Deputy Comptroller; Randy Boughton, Senior Auditor; Beth Weredyk, Senior Auditor; Andrew Zink, Insurance; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman; Joan Crawford, Family Services; Brian Doyle, Family Services; Maggie Veve, SUNY New Paltz; Lin Sakai, Esopus Democratic Committee; Theresa Paras, New Paltz Democratic Committee

- **Chairwoman Archer called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM**

Motion No. 1: To approve Budget Amendment No. 1 – District Attorney Receptionist / Typist

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds the position of Receptionist with Typing, 11651202, a CSEA, grade 4 position at entry level for 12 months, working a 35 hour work week.

Motion Made By: Legislator Gavaris
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: Legislator Ronk confirmed that he will not be supporting Budget Amendment No. 1 or Budget Amendment No. 2 given the County's current financial situation. Legislator Bartels expressed concern over the ability to operate the office with the case load

increase experienced. Legislative Chairman confirmed that funding is coming from the Contingent Account.

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

Motion No. 2: To approve Budget Amendment No. 2 – District Attorney Administrative Assistant

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds the position of Administrative Assistant, 11651403, a CSEA, grade 12 position at entry level for 12 months, working a 35 hour work week.

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

Discussion: None

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

Motion No. 3: To approve Budget Amendment No. 3 – District Attorney Technical Correction

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds position number 11651455, in which an employee is currently housed, in place of position number 11651450, which is vacant.

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

Discussion: Legislative Chairman confirmed that there is no financial cost and that the amendment is strictly technical in nature.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Ronk, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 4: To approve Budget Amendment No. 4 – Capital Pump House Control Upgrade

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the Pump House Control Upgrade Kingston Water Department project to the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 5: To approve Budget Amendment No. 5 – Emergency Management Move

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the Emergency Management Move project to the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program.

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

Discussion: Legislator Bartels expressed that she has concerns over the project which she intends to bring forward at the time Resolutions pertaining to the Capital Project are before the Legislature.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 6: To approve Budget Amendment No. 6 – DSS Basement Restoration

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the DSS Basement Restoration project to the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 7: To approve Budget Amendment No. 7 – Assistant County Attorney

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment restores the 2019 adopted salary for Position No. 14201050 AST CO ATT, which is currently vacant.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated that he does not support the Amendment as he feels the salary is important for obtaining a highly qualified attorney. Legislative Chairman Donaldson expressed concern that the salary was increased without Legislative approval out of the budget cycle. Discussion pursued on the position's vacancy, the history of the salary increase, the position's "supervisory" status, and comparable other attorney salaries within the County.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Gavaris

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, Haynes, and Maio, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 3

No. of Votes Against: 4

Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 8: To approve Budget Amendment No. 8 – Raises

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes all non-union rate increases.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk confirmed this Amendment pertains to rate increases, expressing interest in amending the Amendment to

remove select individuals during Legislative Session. Legislative Chairman Donaldson confirmed the money is being placed into the Contingent Account, communicating interest in revisiting each individual increase in the year 2021. Legislator Ronk asked if grant or settlement funded raises can be used in future years. Legislator Cahill expressed concern over hand-picking select rate increases.

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

Motion No. 9: To approve Budget Amendment No. 9 – Hours Increase

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes all increases to standard work week hours.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated that he will be opposed to the Budget Amendment as he feels there is justification to support each, emphasizing the affects that this Budget Amendment has on the Legislature. Legislator Bartels emphasized the ability of Department Heads to exercise temporary alternative work schedules when need arises. Legislator Walter stressed the position of Department Heads affirming that these hours are necessary when making their budget requests. Chairwoman Archer articulated interest in addressing each situation individually in the upcoming year(s) once the pandemic is over.

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

Motion No. 10: To approve Budget Amendment No. 10 – Management, Non-Union Cuts

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes 2% of Regular Pay from all applicable management, non-union positions. Applicable positions are those which did not

already incur a reduction, and which are not newly established by the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter stated that she appreciates Legislator Bartels efforts and underlying intent but that she feels uncomfortable taking money away from individuals. Legislative Chairman Donaldson thanked Legislative staff for their hard work on the creation of all Budget Amendments. Legislator Ronk emphasized concern in cutting the salaries of individuals who have worked hard throughout the pandemic and will again be required to step up if another shut down occurs, as well as in the unfair treatment of employees when compensation time payout has been approved for Board of Elections staff. Legislator Bartels stressed that the Budget Amendment is about a difficult decision in a difficult budget time.

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

Motion No. 11: To approve Budget Amendment No. 11 – Title Changes

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment re-establishes all 2020 Adopted Budget titles for which the 2021 County Executive Recommended title change resulted in an increase to overall Regular Pay for the position number.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter questioned the act of changing an employee's title due to a change in duties versus changing a title to award a pay increase, asking for support in response to title change requests.

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

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 12: To approve Budget Amendment No. 12 – Ulster County Community Action

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Economic Development to UC Community Action in the amount of \$28,750.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: Legislator Ronk asked if there are other appropriations for Ulster County Community Action within the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget. Legislative Chairman Donaldson confirmed they are also paid for application of the HEAP grant. Discussion pursued on activities and programs the Organization manages. Legislator Haynes stated support for awarding Non-County Agency's funding equal to the adjusted 2020 contractual value.

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

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, and Maio

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 2

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 13: To approve Budget Amendment No. 13 – Ulster County Library Association

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Library to Ulster County Library Association in the amount of \$77,700.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Gavaris emphasized that the Library Association's boarders extend beyond those of Ulster County and that they receive taxpayer money from other, making a point that since the Library Association services outside taxpayers, appropriations at the district level may be more appropriate. Discussion pursued on the limitations to individual access, the library districts' boarders, the fairness of outside resident access, and how this concept relates to other Non-County Contract Agencies.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Ronk, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 14: To approve Budget Amendment No. 14 – UPAC

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Performing Arts to UPAC in the amount of \$25,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: Legislator Ronk stated disbelief that the Facility’s utility cost is the same at full operation as it is at shut down. Legislator Gavaris reiterated these sentiments, emphasizing the need for limited services during shut down. Legislator Haynes expressed discontent with the Facility’s request for a value equal to last year’s.

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

Motion No. 15: To approve Budget Amendment No. 15 – Arts Mid-Hudson

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Performing Arts to Arts Mid-Hudson in the amount of \$80,000.

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

Discussion: Discussion pursued on the 2020 adopted appropriation, the 2020 reduced contractual value, and the 2021 requested value. Legislator Haynes stated that she would support the Amendment at the 2020 reduced contractual value, affirming that virtual

fundraising is possible and she hopes that many of these agencies have found alternative fundraising solutions to compensate for lost revenue during this time of difficulty. Legislator Walter emphasized that this Agency serves as a driver of economic development, stressing how it impacts individuals within the community.

Motion No. 16: To amend Budget Amendment No. 15 – Arts Mid-Hudson

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Performing Arts to Arts Mid-Hudson in the amount of \$80,000.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk suggested amending the Budget Amendment to \$60,000.00. Legislator Criswell reiterated the impact on individual artists. Legislative Chairman Donaldson provided a brief history of the County’s relationship with the Agency and how its services have changed over time. Discussion pursued on interest in a lesser value.

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

Voting Against: Legislators Gavaris

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 1

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 17: To approve Budget Amendment No. 15 – Arts Mid-Hudson, as Amended

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Performing Arts to Arts Mid-Hudson in the amount of \$60,000.

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

Discussion: None

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. 18: To approve Budget Amendment No. 16 – Ulster County Soil and Water Conservation District

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Conservation to Ulster County Soil & Water Conservation District in the amount of \$61,305.

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

Discussion: None

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. 19: To approve Budget Amendment No. 17 – Cornell Cooperative Extension of Ulster County

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Conservation to Cornell Cooperative Extension of Ulster County in the amount of \$325,800.

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

Discussion: None

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. 20: To approve Budget Amendment No. 18 – Awareness, Inc.

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Awareness, Inc. in the amount of \$12,500.

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

Discussion: Legislative staff confirmed the 2020 adopted appropriation, the reduced 2020 contractual value, and the 2021 requested value. Legislator Ronk expressed concern in the Agency's accounting, questioning how expenditures are equal to those before the pandemic without travel and face-to-face interaction. Discussion pursued on information available pertaining to current year expenditures. Legislator Walter expressed concern in the quantity of residents reached by the Organization. Legislator Bartels expressed interest in amending the Amendment to reduce it to the 2020 reduced contractual level.

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

Motion No. 21: To approve Budget Amendment No. 19 – Dispute Resolution Center

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Dispute Resolution Center in the amount of \$26,500.

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

Discussion: Chairman Donaldson explained the program. Legislative staff confirmed the 2020 adopted appropriation, the reduced 2020 contractual value, and the 2021 requested value.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, 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 discuss Budget Amendment No. 20 – Supervised Visitation

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Family of Woodstock in the amount of \$30,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislative staff confirmed the 2020 adopted appropriation, the reduced 2020 contractual value, and the 2021 requested value. Discussion pursued on the County’s mandates pertaining to the services, the appropriate Department to oversee the contract, the history of the contract, and the alternatives to providing the services.

Motion No. 23: To amend Budget Amendment No. 20 – Supervised Visitation

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Family of Woodstock in the amount of \$30,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Haynes

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Maio

Discussion: Legislator Haynes suggested amending the appropriation to \$20,000.00. Committee members stated discomfort in terminating the contract in full.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes, and Maio

Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 4

No. of Votes Against: 4

Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 24: To amend Budget Amendment No. 20 – Supervised Visitation

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Family of Woodstock in the amount of \$30,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson expressed interest in amending the Budget Amendment to \$25,000.00. Legislator Ronk emphasized Family of Woodstock’s ability to fundraise.

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

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, and Walter

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 2

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 25: To approve Budget Amendment No. 20 – Supervised Visitation, as Amended

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Family of Woodstock in the amount of \$25,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Gavaris

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Gavaris, 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. 26: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 21 – People’s Place

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to People's Place in the amount of \$10,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Legislator Ronk vocalized disagreement with funding People’s Place as there are many other food panties throughout the County who are not receiving County funding. Legislative Chairman Donaldson expressed support for the Organization, informing Committee members that individuals from all over the County come to the Organization for help.

Motion No. 27: To amend Budget Amendment No. 21 – People’s Place

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to People's Place in the amount of \$10,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Haynes

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Haynes requested amending the appropriation to \$5,000.00. Legislative staff confirmed the 2020 adopted appropriation, the reduced 2020 contractual value, and the 2021 requested value. Legislator Walter emphasized the density of individuals in need in relation to the Organization’s location. Legislator Cahill stressed concern that funding would be allocated to a general fund rather than to a specific program. Discussion pursued on the Legislature’s ability to specify the use of the funding, the population served by the Organization, and the need for such services throughout the County.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Haynes, Maio, Walter

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, and Gavaris, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 3

Disposition: Amended

Motion No. 28: To approve Budget Amendment No. 21 – People’s Place, as Amended

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to People's Place in the amount of \$5,000.

Motion Made By: Legislator Haynes

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, and Gavaris

No. of Votes in Favor: 6

No. of Votes Against: 2

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 29: To approve Budget Amendment No. 22 – Sawkill Fire Company

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment assigns 2021 County Executive Recommended Budgetary funding within Other Home & Community Services to Sawkill Fire Company in the amount of \$16,527.00.

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

Discussion: Legislator Cahill confirmed that he is comfortable with the Committee's decision.

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

Motion No. 30: To approve Budget Amendment No. 23 – Domestic Violence

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds renewal of the Family of Woodstock Title XX Domestic Violence Assistance contract, increasing revenue from Gain on Sale of Tax Acquired Property. To serve as a request from the Legislative body for the renewal of these contracted professional services.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter pointed out that the source has changed since the Budget Amendments presentation to the Ways & Means Committee. Commissioner of Finance Burt Gulnick confirmed that the sub-account is sale on tax acquired property and since the 2020 auction was cancelled, 2021 auction revenues are projected to be higher.

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. 31: To approve Budget Amendment No. 24 – Family Violence Option

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment funds renewal of the Family of Woodstock Family Violence Option contract, increasing revenue from Gain on Sale of Tax Acquired Property. To serve as a request from the Legislative body for the renewal of these contracted professional services.

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

Discussion: None

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. 32: To approve Budget Amendment No. 25 – Family Assistance

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment restores funding to contracts proposed to be reduced within the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget, and to increase Hotel/Motel Occupancy tax for consideration of the execution of a contract with Air BnB.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter confirmed that the County Executive’s office identified and communicated that funding equal to the 2020 contractual value for each service identified in the Amendment is currently included in the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget, that the Legislature will not have the opportunity to change the value until the contracts are presented to the Legislature by Resolution, expressing empathy for the Agencies who are looking for confirmation that their 2021 contract will not be cut. Legislator Criswell asked why the contracts are not being pursued at the value budgeted. Committee members expressed discomfort in asking the Agencies to operate at full level without assurance of funding. Discussion pursued as to whether the Budget Amendment is necessary considering the funding already exists in the budget line, and how the Committee and the Legislature can communication assurance to the involved agencies without a formal budget amendment, memorandum, or other mechanism.

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

Voting Against: Legislator Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes
No. of Votes in Favor: 4
No. of Votes Against: 3
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 33: To approve Budget Amendment No. 26 – Assigned Counsel Program

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment establishes the Department of Assigned Counsel; to reclassify the AS COUSN ADM (Conflict Defender Admin) to the Assigned Counsel Department; to adjust the AS COUNS ADM (Conflict Defender Admin) to a full-time positions, up from benefited part-time; to create a CSEA Administrative Assistant Position (grade 12, entry level, at 40 hours/week); and accounts for State Aid from the Office of Indigent Legal Services.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter confirmed that the County Executive’s office has affirmed support for the Budget Amendment if the two positions involved can remain in Finance until the work is complete for the creation of the new department, reiterating that the Budget Amendment is fully funded. Legislative Chairman Donaldson and Legislator Bartels thanked Legislator Walter for her work on the Amendment.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Ronk, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 34: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 27 – Black Creek

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the Black Creek Capital Project which includes cameras and an intercom security system in the jail.

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

Discussion: Legislator Walter affirmed that the upgrade will maintain the system for a minimum of five years, while a total overhaul may last a matter of ten or eleven years. Legislator Ronk agreed, but requested the Project be pursued in 2022. Discussion pursued on

the break even point of the project, the potential for operating savings, and the overall costs of the project. Legislator Walter expressed concern over pushing the project out. Committee members agreed that the project should be included in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Motion No. 35: To amend Budget Amendment No. 27 – Black Creek

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the Black Creek Capital Project which includes cameras and an intercom security system in the jail.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk suggested moving the Project out to 2022.

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

Motion No. 36: To approve Budget Amendment No. 27 – Black Creek

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment adds the Black Creek Capital Project which includes cameras and an intercom security system in the jail.

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

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson affirmed that this Budget Amendment is to include the Capital Project in the Capital Improvement Program but does not approve the project, which is done through Resolution.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Ronk, Bartels, Gavaris, Haynes, Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
Voting Against: None
No. of Votes in Favor: 7
No. of Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 37: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 28 – Chief Diversity Officer

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment reclassifies the Chief Diversity Officer from the Personnel Department to the Sheriff Department - Sheriff Administration Division with the proposed job description therein.

Motion Made By: Legislator Walter

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Ronk

Discussion: Legislator Walter reiterated prior communication that the position was filled and her and Legislator Haynes are willing to withdraw the Budget Amendment.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Motion No. 38: To approve Budget Amendment No. 29 – Public Health Director of COVID Ops

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment moves Position No. 43201003 back to entry level and defunds Position No. 40101122 and creates the position of Director of the County's COVID-19 response and operations.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: Legislator Walter expressed concern that an individual was hired into a job title that was not appropriate for them and awarded the salary associated with that position, expressing that COVID-related positions should be temporary and covered by the CARES act or another revenue source, asking if the Department of Health needs a communications specialist and if this person will be utilized after the pandemic and if so, if the salary appropriate for that position. Legislator Walter further stated support for the County Executive's response to COVID. Legislator Gavaris affirmed that the County cannot be part of distribution of the vaccine because the New York State Health Department communicated that the distribution program is going to work based on ten (10) regional hubs throughout NYS and those hubs are not allowed to then reallocate that duty to other distributors, and that the hub covering Ulster County is Westchester Medical Center. Legislator Bartels reiterated concern over the salary, who the right person is for the job, and why the position is not being contracted for. Discussion pursued as to the County's involvement and the position's role in vaccine distribution, and the timeline of this need.

Voting In Favor: Legislators Ronk, and Haynes

Voting Against: Legislators Archer, Bartels, Gavaris, Walter, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 2
No. of Votes Against: 5
Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 39: To approve Budget Amendment No. 30 – Discovery

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment creates and funds Position No. 31101447 Discovery Coordinator. The position was established on October 30, 2020 by Order and Determine number 11305.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 40: To approve Budget Amendment No. 31 – COSSAP

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment create and funds the Division Oracle in the Sheriff Department, funds positions no. 31101451 Administrative Assistant and 31101452 Social Worker, and creates and funds two new positions for Peer Advocates in response to the award of the COSSAP grant. These positions are reimbursable by the grant for 3 years.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 41: To approve Budget Amendment No. 32 – Fire Coordinator

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment creates and funds an additional part-time DEP CO FIRE AND EMER COORD PT at an annual salary of \$5,654.20.

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

Discussion: Legislator Ronk confirmed that there is no current County employee who oversees fire training as a whole or who does fire training scheduling, that these duties may be farmed out to multiple individuals but that this is a modest salary to ensure the Fire Training Center is properly utilized and taken care of.

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 7

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 42: To approve Budget Amendment No. 33 – Enterprise West

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment zeroes out expenditures for Enterprise West Redevelopment Project within the year 2021.

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

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Archer, Bartels, and Walter

Voting Against: Legislators Ronk, Gavaris, Haynes, and Legislative Chairman Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 3

No. of Votes Against: 4

Disposition: Defeated

Motion No. 43: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 34 – Retirement Incentive Vacancies

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes funding for applicable position numbers post the incumbent's retirement date. Applicable Positions are those within the 2021 County Executive Recommended Budget for which a current or prior incumbent took the retirement incentive but for which funding is recommended.

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: Chairwoman Archer clarified that her intent was to ensure that backfill dollars were used to fund only necessary positions and that the Legislature was given the opportunity to understand hires resulting from the retirement incentive. Further, Chairwoman Archer stated that she will be withdrawing the Budget Amendment and she trusts that the County's elected officials will do the right thing with regards to filling these positions.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Budget Amendment No. 35 – Retirement No Fills

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes funding for position numbers for which the current incumbent is pursuing the retirement incentive and the County Executive has communicated the position will not be filled.

Discussion: Chairwoman Archer stated that she will be withdrawing the Budget Amendment.

Disposition: Withdrawn

Motion No. 44: To discuss Budget Amendment No. 36 – Insurance

Budget Amendment Summary: This Amendment removes the Confidential Secretary Position from the Insurance Department and restores the Accountant, CSEA position.

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

Discussion: Legislative Chairman Donaldson confirmed that the Budget Amendment was changed from its original presentation to the Committee to change the Confidential Secretary back to an Accountant. Legislator Bartels noted that the individual previously aiding the Insurance Department was housed in another Department, questioning how this working arrangement functioned and why it could not be continued. Discussion pursued on the Insurance Department's needs, the legality of the transfer from a union position to a non-union position without Legislative approval, how the Accountant position was created, and if it was ever filled. Legislator Bartels expressed interest in speaking with the Department Head for clarification. Legislator Walter asked for confirmation that the change will be an exchange, rather than a

subtraction and an addition which may have a different effect. Legislator Cahill expressed concern about the Administration taking away promotional opportunities from CSEA employees.

Disposition: No Action Taken

Motion No. 45: To approve Resolution No. 429 – 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.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 46: To approve Resolution No. 430 – 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.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 47: To approve Resolution No. 431 – 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.

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 48: To approve Resolution No. 432 – 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 Walter
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Bartels

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 49: To approve Resolution No. 433 – 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, to properly close out the 2020 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 Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 50: To discuss Resolution No. 434 – Adopting the Ulster County Budget For Fiscal Year Commencing January 1, 2021 And Making Appropriations For The Conduct Of County Government

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the Tentative Budget, as on file with the Clerk of the Legislature, as changed, altered, revised, and as thereafter set forth, and appropriates for the objects and purpose specified effective January 1, 2021 the several amounts as set forth in the “ADOPTED” column of such budget.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Motion No. 51: To amend Resolution No. 434 – Adopting the Ulster County Budget For Fiscal Year Commencing January 1, 2021 And Making Appropriations For The Conduct Of County Government

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 52: To approve Resolution No. 434 – Adopting the Ulster County Budget For Fiscal Year Commencing January 1, 2021 And Making Appropriations For The Conduct Of County Government, as Amended

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 53: To discuss Resolution No. 435 – Adopting Ulster County Capital Program For 2021 - 2026

Resolution Summary: This Resolution adopts the Capital Program, as on file with the Clerk of the Legislature, as changed, altered, and revised.

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

Motion No. 54: To amend Resolution No. 435 – Adopting Ulster County Capital Program For 2021 - 2026

Motion Made By: Legislator Bartels

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Motion No. 55: To approve Resolution No. 435 – Adopting Ulster County Capital Program For 2021 – 2026, as Amended

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

Discussion: None

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

Voting Against: None

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Disposition: Approved

Old Business: None

New Business: Chairwoman Archer thanked the Committee and Legislative staff for all their time and effort. Legislative Chairman Donaldson thanked Chairwoman Archer for her hard work. Deputy Clerk of the Legislature – Finance, Amber Feaster informed Committee members that the amended value of the Contingent Account is \$362,926, and that the savings from Legislative Non-County Contract Agencies is \$298,695.

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

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Donaldson

Motion Seconded By: Legislator Walter

No. of Votes in Favor: 5

No. of Votes Against: 0

Time: 7:19 PM

Respectfully submitted: Amber Feaster

Minutes Approved: December 8, 2020

**Ways &
Means Committee
Special Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: November 24, 2020 – 4:00
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656,
Meeting ID 990 7237 9754
PRESIDING OFFICER: Lynn Archer, Chairwoman
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Natalie Kelder, and Amber Feaster
PRESENT: Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr., Tracey Bartels, John Gavaris, Heidi Haynes, Mary Beth Maio, and Eve Walter (teleconference 4:00 – 4:35 PM); and Legislative Chairman Donaldson
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes
OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislators Cahill, Criswell, Delaune, Litts, Parete, and Uchitelle; Commissioner of Finance, Burt Gulnick; Deputy Budget Director, Christopher Kelly; Clerk of the Legislature Victoria Fabella; Comptroller, March Gallagher; Christopher Quirk, Deputy Comptroller; Randy Boughton, Senior Auditor; Beth Weredyk, Senior Auditor; Andrew Zink, Insurance; Patricia Doxsey, Daily Freeman; Joan Crawford, Family Services; Brian Doyle, Family Services; Maggie Veve, SUNY New Paltz; Lin Sakai, Esopus Democratic Committee; Theresa Paras, New Paltz Democratic Committee

Chairwoman Archer: Maybe missing one or two. But why don't we go ahead and get started? We have a pretty long agenda today. I'd like to try and get through everything. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today, November 24th, for the Ways and Means Committee Meeting for disposition of the Budget Amendments.

Natalie, could you please call roll?

Natalie Kelder: Archer.

Chairwoman Archer: Here.

Natalie Kelder: Ronk.

Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Here.

Natalie Kelder: Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Present.

Natalie Kelder: Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Here.

Natalie Kelder: Maio.

Legislator Maio: Here.

Natalie Kelder: And Walter.

Legislator Walter: Here.

Natalie Kelder: You're on the phone. So, your votes will not be counted until you're present in video.

Legislator Walter: I understand.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Just for, just for clarification, she could also come back, when she gets back online, she can vote on the previous amendments that we've already decided. Just so you understand, Eve. Okay.

Amber Feaster: And for the record, Chairman Donaldson is with us, and so is Legislator Ronk.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, thank you, everyone. Why don't we get started the Budget Amendment No. 1, I'll take a motion to move that.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris. Seconded by Chairman Donaldson.

Any questions?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah. What are they, where are we at? No. 1 is the DA (District Attorney), right?

Chairwoman Archer: District Attorney, the receptionist/typist Right. Any questions on that?

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, thank you. You know, just speaking about all three of these amendments, you know, as a whole, not just speaking about the first because I feel like that'll move this along a little bit. I'll be supporting the third one for the paralegal, but I will not be supporting the administrative assistant or the receptionist typist. You know, I understand that, you know, due to

what I feel is the ill-conceived discovery reform, which just turns out to be another unfunded mandate and several portions of local government from the state. I understand his need for the paralegal to be able to comply with the discovery reform. I just feel like with the budget situation where we are, I don't feel that the other positions are necessary at this time.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other comments?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Is the

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels?

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I mean, I, I thought that the DA gave a compelling argument for the first two positions. I'm, you know, I'm struggling with it, too, given the budget cycle and what I believe is going to happen next year. I just am not sure how it would impact his work to not have them, given the change in workload. He he, did he, did we get that the caseload provided?

Chairwoman Archer: Everything's doubled.

Legislator Bartels: Substantial. Yeah. So, I'm just I'm concerned about the ability to, to operate the office.

Legislator Walter: Legislator Archer?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Legislator Walter can go if you'd like.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, okay. Sorry.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. Yeah, so, I just wanted to remind people that there are two. Because one of them was a misunderstanding. He had needed this to go in the budget. The Executive, in conversations, they were somehow it got down that they he didn't want it, when he actually did. So, just to clarify that that's one of them.

And then the second one, he really thought he can go without and when they have the initial conversation, but pretty much discovered that that's just not possible. So, just adding that. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Chairman Donaldson, then Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes, I, I like Tracey, have a huge type of concern. Is he going to be able to operate and do what he's got to do without it?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah. And just to be clear, the, the third one isn't a position of a paralegal. It's just, it's just it's a technical clarification because they funded the wrong line. You know, the person is living in a different line than was funded. So, it's not a new paralegal. It's just,

Chairwoman Archer: It's just a job number change.

Legislator Bartels: it's a technical change.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, on Amendment 1, which is the receptionist. Any other questions on that one? Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes. I mean, where, the money is coming from, in this particular first one, it's all coming. Where's the money coming from on that first one?

Chairwoman Archer: I believe it's contingency account.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It doesn't show on the amendment, does it?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, I think it does. At the bottom.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Oh, yes, yes, I'm sorry. I didn't, I looked over it. I looked right over it.

Chairwoman Archer: That's okay.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Are we having a running total of how our contingency is changing?

Chairwoman Archer: Amber?

Amber Feaster: I, I'll do my best to keep track of it. But I have, um, I'm keeping track of the legislative Program savings, and I have the votes and everything that I'm keeping track as well.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, can Natalie help with that? Or? Okay, Well, we'll do our best. You know, if not, we'll get the tally as quickly as we can.

Okay. So, on the on the first Amendment. All in favor?

Opposed? Legislator Ronk and Maio. Thank you.

On the second one? Move for a vote.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you.

Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Second.

Legislator Bartels: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Chairman Donaldson, second.

Okay. On the administrative assistant, all in favor?

Opposed?

Legislator Ronk: No.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk and Maio, No.

And the third, which is the technical correction for the paralegal's job number. Move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Let me ask, I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Sure

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: How the third one as no, no budgetary effect, right?

Legislator Ronk: Correct.

Chairwoman Archer: Correct. It's already in the budget. It was just under the wrong job title, correct?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right so, so, right so, okay.

Legislator Bartels: Job line, it's a job line.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I wanted to make sure so other people that are not looking at the amendment also understand.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Great. Thank you. Okay. All in favor?

Opposed? All in favor, thank you.

Next is Amendment 4.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: This is the Capital Pump House Control Upgrade. This was omitted in the original Capital Plan.

Move for a vote. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Unanimous vote.

The next one is Budget Amendment 5 – Emergency Management Move. Again, this

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you.

Second? Chairman Donaldson. This again was one of the components left out of the Capital Plan.

Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I, I do have some of the concerns that I raised but I'm, I'm going to support it and then do my due diligence in the, in the coming months.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislator Bartels: Since it's the Capital Plan, there was a lot of work done, as referenced by both Legislators Ronk and Haynes.

Chairwoman Archer: Great. Okay.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right, and we still, I mean, we still have to okay any of the money being spent, so.

Chairwoman Archer: There's more opportunity for discussion. Okay.

All in favor?

Group: Aye

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Unanimous. Moved.

Okay. Amendment No. 6 – DSS Basement Restoration. Move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second. Chairman Donaldson. Any questions?

Okay. All in favor?

Opposed? So moved.

Okay, Amendment No. 7 – Assistant County Attorney. **I'll, somebody** want to move this?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, second?

Legislator Bartels: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Okay for discussion. Any questions on this? Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: No question. Just a comment. I don't support this amendment. I think it's important that you know, we have the opportunity to get a qualified Supervising Attorney to be the First Assistant County Attorney. That's the reason that this was increased in the first place. It's regrettable, that due to, you know, the circumstances surrounding the vote from the Legislature and some things that were said about, you know, our, you know, now former First Assistant County Attorney, you know, she's gone on to pursue other endeavors. But I think it's important for us to be able to entice a well-qualified attorney, so, I don't support cutting this position.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Just for clarification, when you say cutting the position, you don't mean, you mean cutting the pay, not the position.

Legislator Ronk: The salary of the position.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other questions? Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I'm a little torn on this one. I certainly understand that you, you do need somebody that is second in command. We have, you know, right now, Clint is, Clint is the County Attorney, but there also needs to be somebody that's going to be responsible, right after, you know, right after each position, if he's out or whatever it may be, the reason may be. So, I'm, but I certainly understand, you know, when the position was increased, it was increased without any input from the Legislative body and that that was a that's a concern of mine. It's always a concern of mine when they increase pay in any, any sort without, you know, Legislative input. So, I'm a little torn on this one, because it does sort of make sense, at the same time, even though we were not made aware of it ahead of time.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: This has passed in the budget last year. So, we were made aware ahead of time. You know, so, I'm, you know, I don't necessarily agree. This is something, Legislator Donaldson, that, you know, we adopted in the budget last year. And this was not, it's not, it's not a mid-year increase. It's, you know, what, what occurred last year. I just, I don't agree with that statement. I

understand what you guys to understand your point. But, you know, this is, this isn't, you know, negating an increase that's happened in, in this budget. This is a reduction year over year.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I'm just, two things. Yes, we, we did adopt in the budget last year, but to Chair Donaldson's point, the change was made mid-year without Legislative approval. And then, once the person was in the position, we confirmed that salary which had been made, the change had been made mid-year without Legislative approval.

That said, the proposed, the proposed adjusted salary, bring it back down to the previous rate of \$87,952 is more than \$10,000 higher than the next Assistant County Attorney in the office. So, it's still it's still a significant step up above from the next Assistant County Attorney, if you want to call it the First Assistant and have it be have a supervisory role. It's \$10,000 over the next Assistant County Attorney.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, if, if, if we're going to, if we're going to start negating raises that we adopted in the budget last year, that were done mid-year without Legislative approval, I've got a couple of options I'd like thrown in as well. But I, I just don't think that's proper.

Chairwoman Archer: Well, the reality is, is there's nobody in this position now. And some of the other ones, that, you know, if somebody was in the position, you don't want, you know, you necessarily wouldn't want to take a big reduction. So.

Legislator Ronk: There's a, I just want to remind the committee that you know, after that comment, there's a resolution later to take 2% away from all of our hard-working management staff.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well that, that has nothing to do with this resolution, or that

Legislator Ronk: That comment had to do with Legislator Archer's statement.

Chairwoman Archer: One at a time, please. One at a time. Chairman Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk: Oh you're the only one that's allowed to cut anyone off, got it.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: We are doing one at a time. So, let's focus on this. And I agree with Legislator Archer, and that, you know, it is not taking anything away from somebody that's sitting in there. And I can understand where you're coming from, Legislator Ronk. But, you know, we'll discuss that when we get to that point. The, right now, this number would be approximately \$10,000 more than the one, anybody just below them. Is that correct?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, that's what Legislator Bartels said. I don't have it in front of me.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And the other, in other words, is there an increase in this? That is from the previous year, or I'm, I'm not seeing that on there.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm not sure I understand the question, Chairman.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: No, it's a, it's not more than it was last year, correct?

Chairwoman Archer: No.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Not more than the one that was increased without our input from the year before and then got put on in the budget?

Chairwoman Archer: Correct.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah. Thanks. You know, with respect to Legislator Donaldson on the on the, you know, resolution that that's coming up later that I alluded to. You know, it had to do with what Legislator Archer was speaking about, which was, you know, taking, you know, we wouldn't want to take money away from people who already have it. And that comment seemed, you know, in, at odds with, you know, her support of a resolution that would do just that. So, that was, that was where my comment was coming from Legislator Donaldson.

On this, it may, we may, we may not be taking away, you know, money from somebody who's in the position, but I think that we're taking away the County Attorney's ability to hire a supervising attorney for that salary. You know, you'll, I believe that you'll find that supervising attorneys and other departments are paid more than that. And that's, you know, a concern. You look at like the First, you know, the First Assistant District Attorney, the First Assistant Public Defender, you know, you go down the list, and, you know, they're higher salaries. And, you know, that really goes to the entire County Attorney's Office where attorneys in other areas of the county, in other positions in the county, are paid more than the Assistant County Attorneys. I just, I don't know why we would want to hamstring ourselves in the position of the person who's there to defend us, in our actions.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I just want to point out, though I, I don't have the exact numbers, that both the Public Defender and the District Attorney have considerably more attorneys in those office. So, in terms of being in a supervisory role, you'd be supervising many more attorneys than in the County Attorney's Office.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay on a, on amend.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Does anybody know

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry, go ahead, Chairman.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah. Does anybody know the, what, what actually is that they and the Public Defender and the DAs Office for a comparable position?

Chairwoman Archer: Natalie, can you look that up quick? Do you have that ability?

Commissioner Gulnick: Hi, this is Burt. I'm actually driving. I can tell you the First Assistant DA makes over \$100,000. I don't have the salary right in front of me. But I, as soon as I get back to the office, I can get it.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: And I'm looking at the Public Defender's page and the Chief Assistant Public Defender in 2020, made \$96,560, proposed for roughly a \$10,000 raise this year. But by my fast count, there's over 26 Assistant Public Defenders in the office. So, it's a considerably different, the dynamic of the office. And I assume also the caseload is considerably different.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels, I'm sorry, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I understand that you can make the confusion. You know, I, I think that, you know, if you'd look at both the Public Defender's Office and the DAs Office, there's quite a few part time ADA's and an APDs in those offices, as well. You know, so, I don't think it's apples to oranges. I also know that the County Attorney's Office does a wider arrange of law from the In rem's, to juvenile offenders, to defending us against actions that come against the county, to defending the county against things as silly as somebody getting hit by a train on a county road. So, you know, you also need to have a large, you know, array of skills and expertise where in some of these other offices, it's pretty one lane. I don't know. I just I don't think that, I just don't think that we should do this. That's all and I'll stop talking.

Chairwoman Archer: Natalie, were you able to get us some current numbers for the DAs Office?

Natalie Kelder: I'm pulling up the budget right now.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. I'm trying to.

Amber Feaster: There's a lot of Assistant DAs, in the DAs Office, and they have a wide range of regular pay.

Chairwoman Archer: Do they have a, like a supervisory or a first?

Amber Feaster: There's no title, it alludes to that.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislator Ronk: I'd go out on a limb and say it's the most, highest paid Assistant District Attorney would be the Chief Assistant.

Amber Feaster: There is an Assistant District Attorney; there's two of them that make \$98,000 and \$99,000.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: And there's also one that there's also one or two that make over \$100K, \$107K.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All right, on the on the resolution?

Amber Feaster: There is a \$106,605 pay and a \$107,903.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, does that answer everyone's questions? On the resolution, all in favor of Amendment No. 7.

Opposed?

We have Haynes, Maio, Ronk opposed. Chairman, did you vote on this? You're frozen? Yep, we lost the Chairman. Okay. So, we had three. So, we have three so it's

Legislator Ronk: Defeated until somebody else votes.

Chairwoman Archer: Till someone else votes. And we have coming back on, probably, Chairman and Legislator Walter. Okay, so, we'll put that to the side.

Okay. Resolution No. 8. Move for discussion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Bartels: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, these are the raises. Any questions? No questions. Okay. Go ahead, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Are these, these are the non, I just want to confirm these are the non-change to the standard workweek raises.

Chairwoman Archer: No, these are raises.

Legislator Bartels: Yes.

Legislator Ronk: I'm correct, right, Legislator Bartels?

Chairwoman Archer: Oh.

Legislator Bartels: Yes.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry, I thought it was hour increases.

Legislator Bartels: It's all the non-union rate increases. It's the straight rates.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Straight rates. Okay. Sorry about that.

Legislator Ronk: I'll

Chairwoman Archer: Any, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I, I don't, I don't agree with all of the increases being put in here. I think that some of the people have made compelling arguments as to why, particularly the Clerk's Office. If I'm voted, if I'm forced to vote on this as an omnibus, I would vote yes on this amendment and no on the next one. But, you know, again, I think that, you know, when it comes to the floor, I may be making some amendments to this to, you know, reflect I think some of the better arguments that have been made for these.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson, and then Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I apparently got knocked off the Zoom. Did you? I just got back on, my computer wasn't doing it, so I'm on my iPad instead. Did you vote on the one for the

Chairwoman Archer: Assistant County Attorney, yes. And it was a three/three vote. So, you will be the deciding vote for or against.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I will vote, I'm going to vote against it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Okay. Great. Thank you.

Now we're on Amendment No. 8. Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah to Legislator Ronk's point, I'm fine with moving this as an omnibus. I've spoken to a bunch of Legislators. I know that they're going to be individual amendments. And as I've said, you know, there's, there's one in here, in particular, that I've been advocating for years. So, it's really difficult. I just did not want to pick and choose. I had multiple legislators, asking that we put in a resolution preventing any pay raises. And so, that's what, that's what I did. This was the way I could handle it. But I understand that on the floor there's likely to be amendments.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Chairman Donaldson and then Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Is there an ability to actually take all the pay raises and move them into a contingency account, so we can actually go through them one at a time? You know, with the new year, shall we say?

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, that's an interesting approach. Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I mean, I, I clearly there's an ability to do that to take all this number. And, I mean, that's essentially what this resolution does, it doesn't give the pay raises to the individuals, it

moves the money into contingency. You know, part of the problem, I think, is that, you know, it's such, I was talking to someone about it today, a department head and then also a colleague, you know, it's just such a difficult, it's such a difficult year. But I feel really strongly that 2021 is going to be worse. And as I, as I make my way around the county and speak to people about this, it's really, really a hard year to give and unjustified pay raises. Just, it just is. But to answer your question, Chair Donaldson, this does move all the money into contingency. So, at any point, it could be moved out of contingency by resolution.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right. Right. But what my mind set would be, well, it is a contingency, but with the understanding that we are going to take each one of them up individually, as we're able to. In other words, not that we're, in other words, the way it's set up here, it's sort of like it's a done deal. We're all saying no, no raises. As opposed to, there's, I mean, my mindset, there's certain people in here that really should be getting raises without a doubt. Because they're, you know the, the amount of work that they're being forced to do is increased. So, they may actually have added hours that they should be working. And/or they're working on, some people are working in a different title. And, you know, they're actually, you know, if you're changing the titles in that they somebody left, they may have moved up, and you're going to work in another title. Then they certainly deserve the increase in the title that they're actually working out of. It's no different than if they were, you know, CSEA members that were, you know, working out of title. Then they, you know, they can just put in an appeal and, and they would get pay.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, just through you, to Legislator Bartels. I noticed that there's, you know, Public Defender Hurrell Herring positions, are we, you know, are we decreasing grant funded positions in this resolution? Settlement funded resolutions, I guess would be more accurate.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: We're not giving the raises that were proposed.

Legislator Ronk: Are those raises grant funded?

Legislator Bartels: I believe that they will be.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes.

Legislator Ronk: Are we able to use that money in future years? Or is that just money that we're giving back to the state as part of the settlement?

Legislator Bartels: I don't know if Legislator

Legislator Walter: Legislator Archer, my hand is up.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry. I can't see that. Okay, can you

Legislator Walter: You don't see me having my hand up in my car?

Chairwoman Archer: I don't, but thank you for chiming in.

Legislator Walter: So, to respond to Legislator Ronk, not necessarily. I mean, there's another resolution, another amendment that further down, that also utilizes the same pool for the Assigned Counsel Administrator. There's also sometimes uses, you know, we've applied it to rent, we've applied it, we can apply it to equipment. So it's, it's not necessarily a give back. It may just easily be utilized for other purposes.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels and then Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, in terms of the Public Defenders, you know, there's, there's two, because I'd asked that all of these raises, you know, our, our financial analysts were a huge help. And I asked that we flag any of these raises. There are two modest raises in terms of an Assistant and a Deputy Chief Assistant. I'm not sure how those numbers were, you know realized, a \$1,200 and a \$642 raise. But the more, the the more extreme range is the Chief Assistant Public Defender and the justification given.

I'm sorry, I'm getting an echo. It's hard to talk with the echo.

The justification given to the Chief Assistant Public Defender raise is that it was given to the Public Defender. But in fact, the raise that we approved for the Public Defender was due to moving to a full-time position. So, the Chief Assistant Public Defender had always been a full-time position. So, I didn't really understand why we were adding nearly \$10,000 to that simply because the Public Defender saw a higher salary.

Chairwoman Archer: So, I think what I'm hearing is that there's probably still some increases here that have to be sorted out and clarified. But the intent is to not approve raises and, and get more clarity before the final vote, it, it, did I hear that correctly?

Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I mean, it sounded like Legislator Ronk was saying, because they've been broken out into three different kind of buckets, sounded like Legislator Ronk was saying, if we were moving it wholesale, he would be supporting this one, but maybe not the later ones. But that there could be amendments on the floor to this one, if this one gets approved. I can say that Chair Donaldson, in describing the discussion of raises and looking back at raises throughout the course of the year, was referencing all three of the resolutions. Because he was talking about changes to hours and changes to titles. And those are later. Those are later amendments. This, this amendment is the most clean of the, of the raises. This is where people are just given straight raises.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Ronk. Oh, sorry. Can, do you mind if we get?

Legislator Ronk: Of course.

Legislator Cahill: No, no, no, nope, nope actually let the committee.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Cahill. I'm sorry I. Go ahead.

Legislator Cahill: That's alright, I want the committee people to speak. I'm a guest. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Ronk and then we'll have Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Ronk: All right, I, I just I find some of the, you know, some of some of the aghastness over raises, in this budget, a little disingenuous, considering when I brought up some of the large salary increases in last year's budget, I was tarred and feathered. You know, and we approve them. And now they're still, you know, getting these salaries. But now, anybody else that comes forward, you know, is being looked at differently than last year.

I just feel like we, you know, we tend to pick something to focus on the budget, and this year, it's raises. And it's just concerning to me, because we don't have any kind of, you know, rhyme or reason to how we do these things come, you know, November or December. I, I don't know, I, I just, it's, it's a concern to me over the over all three of these, you know, all three of these amendments. But I yeah, Legislator Bartels is correct, I plan to support this one and then go back and, and do a little bit more work on you know, whose made some better arguments than others on why the raises are justified.

I don't support any of the changes to the standard workday in the next one.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Again, and I know, we're, you know, going back and forth. But again, part of where I see the difference is that this is an extraordinary year. We're in the middle of a pandemic, and in a financial crisis that's bound to get worse. So, that's in large part, you know, when I look around again, when I look around the county, when I talk to friends and colleagues and neighbors, and I see what people are going through. And I imagine how much worse it's going to get in terms of food insecurity and difficulty in making ends meet. And I just, I just do not feel that kind of to, to give raises, but you know, we can respectfully disagree on that. That's fine.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Cahill, thank you for your patience.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I just want to reiterate, I have to drop off for another meeting. But I just wanted to get this out there that I think that any selective CSEA raise via through a move up in a in a job grade, arbitrarily without going through a list or extending their hours, is something that I'm going to vote against, at all. And I know that they're probably... I don't know if they're in this, No. 8, or further down the road, but I do have to leave. So, I wanted to bring it up.

I just think it's unfair, that we're selecting only a handful of our CSEA employees to give raises to when the vast majority of them won't see a raise. And we're going to have all five of our collective bargaining agreements expired very, very shortly. And I think, you know, handpicking unionized employees to give them raises and finding a way to do it is just not the correct way to do it. And I think it sends a terrible, terrible message to the folks that work so hard in our county day in and day out.

So, if I, if I see those at any point, I'm just letting me know, I'm going to vote against those resolutions. And again, I know how we're going to do this today. I appreciate that. But when we get down to those, that's exactly how I'm going to address those. So, thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. And please note that Legislator Walter is now present. And we'll kind of go over before we close out on the votes you missed, so you can weigh in. Okay.

Any other questions on this one, on Resolution No. 8, the raises? Okay. All in favor?

Opposed?

Legislator Gavaris I wasn't sure which one you were.

Legislator Gavaris: I'll be yes to move to the floor but however

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, okay, so it was unanimous. All right, thank you. Now we have Amendment No. 9 – Hour Increases.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Second? Legislator Walter, second. Okay. Do you have a comment, Legislator Ronk?

Legislator Ronk: I do. In fact, thank you. I am going to be opposed to this one. I think that, you know, that the folks who have made these increases in hours and changes in work schedule, have a good justification for them. You know, I just want to say that if, if we adopt this, we actually take hours away from our Deputy Clerk of the Legislature, who is the entire reason we're able to have these Zoom meetings. I find it ironic that, you know, you know, the, the extra work that she's done in the extra hours that she's worked to make these Zoom meetings, including this one, where we might be cutting her salary, I don't know, the whole, you know, cutting her, you know, salary in the upcoming budget due to the number of hours, you know, all this is going to do is increase her comp time. And, you know, cause I think problems for the Clerk in operating the office when it comes to that particular position.

And then you go down the list. And, you know, the Comptroller has made really good arguments as to why, you know, those, hour increases are happening. I had previously opposed the Comptroller's attempts to move these positions back up in hours, but I believe that Comptroller Gallagher has been, you know, doing a good job, and really did a good job in justifying them to me. Again, you know, I understand the concern about just straight rate increases, but these are actually, you know, compensating our employees for extra hours that they're working. So, you know, a lot of them are COVID-related. I I just don't, I don't see the reasoning behind this.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Again, I think that department heads have the ability to use alternative work schedules on a temporary basis, and making 40 hour work weeks permanent, which is what's happening in, in many of these cases, I don't, I don't think is advisable, you know, again, we may not

be in a long-term situation, or hopefully, we will not be in a long-term need for this, for the type of work that we're doing. So, I'm, I'm obviously supportive of this. I put it forward.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: So, I took a big step back on we have, we have several different kinds of personnel kind of issues in front of us and, and amendments related to personnel. And some of them include, as we just saw, sort of positions that are completely empty, and we'll have those again later. Some of them are hours increase. Some of them are people put in positions that don't match their job titles and given an increased salary based on that, and then their job titles changed.

So, I kind of take a step back on which ones I feel really okay about; which ones I don't. I'd have to say like, for this one, and I'll feel the same way for the next one is, you know, these are, and I agree with Legislator Ronk, like these are people who need them trusting the heads that these jobs can't get done without these requests. And I feel, and I also feel bad... I don't like the idea of taking away money that was already given and I don't like the idea, and I feel more comfortable trusting the heads that if they needed this, these hour changes they do. There are plenty of other situations where I'm not happy with those. But with this, I kind of I just feel like, if this is what the department had, say they need. I, I feel like I have to trust it. And I, I feel that these department heads did make other cuts in other ways. And I don't think they would have asked if they didn't need it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, just to respond to Legislator Bartels comment about alternative work schedules on a temporary basis. You know, that can work if there is a vacancy in the department, or if there's extra money somewhere in the department that can be moved. But that's the only way that you can do an alternate work schedule. You know, without appropriating more money to that position, you know, to the department, or the division. And in addition to that, you know, the comment that these are now permanent, hour increases is incorrect. Just like we're adding the hours this year, if something changes, and the department head comes back next year, or we decide that the department head didn't need the hours increase, we can bump them back down its the budget time. So, nothing's permanent, you know, in the budget, we have the ultimate appropriating authority.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, my concern is I'm, I'm not so keen on doing this blanket in this manner. I'm not sure if every one of them all fit the same bill. I mean, that is what my concern is when we're looking at these. So, I tend, I tend to agree with Legislator Walters and Ronk on this, you know, if they're looking for this need, and they pointed out that need, then, I mean, we do have to have some faith in that the people that are doing these jobs are, you know, need that extra time.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other comments? On the resolution? All in favor?

Opposed?

And I just want to go on record and, and, and say that, you know, once we get past this, I would hope that next year we look at adjusting, because if we're a standard 35-hour workweek, then I would hope that once we get past the hurdles of COVID that we can address these appropriately.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: To that, to that comment. We are not a standard 35-hour work week. There's 35, 37.5, and 40. All over county government in and out of the unions.

Chairwoman Archer: Well, yes, yes, that's correct there, but for non-union, we're 35 Hour Workweek, right?

Legislator Ronk: Not across the board, I don't believe

Chairwoman Archer: Well, with one at, one or two exceptions.

Legislator Ronk: Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: So, but anyway, I do think it's something to look at and I recognize people are, are reducing headcount, and they're making up for it in different ways. So, I'm supporting this so I don't think we need to delay it.

Okay, the next one is the management non-union cuts amendment number 10. Move for discussion?

Legislator Ronk: Oh I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. And second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Walter. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: So, again, I also I want to say that I appreciate Legislator Bartels effort, and desire, and and energy into helping us have a more efficient budget. I really do. I, this falls also, I do feel uncomfortable with taking away a raise that people were already offered. I absolutely get, and I think there are many other things that we can and should cut, but, and it's one thing to cut a raise that's potential, but one that occurred in the past, I'm, I'm uncomfortable with. And these are all ones that have already occurred, right?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. Chairman Donaldson

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I also want to thank the massive amount of work that these amendments cause for the, our budget people. I know they were, Amber was up, you know, through the weekend, making sure last week to do all these things were put together. And I'm sure she did some more work in this weekend. And these are pay that was already there. I voted against this particular thing when it was there, but now it's there. I'm not going to be taking money away from people.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other comments? Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, as I've previously stated, I, I absolutely can't support this, you know, you're taking away a 2% increase that was given last year. People made life decisions on it. I also, you know, want to thank Amber and Natalie for their hard work on all the amendments, but on this one in particular, because I feel like it was, you know, it's, it's almost ironic that, you know, you know, Amber had to work over the weekend on a resolution that would cut her own salary by 2%. And she did it so well and with such grace. So, I appreciate that.

And, you know, I just can't you know, it's, you know, it to me, it's disrespectful to the hard working, you know, folks who, you know, a lot of a lot of these folks are the ones who volunteered during the shutdown to come in, and, you know, staff the COVID hotline and help out at the EOC. You know, you know, there was a resolution this past month to, to give payouts to our political appointees at the Board of Elections for their comp time. But, you know, then, you know, in the budget, we're going to cut the, you know, we're going to cut the salaries of all the staff who worked during the shutdown, during the pandemic. And, and you know, pending another shutdown are going to work again through the shutdown. I don't know, I just, you know, I, I, I find this of all of the amendments, I find this one the most troubling.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I also respect the work that was done. And I, I thanked Amber and the irony wasn't lost on me. That said, to suggest that it's disrespectful, I mean, it's it, it would be a difficult decision to make, I still stand behind it. I can imagine, you know, where it's going to go, at least in this committee, but I still stand behind the decision. You know, people are being asked to make sacrifices all across this county. And I expect that what we're going to see in this coming years is more people losing their homes, more people defaulting, more people falling into food insecurity into homelessness, etc. And, again, it's not it's not about lacking respect for our hard workers. It's about a difficult decision and a difficult budget time.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, with that all in favor of this amendment, Amendment 10?

And opposed?

Okay. Amendment 11 - Title changes.

Legislator Walter: I'll move for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Seconded.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Any questions on this one? Legislator Walter, you're on, you're on mute.

Legislator Walter: So, this is where I do have an issue. And I, you know, I think this issue relates not only to these current title changes, but what, to me has felt like subtle efforts throughout the

year of moving people into positions, into titles that didn't necessarily match what they did, for higher salaries and various other kinds of wonky things. And I will say that I did look at the budgets proposed for a couple of other counties. And I feel like I'm okay with the title change, but it not as long as it doesn't come with a salary increase. And they just need to change their title. That's one thing but I'm not okay with these title changes and efforts to get a salary increase. That's, that's not a title change. I mean, that's, that's a different job, with a different salary. And I think that needs a lot more kind of explanation behind it. So, I'm not supportive of this. I mean, I am supportive of this amendment. I'm not supportive of doing title changes to increase salaries.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you for the clarification. Any other questions?

Okay, on, on Amendment 11 - Title changes, all in favor?

We have Haynes Maio, Bartels, Walter Ronk, Archer, and Chairman Donaldson.

Opposed. Legislator Gavaris. Thank you.

Amendment 11, or Amendment 12 – Community, Ulster County Community Action. Move?

Chairman Donaldson moves. Second, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. Just through the Chair to Chairman Donaldson. Is this in addition to the other any other appropriations for Community Action in the budget, or this is the only appropriation for Community Action?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: They are, they're paid for a doing certain, they're paid for the Heat, for doing HEAT applications. That's something, that's one of the things that they, they do. They go all through, I believe they've been doing that for many years. It's Social Services contracts with them. Because they do other, you know, various programs. So, they're able to, in other words, that they're able to do all the income verifications and things of that nature, because the number of whatever programs they have, they have to do that for their programs.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: So.

Chairwoman Archer: And, and I believe this one is specifically earmarked to help with housing issues, correct?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes, Housing issues. Well, it's actually a number of things that could be housing issues. That's one of the major things that they do that for. But they, they, you know, they again, they use their ability for, you know, income verifications before. And they also do things like for instance, if they are going to give someone help them with a rent, so they're not being thrown out. They, they make sure that they're not, you know, not going to be a reoccurring thing.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. So, with respect to housing issues, is it, is it help, is it like paying people's rent? Or is it like what the County Executive has done with the County Attorney's Office and the Legal Services of the Hudson Valley about the, you know, eviction orders during COVID?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: No, it would be actually giving them a small, small grant, shall we say?

Legislator Ronk: Okay, thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Any other questions on this?

Okay. All in favor.

Opposed? Haynes, Maio, and Ronk.

Thank you. Amendment No. 13 - Ulster County Library Association. Move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Second?

Legislator Bartels: I'll second.

Chairwoman Archer: Bartels is second. Okay. And did somebody have a question?

Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: I just want more of a statement. I guess, you know, I, I have a somewhat problem. I think I said this last time with the library. While it's a great service, and I agree that it is. The library districts extend beyond the county's borders. They already receive taxpayer money from those districts. But those districts that they get the money from are part of the school districts, which again, extend beyond the borders. So, essentially, we can be paying for other outside county residents. And I don't necessarily think that's fair to our taxpayers.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson and Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I believe that would probably, if there is, it's got to be a handful, it's not a lot, because these are going, this you have to have a library card in order to add, you know, access these services. So, you have the library card from your local library. So, granted, you may be able to maybe some that might be able to access that, but it but every virtually it's meant for the access for our Ulster County people. Now if somebody else can access it... well, I mean, it's, it's not hurting us by doing that. And yes, they all are taxing authorities. But what ends up happening is even the City of Kingston, one of the larger libraries would not be able to afford these programs that they're putting in there. Because if they did that, they would be paying \$77,000 or whatever. And they would have to pay it through their taxes. But in this case, instead, and, and no different than the Town of Olive Library is now able to, if you're a member there, you can access all of these various programs that are put on online for anybody to access. So, I mean, I could understand that.

Well, that's sort of sort of what they you know, in unintended purposes that somebody may be able to get it. But I don't think that should be a reason to turn it down. I think it should be if you want to turn it down, it should be turned down on its merits, but what is providing for all of Ulster County residents.

Chairwoman Archer: So, I have a number of folks: Legislator Bartels, Ronk, then Gavaris, and Haynes.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I was just going to follow on the last comment and say that, you know, I believe that it's a subscription, we pay for the subscription. So, I don't think we pay by the user. So, even if, even if some of the members of our library system live outside of the county, we wouldn't be paying extra for them using it. And I would also say that the, the same kind of benefit applies, you know, for those of us that live on borders of the county, we're nearby, you know, we may, we may use libraries within the system. But across the county border, I can tell you that my daughter regularly goes to a library that's not in the county, but our main library is our Gardiner Library, but we regularly go to another library as well. So, I don't think there's any, any harm in it because I don't think there's any additional fee related.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk, then Gavaris, then Haynes.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. Maybe Amber can help. Amber, do you, do you have offhand what the revised appropriation for the Library Association was? After we made the reductions in the spring, summer?

Chairwoman Archer: \$84,500?

Legislator Ronk: \$84,500. That was the reduced amount or the original amount.

Chairwoman Archer: No, that, that, no, the reduced amount was \$77,700?

Legislator Ronk: Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: Their original was \$84,500, sorry. Okay, Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Let Legislator Haynes go first.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislator Haynes: I, I really struggle with these. I really do. So, I know that we're on libraries right now. But I would like to change my prior vote. I want to vote yes to the Community Action.

I see that that was the same amount that they received last year. And I think that that's fair, I didn't have this, this screen up. I think the screen is really helpful. It's what they got last year as compared to what they're asking for this year. Because I really, you know, unfortunately, we did a lot of reductions to these programs last year, because of COVID. And I'm thinking moving forward, I, for most of them, there's still some I have certain issues with, but for most of them, I would like to stick with the same appropriation. So, nonetheless I'm going to, you got my, my change in my vote for Community Action, I will be changing my vote to a yes for that.

And I just say moving forward, I would really suggest that we keep the same appropriations as we did last year for them, with the reduction. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Okay. So, I think we're misunderstanding what I'm saying is, I'm talking about a philosophical view of doing things like this. Library, I 100% agree, this is a great service, we should be doing it. And when I say we, I mean, taxpayers should pay for this. But I think it needs to be done by the districts. Now, Legislator Bartels, you said that you go to another library other than the one that's closer to you. But that is that it's still in the school district that you are living in. So, then you're getting a benefit. My point exactly is if you do it by the school districts, if they collectively agree that they're going to chip into this program as the Association of Libraries, then it's coming, the, the number of people paying for this becomes more so the price per household is less, I think just to pay for, the county to pay for it. It's not spread as much apart. That's what I guess it's just a philosophical view of this whole thing, not just related to this. But in general, any of these things that we fund.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels and then Chairman Donaldson.

Legislator Walter: I just want you to know my hand has been up, Legislator Archer.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter, I'm sorry, I didn't see that. I apologize. Go ahead, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Okay, thank you. I just, for me, you know, we had this conversation of which, that the things that get funded by this should really be able to provide a service across the entire county; and I think, check. And I think this does that, absolutely. That it needs to be a, an organization that isn't reliant just on this funding; check. They, they, there's other funding that that keep it going, but that they really need this funding in order to do what they do and they do provide an important service, especially during a time of time of COVID. So I think it just sort of checks every single box for me of who I would want to fund.

And I would have to say that any the, you know, I respect the concept, the philosophical concept but like any of our programs, if someone is a runaway from Dutchess County who show up here, and they need help, Families Woodstock would help them and not necessarily throw them away because they're from Dutchess County. And, and it should be a service over in Dutchess County helping them. Like, I, I think that it's, it doesn't upset me if somebody gets some benefit of our library, I'm sure someone in Ulster County at some point went over to another county and utilized their library services perhaps, or up or down. So, I feel like it's a wash in the end. But it just, it represents the kinds of things we want to give this funding to in my mind, and so I'm very supportive of it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Bartels then Chair Donaldson.

Chairwoman Bartels: Yeah, I totally agree with Legislator Walter as it relates to the libraries. I'm, I'm with Legislator Gavaris. I'm a little, I'm confused about the school district issue because the libraries aren't currently funded by the school districts, right? There by library district, like, in my

town, it's a Library District. It's not an it's not a school district. And I don't know what you're saying because

Legislator Gavaris: They match. Their boundaries are the same as the school districts.

Legislator Bartels: No, in Gardiner, in Gardiner for example, Gardiner is funded by the Gardiner Library District. But Gardiner kids are either in New Paltz School District or the Wallkill School District. So, it doesn't go, but I can tell you that the card, it's a system card. So, you can take that card and go to a library that's in the system. But that isn't in the county, and you can take out a book and you can take out a movie and you can go to their programs. And that's you know, across, across the county lines, because your card is a system wide card.

So, I totally agree with Legislator Walter, this checks all the boxes for me, and particularly in time of COVID. This, what we are actually funding is incredibly needed because it, it allows for digital, digital access to movies and content. And again, since he's right here with a thumbs up, I'm going to thank Peter Criswell for turning me on to Canopy, which I use with my library card and I love, and my daughter loves. And, you know, pre-COVID, our library's about to shut down again on Saturday, but pre COVID there were weeks where I was in the library five days a week with my daughter. So, it's just, I feel like it's really, really worthwhile. And each of us has one of these in our community. So, I'm strongly in support.

Chairwoman Archer: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yes, I mean, this this method of funding the library's goes back to 2007, I believe it is. And the process was, you know, not to fund individual libraries, but to fund Association, which could and then, the individual libraries, even the very small libraries, who really benefits to smaller libraries that are a little better than the larger libraries. But it really benefits all of them because they all get access to this program. So, it was something that when you know, when it was done, it was, you know, actually an innovative way of funding libraries.

In fact, that before that there was a thing where, I believe it was Dan Alfonzo, and now I'm, I'm dating myself, but Dan Alfonzo was the chairman at the time. And one of these pushes was he wanted to get library funding on \$1 for every resident in Ulster County. And at that time, before we had that budget breakdown, where we had a 35% increase, followed by another 12% increase. We were funding libraries at about \$178,000 but they were given to individual libraries. Which was kind of problematic because they had their own taxing district. And some of them actually did not have a taxing district. And at that point, you know, they did voluntary-wise is the way they raised their money. Now, I believe they all are have a taxing districts.

If I if I'm correct, but those are all separate. They're not they do not follow any school district. I mean, the Kingston Library is within the City of Kingston. So, yes, that is part of the City of Kingston. You know, it's not part of the Kingston School District because it's totally separate. Although they may benefit from it, because I mean, I know when I've done tutoring, I would use a library as my spot. Because it made sense; I could meet there. So, I mean, as Legislator Bartels and Walter pointed out, this kind of checks the boxes because every, every resident of Ulster County. There are actually a couple that may not because of the problem with access. But in theory, they all get to use it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, on the Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: That's okay. I'm just going to be a very brief I'll be supporting this. I think the library has provided a, a really mutually beneficial service to the county. And I you know, it like Legislator Donaldson and others have said, if we, you know, if we asked each library to have this subscription service, it would be exponentially more expensive than the Association having them. I will say that my library and Wallkill doesn't benefit as much as others do, because it's a member of the Ramapo Catskill Library System and not the Ulster County Library Association. I believe Ellenville is in the same boat, but I could be wrong about that. No, okay. Legislator Gavaris is shaking his head no.

Chairwoman Archer: You know, Legislator Ronk, are we sure? Because I thought I saw on their header that it was one of the 21 libraries that is supported by this program.

Legislator Ronk: I again, I could be wrong. That could be newer, but I know that it's a member of the, of the Ramapo Catskill Library System.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah. Because in in the backup, it, it did have it listed unless I misread it. So

Legislator Ronk: It's one of the libraries so they may have access to that.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah, it did say Wallkill. So just FYI.

Okay. Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Because apparently, it's been totally lost as to what I've said since the beginning. I am in favor of this. I will be voting yes. I said, this is a philosophical view of this funding. That's all I am saying. So, the selling me on the expense is not a problem. I'm a yes. Take yes, for an answer, please.

Chairwoman Archer: Thanks for the clarification. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Okay. So moved. Thank you.

The next one is Amendment No. 14 – UPAC. Move? Someone move it, please.

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it

Chairwoman Archer: Tracey. Second? Legislator Gavaris.

Okay. Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, this appropriation has always concerned me a little bit. You know, I'll be voting no, based on the fact that I find it absolutely unbelievable that they have the same exact utility costs when they're shut down as they do when they're open. That was an, it, it was an asinine comment. I can't believe it was made. I don't know how that's possibly true. Without,

without stage lights alone, your utility costs are going to go down. I understand that you need to heat the building and you need to do other things. But there is absolutely positively no way their utility costs are the same when they're closed is when they're open.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Yes, thank you. I'm, I'm a strong no on this. And I too, was very offended. I think that by his comments that this is necessary expenses and he even referenced which I don't know if Legislator Bruno is on right now. I don't see him. But the gentleman had mentioned about we have to keep the HVAC running because of legionnaires and, and for a person who's been working in a facility that deals with that all the time. It's not there when your system is shut down. There is no concern over legionnaires and to Legislator Ronk's point, when systems aren't running, there's no expense to them. You can winterize a building if you know it's not going to be used. The Shadowland did it. They're not running air conditioning or heat over the wintertime. They drained the pipes they winterize the building and they just kept the office running that's it there's no reason why the expenses should be the same as they were for this past year. It's impossible.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: You know, I understand that this paying for the utilities was, you know, a give-and-get thing with, with UPAC. And I really appreciate them, with everything they do with the kids. My kids both went there to see the Nutcracker. And that's wonderful. But the point, the fact of the matter is, is that we're no longer doing that right now. But yet the appropriation that they're asking for is still exactly the same. I do not plan to support this because of that. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can we just get confirmation? What, what was their ask for, what did we fund last year? In this cycle.

Chairwoman Archer: \$25K, \$25K let's say.

Legislator Bartels: Before the, before the cuts?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: \$25K.

Chairwoman Archer: Before the cuts. \$24,750. Then we then we then we were going to reduce it but we ended up at \$24,750 is that correct?

Amber Feaster: \$12,375.

Chairwoman Archer: \$12,375. Okay, thank you.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All in favor of this amendment?

Walter, Bartels, Donaldson, and Archer.

Opposed. Gavaris, Haynes, Maio, Ronk.

Amendment 15 Arts Mid-Hudson. Can someone move it

Legislator Walter: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: for discussion?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Moved by Walter. Seconded by Donaldson. Any questions, conversation? Are we ready to just go ahead and vote? Okay. On Arts Mid-Hudson, putting them in at \$80K. Approve?

Legislator Bartels: Can I ask a question? I'm sorry. Can you just, because I can't I have all these screens open. Can you tell me what they asked for last year? What we what we approved, and then what we ended up funding after the amendments?

Chairwoman Archer: They asked for \$91,500 No, wait. Sorry. 2020 was \$96,750. And the contracted value was \$61,305.

Legislator Bartels: \$61,305.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, it was reduced.

Chairwoman Archer: Yep.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: This, this resolution would put him at the funding from the year before, \$80K.

Legislator Bartels: The year before you mean '19?

Chairwoman Archer: '19 was \$91,500? So, it's still under '19.

Amber Feaster: That's Soil & Water.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, you're right. Sorry. Where are they?

Amber Feaster: So, this was a \$90,000 2020 adopted budget. The contract for 2020 was \$60,000. And their request was for \$80,000.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: They, yeah, they reduced their request.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Yeah, I looked at the wrong line. Thank you. They're all blurring together at this juncture. Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Again, I, I see the value in this program, but I would only support it if it was at the same reduced amount as 2020. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Then it's just for clarification. Legislator Haynes, you're saying you would support it at \$60,000?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: You know, I too, am struggling, I'm struggling with these. Although I really do see the benefit. And I, you know, I'm concerned, again, that there'll be so much less money available for these kinds of projects and these kinds of initiatives, which are, you know, a huge part of our, of our county. So, I don't know, I'm curious what everyone else thinks about the potential of the lowered number.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: You know, and the other thing that, you know, we're moving into 2021, knowing that we're going into a pandemic. These organizations, although it might have been really difficult to fundraise, there have been other organizations that have been doing virtual fundraisers to help offset costs for their organizations. And this just, moving into 2021, it's really not unknown, it wasn't an unknown thing. So I, you know, I would have hoped that some of them would have found a mechanism in which to try to, you know, raise some funds on their own. And that's why I would, I would, I would definitely vote for a reduced amount.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: I'd like to add that this is economic development, as well. These are people's jobs, they support many artists. And this is how they are, you know, that that is a viable job to have in our county that we appreciate. And so, I really, again, it checks the boxes for me and that it reaches the wide county. It fills a niche that we need. But, you know, it's not the full support for these artists. But it helps many of the artists get through. And especially in the time of COVID, I feel like it's, again, it's necessary to recognize this is somewhat different than UPAC for me. I mean, I supported that as well. But again, many people are, are supported in their work through this funding as artists. And I think it's really, really important that we maintain their amount.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Legislator Criswell wanted to speak.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, I did. I just wanted to get members first. I did see him. Legislator Ronk then Criswell.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I'll make, I'll you know, I'll put them, put them a option on the table. I make a motion that we amend the amendment. That would go to the floor to be \$60,000 instead of \$80,000.

Chairwoman Archer: And Legislator Haynes, you'll second that? Why don't we give Legislator Criswell an opportunity to speak before we vote on that? Thank you.

Legislator Criswell: Just, just really briefly, I wanted to piggyback off what Legislator Walter was saying that these are mostly individual artists. So, they're actually not the money's not going to nonprofit organizations, that, who can raise funds, these individual artists actually don't have the opportunity to go and do fundraising in that same way. So, it really is supporting individuals and, and helping them stay alive during this pandemic. So, I strongly suggest supporting it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Ronk, then Chairman Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. Through the Chair to Legislator Criswell. In past years, portions of this funding have gone for administration to Arts Mid-Hudson, is that not the case now?

Chairwoman Archer: No, it still does.

Legislator Criswell: It still does. I'm just saying it also supports a lot of individual artists.

Legislator Ronk: Understand.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah this is, like the libraries, this was done back in 2007. It began the process, because what was happening is the way we were funding the artists, it really wasn't fair. In a sense. It was who you knew, is basically who got the money. In this case, it's done by a panel. So, yes, the, there is a significant administrative costs, because what they do is they actually are many artists. Putting the artists together to actually work on, to make even a better piece of work, shall we say, sometimes. They actually put, they, they coordinate various efforts in fundraising for other art groups. So, they do, do that. It's kind of difficult to do right now. Like they assisted the Midtown Art District in one point and helping them in a fundraising effort just by being there. You know, they weren't and then they've done that in Ellenville. They've done it in Saugerties, they've done it various places now, artists actually work more comprehensively together. And they often fund, you know, seed money, like somebody brought up the, the Festival of the Voice that was that was actually funded by a grant of, I think \$2,000 or \$3,000. And they got, and now of course, because of COVID, it's not doing well, but it brought like 20,000 people up into the mountains, the Festival of the Voice at one point. So, that's part of what they do. We, we kind of get them to try to give seed money more than unnecessarily constantly re-supporting the same people. So, it does to check the boxes because it does work all over the county.

Chairwoman Archer: So we have an amendment to amend the amount to \$60,000. All in favor of the amendment?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Okay. The amendment fails. On the amended amount on the amendment.

Amber Feaster: I'm sorry, can I, can I hear those votes again. I only saw three opposed.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, that's correct. Three opposed: Haynes, Maio, Ronk.

Amber Feaster: So the amendment passes?

Chairwoman Archer: Gavaris, Gavaris you're opposing the amendment? Sorry, the amendment

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Do that vote over again for the amendment.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. On the amended amount \$60,000. All in favor of that amount?

Group: Aye

Chairwoman Archer: Three, as you have it now? Haynes, Ronk, Maio.

Okay, on the on the actual amendment at \$80K. All in favor?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: My concern is the, I would look at it if the, the whole thing is going to go down for the \$80K. I would vote for the amendment if I would rather see that happening than not.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Okay, Can I ask through the Chair to the Legislators who voted for the \$60,000, would they consider doing something less of like \$50K but putting money into contingency set aside for this? Because I'm concerned about 2021. I think that number one there is federal money being given to people, and artists are now getting that where they didn't get it before, and that separate of the Endowment for the Arts. These, there's additional money that's being given. So, there's other funds out there for them. I think that there's other things like Woodstock, Family of Woodstock, there's other programs that I think are going to have a greater need in 2021 than this. And even at \$60,000, I'm still thinking that's high. I got to be honest.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'd like to, I'd like to change my vote to accept the amendment at \$60K.

Legislator Ronk: I would like to answer Legislator Gavaris' question first, if I could.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead.

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, I would support something lower than \$60K, Legislator Gavaris, and putting the rest into contingency. You know, \$60,000 to me, you know, in my discussions with some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, would be a good compromise, because it's what they got last year. You know, I've, I've always had concern about this contract with Arts Mid-Hudson. But when you've got Legislators putting in, you know, salary decreases for our own employees, I, I can't justify giving \$80,000 to Arts Mid-Hudson. I, I totally tend to agree with where you're coming from on it. So, you know, I, you know, I would I would consider that, if that was, if that was going to be supported.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: I wasn't suggesting we do the full \$80,000 I was saying \$50K, \$50K in the budget, \$10K in contingency.

Legislator Ronk: Agreed.

Legislator Gavaris: Okay. All right.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: But anyway I changed my vote.

Chairwoman Archer: Chair Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I changed my vote to accept the \$60,000 amendment.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so

Legislator Bartels: I change my vote, to accept the amendment too.

Chairwoman Archer: So, on the amendment to \$60K. Can we get a recount here? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Legislator Ronk: I'm still in favor of the \$60K.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, we have everyone in favor of the 60 except for Legislator Gavaris. Correct? Thank you. So, \$60K it is. Alrighty. The next amendment

Amber Feaster: So, now vote to approve the amended vote?

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, sorry. On the, on the amended amendment, amended amendment amount.

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor. Thank you. Everyone is yes. Okay. Thank you.

Next we have amendment 17, or 16 - Ulster County Soil and Water Conservation District.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second? Okay.

Chairman Donaldson: Seconded.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson. Any questions? Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? So moved unanimously.

The next one is Amendment 17 - Cornell Cooperative Extension. Move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson. Any questions? All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Unanimous. Moved.

Next, we have amendment 18 - Awareness. Move?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second? I'll second it for discussion.

Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I just wanted to ask if someone could run, run the numbers by us. What, what was asked for last year, what was approved in the budget, and what we amended it to?

Amber Feaster: The 2020 budget was \$12,500. The contract was \$6,250. And the request was for \$20,000.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I mean, you know, my concern with this organization is well documented over the years. I've, I've shown up in a couple of documents that the proprietor has put together, I believe, mischaracterizing things that have gone on in the past, between myself and the organization when I was chair. You know, but I've always found, my biggest concern has always been that I've always found their accounting to be, curious, of, of expenses that were being billed to the county.

This is another organization kind of like UPAC where I, I wonder how the expenses are possibly the same amount in a pandemic world as they are pre-pandemic. You know, you know, Zoom accounts are not, not that expensive. I think that's where a lot of these group things are happening. I don't know if she's delivering pizzas to the individual houses of the of the peer, you know, counselors, and, and, and peer-to-peer folks, but you know, a lot of the money was in travel and, and pizza and

whatnot. You know, I just I can't I can't support it without a detailed accounting of, of how this would be spent.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: I do not intend to support this and there is not even an amendment that would convince them to support this. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels then Chairman Donaldson.

Legislator Bartels: Do we have, has the contract, the contract been executed for 2020? And do we have an accounting of where that what they would have spent on?

Natalie Kelder: It has not been executed at this time.

Chairwoman Archer: Is this the only one outstanding?

Natalie Kelder: No, they're all outstanding at this time.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right, they're all outstanding because we're having a bit of a feud as to who signs the paper. In the past that paper was always signed by the Chairman of the Legislature. Well, the County Attorney's claiming that they had to be signed by the Executive, which, of course, our attorney's argument is that you, do not have to be signed by the Executive because they are contracts that the Legislature are entering into. So, we're having a little problem with that.

So, but, but the problem is, is some of these nonprofits are really needing the money and they're not getting it, and they're struggling. And so, I'm getting a little aggravated with the thing, and I've had some conversations with Clint about it, but I'm not sure where we're going to go with this. But we're going have to get them, you know, they're going to have to be executed.

Now, having said that, for this particular one, I mean, I, you know, some of these I put in, like the Soil and Water. I put that in, because I knew that the process had to be followed. And it wasn't necessarily something that you know, was my bailiwick, shall we say on that one. And in this particular one, I put this in, because I know some legislators will, you know, would want wanted it. So, I put it in so you can have the discussion. I'm not going to sit here and make an argument for it.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can I just, and just, so, I, I understand, that there's a problem with actually executing the contract. But have, has this organization provided the backup for a contract to be executed at this point? It's just being held in contract management? Or is it, have they not yet provided all the backup?

Natalie Kelder: So, they don't have to provide the backup until it's time to pay the invoice. And since the contract hasn't

Legislator Bartels: Oh yeah, right.

Natalie Kelder: been executed, there's no invoice to try to pay. So, they've provided everything to execute the contract. We just haven't gotten to the next piece.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter. Thank you, Natalie.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, and, you know, I'm, I'm all for prevention. And I'm for peer-to-peer support, I kind of have to agree with what some of the other people have been saying at, at this time. And I'm back to my box-ticking. You know, this isn't something that's broad across the whole county. When I look at what they want the funding for, which is materials and pizza. You know, we're in a pandemic. The schools are closing again. It's, It's one thing to take away funding that really gets in their way of, of continuing services, but if it's funding for services, they can't really provide any way, or are very limited. I, I, I think I agree that this, you know, perhaps in future years, but at, at this point, if anything was to get cut, this would probably be something I would support.

Chairwoman Archer: So, why don't I,, we get to vote. A vote in favor of this amendment? All in favor?

Legislator Bartels: I'm not ready to vote.

Legislator Ronk: Legislator Bartels has a question.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, you have a question?

Legislator Bartels: Waving wildly, sorry. Yeah, I'm struggling with this, with this one as well. But I can say that if I was going to support it, I definitely would want to see it at the previous level, at the, at the amended level.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other comments before we take the vote? Okay, so on this amendment? I'm sorry, go ahead.

Legislator Bartels: I am going to make a motion. I don't know if anyone would be supportive of an amendment to amend it to the 2020 level, which if I followed that right, was \$6,250. Is that right? Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes.

Legislator Bartels: So, I've made that motion.

Chairwoman Archer: Is there a second on? There's no second.

Okay, on, on the amendment as it currently stands, All in favor?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll be yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, one. Yes.

Opposed?

Okay, the remainder are

Legislator Bartels: I can't support it at this level.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All right. The next is Dispute Resolution Center, Amendment 19. A motion to move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Seconded by Chair Donaldson. Any, any conversation? Any questions?

Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah. Yes, this is, well, it since the CASA program that Dispute Resolution runs for the County at this point. And if anybody needs to know anything about that, I can explain it, but I don't think I need to. It's been a program that's been around quite a while and it used to be a standalone. So, we actually funded this at higher levels in the past, but due to Dispute Resolution taking it over, they use their administration in order to carry out the Court Appointed Special Advocates. So, it is a program that is used by the various Family Court Judges. It's a protective program for children that are, get in the system.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other questions? Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can, can Amber or Natalie just provide the numbers again from last year, please?

Chairwoman Archer: Last year

Amber Feaster: The budget for 2020 was \$39,750. The 2020 contract value was \$26,500. And their request was for \$26,500.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. On the amendment, all in favor?

Opposed?

Legislator Gavaris, are you opposed? Oh, you're, you're for it. Thank you. So, we had no opposition. Legislator Ronk wasn't in the room.

Okay. The next is Amendment 20 - Supervised Visitation. Family of Woodstock. Move for discussion?

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it, Bartels.

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Any questions? Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: First Amber, can you do the same thing? Run the 2020 numbers? I'm sorry, I have too many screens open.

Amber Feaster: The 2020 appropriation was \$30,000. The 2020 contract was \$20,000. And the request was for \$30,000.

Legislator Bartels: Can I make a comment?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, please.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you. So, I'm, I think that this is, it appears to be an important program. Despite the fact that it is not mandated. I would like to support it in some fashion moving forward into 2021 but I, I really think we need to have a sit down with Michael Berg and members of county government to understand, to really get a better, better handle on this. I had a very long conversation with Mike Iapocce now, it's months ago. But I, frankly, feel we need more clarity on this moving forward.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I don't know if there's, I think there's a little mixed up because it is I believe it's mandated; it has to be done. But it not mandated that Woodstock does it? It's got to be done by somebody.

Legislator Ronk: Can I, can I just speak to that?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk then Haynes.

Legislator Ronk: I, I believe that supervised visits are required to be done. But you know, the county is not required to pay for the supervised visits, the parents are required to pay for the supervised visits. The county has in the past, paid for the, you know, supervised visits of some folks, through Family of Woodstock, that, you know, either can't come to an agreement between the, you know, custodial and non-custodial parents, or that don't have the means to pay for a third party when you can't come to an agreement. So, I, I think that's the confusion, the mandated versus non mandated, is that the county is not mandated to pay for the services, the services is mandated to be provided, if there is to be a visit.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: Yeah, that is absolutely correct in what Legislator Ronk did say. I mean, it could be provided for by a mental health professional. You know, once the judge determines that there should be supervised visitation, but it is not incumbent on the government to provide that service. However, I would have to say that this is important and I would not want to see us just pull the rug out from under this. However, I would like to support a reduction. I'd like to see if we could do an amendment to the previous year's amount of \$20,000.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Well, there's an amendment on the, on the floor first.

Chairwoman Archer: Somebody want a second that amendment?

Legislator Bartels: Was that, that was a motion Legislator Haynes?

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, yes, and Mary Beth Maio seconded for discussion. before we vote.
Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yes, it's, it's not exactly on the amendment but on, on the subject, whether it has the amendment or not. I, you know, I wholly agree with Legislator Haynes, that was my thinking this morning, the, the pulling the rug out from under them. That's exactly, I thought. I do think we need to do some more research and we need to understand this better. But until we do, I don't want to stop the program.

I'd also in our, in our research, and in our further investigation, I think we should look to other counties and see what other counties do just, again, can learn a lot from our neighbors.

And it may be in the end that this is the, this is the best way to administer the program. And that we think it's worthy at whatever level we end up funding moving forward. But, but I do, I do want to get a better handle on this. I want to know what our neighbors do. etc. So, I'm, I'm, I am willing to support it today. But I don't want the conversation to stop today.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, yeah, I mean, there's, there's going to be some understanding, it is required to do. We may not be required to pay for it. But, but when we bring up the idea that maybe a mental health, sometimes the court may order that it may be done and they would be a mental health specialist that does it. Well, in that case, we're, and if it cannot be paid by them, people, those people, it will be paid by the county. So, in some ways it will be paid by the county and if could not if they did not have the money to do it themselves.

So I mean, I agree with Legislator Bartels, we should probably look at this and other ways to see our other counties do this. You know, so in fact, I, I brought up the idea that they should be put into the County Executive's Budget. But the problem is Burt was unsure where it would go because it wouldn't fall into Social Services. He said, because of the way it's set up.

So, I really would hate could see some someone not being able to see the non-custodial parent. Because there's no one doing it for us. And I have a feeling, to be honest. I mean, in the end, I think we would probably end up paying more because I believe it would still have to be done in some way or form. It's ordered by the court. It's ordered by the court. It's going to be done.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Walter then Bartels.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I mean, I, I just wanted to say that I, I feel like this is a service that no one else really provides. It's very important. We, we contract out with many of these different agencies because we don't provide, and aren't able to provide these services. And I'd be very hesitant to make any kinds of reductions in, in something like this, that has a high importance.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, one thing to also remember, and unless this has been mentioned already, is that you know, Family of Woodstock could still fundraise for these services. Family of Woodstock, I don't believe, has said that they're going to cease the services if this is not passed. I believe that his exact words were that they would try to fundraise for it. You know, again, you know, it's not a service that we're providing. It's a service that family Woodstock is providing that we are paying for.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so we have an amendment on, on the table for a, to amend this amendment to \$20,000. All in favor of amending this amendment to \$20,000.

Chairwoman Archer: We have Gavaris, Haynes, Maio Ronk.

Okay. Opposed? The amendment at \$20,000 passes.

So, on the amended amount?

Legislator Ronk: It fails Legislator Archer.

Chairwoman Archer: We had 1-2-3-4.

Legislator Ronk: 4-4

Chairwoman Archer: I didn't count myself. Sorry.

Legislator Ronk: It's okay.

Chairwoman Archer: It's a, it's been a long week and it just started.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I do understand the need for, you know, with some of this, but I think the \$20K may be a little low. I mean, I would go with a \$25K if those people would support that aspect of it. Because I think they're still going to be spending probably, they'll probably end up spending more like \$25K this year instead of the \$30K. So, if anybody wants to go to the \$25, I'd be willing to do that one.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks, I'd be more inclined to stay at the \$20K. And then, you know, what

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: But the \$20K didn't pass.

Legislator Ronk: you know, see if Family could fundraise the other \$5K.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can I, we're back to this the previous situation in, in the event that it stays at \$30K? Would those who wanted the amendment no longer support this? Can I just ask through the Chair?

Legislator Ronk: I, I won't support it at \$30K.

Legislator Haynes: I don't want to see it go away. So that's difficult for me.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Legislator Haynes, would you do \$25K?

Legislator Haynes: Yes.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: All right.

Legislator Gavaris: I would do \$25K.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll make a motion to change it to \$25K.

Legislator Gavaris: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Second? All in favor of the amended amount to \$25K.

Opposed? Legislator Ronk. The only opposition.

On the amended amount of \$25,000.

Legislator Walter: My hand was up for opposed.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't see that.

Legislator Walter: For opposing reasons. But opposed.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I missed that. So, we have two; Legislators Ronk and Walter.

On the amended. Okay, on the amended amount of \$25K. All in favor?

Opposed? Legislator Ronk. The only opposition. Thank you.

The next is Amendment No. 21 - People's Place. Move?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Bartels: I'll second it, Bartels.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I just want to reiterate my, you know, my continuing opposition to funding the People's Place out of the county coffers. You know, I can tell you that there's multiple, you know, food pantries in many of the towns in the county, including in my town, and my hamlet of Shawangunk, you know, Town of Shawangunk, Hamlet of Wallkill, including the Loaves and Fishes Food Pantry, which tomorrow is going to be giving out 225 Thanksgiving baskets, which is about 100 more than last year. So, that means that there's 100 more needy families in need of a Thanksgiving basket than there was last year. And they're not receiving a dime of county funds.

I would be comfortable if we were giving \$10,000 to the Food Bank of the Hudson Valley, which distributes food to all the food pantries in Ulster County. But you know, we're just singling out one here. And to me, it's where you know, it's when you start picking favorites with organizations like this, that you really start to have problems. Because, you know, I mean, again, I said this during last year's budget, maybe it makes me a bad legislator that I'm not bringing forward, you know, \$10,000 or \$5,000 for the Loaves and Fishes Food Pantry, you know, but I just that's not how I see the county budget. You know, it's, you know, you, I think you can support things like, you know, the Food Bank of the Hudson Valley, like I say, which supports all of them. You can support the Library Association, which supports all of them. I just, you know, when you pick one organization like this, even though it does more than the City of Kingston, I understand that, you know, many legislators have brought that up, but it's the Kingston central area that this more than anything supports. You know, again, you know, I know that there's multiple food pantries in many towns across Ulster County that aren't receiving any funds as part of this, and they're seeing the same increases in need as the People's Place is.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: As a, I certainly understand that in fact, this original amendment was not put in by anybody from the City of Kingston. It was actually put in from somebody outside of Kingston. And just as a point of information, today, yesterday, and today, they handed out 1,300 turkey dinners, turkey, in other words things for them to make their turkey dinners at home. 1,300 of them. They came from all over the county to come get them from the People's Place. I just wanted to, you know, put it in perspective on what they're doing and what they're using the money for. It's not 140 or 120, 1,300.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes then Bartels.

Legislator Haynes: Again, I, I, I'm fairly certain I'll only support this at the amount that they received last year which was \$5,000. So, I will make that amendment to, to reduce the amendment to a total of \$5000 from \$10,000.

Chairwoman Archer: Is there a second on that motion?

Legislator Ronk: I'll second the amendment I'll support the amendment but I don't plan to support the, the amendment as a whole.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can Amber give, so, last year, did they ask for \$10,000 last year and got \$5K? Or what, what was the

Amber Feaster: The 2020 budget was \$10,000. The contract value for 2020 is \$5,000. And the request is for \$10,000.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other questions? On the motion to amend?

Legislator Ronk: Legislator Walter has her hand up.

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry? Legislator Walter. Sorry.

Legislator Walter: You know, I feel like I'm going to sound a bit hypocritical. Typically, I would completely agree with Legislator Ronk's point, because this is very focused in Kingston. And I guess the only thing I want to add to that, though, is that the density of people in need, I would assume are in Kingston. Not to say there are not people in need across our entire county, but in terms of density and heads, like the number of people. I would imagine that the highest number of people who need this service happen to be located in Kingston. And you will hear, like, typically, I'm not advocating for things that are Kingston centric. But I just wonder, just to put that out there as a consideration, again, not percentage of people in poverty because I know Ellenville is higher, but that number of people who might need the service, I just want us to consider that possibility.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Cahill.

Legislator Cahill: Thank you. And are you, are you still speaking on the amendment? Because I'll wait till the resolution, if you're still speaking on the amendment, because I'd like to speak on the resolution itself.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead. You can, we haven't, we haven't voted on the amendment yet, so just go ahead.

Chairman Cahill: Okay. So, so, when we were going through the budget appeals, People's Place came to the budget appeals, and the question was asked of them, what specific program would the money be used for? And I think the director said, well, they weren't sure. They were just throwing it in the general fund. And I think that's counter to what the whole idea of what we make other organizations go through and tell them exactly what are you going to be using this money for? My recollection is, is that we'd never got that answer from the People's Place as a legislature during the budget appeals wondering if you guys did get that.

Chairwoman Archer: Natalie, you've got the back up there.

Natalie Kelder: I asked the question after our meeting, and I never heard a response.

Chairman Cahill: Right. So

Legislator Walter: I think, its written, it's, it's in the request for funding.

Chairwoman Archer: I thought it was in the actual document.

Legislator Walter: It is, it is \$18,831 for housing assistance, and \$9,919 is program support. So, that part is general, yes. But the other one, and it lists rent assistance.

Legislator Cahill: So, it was in there, the director just wasn't able to articulate the request fairly. Is, is that accurate?

Legislator Walter: Almost \$10,000 of it is program support. So, that's general.

Legislator Cahill: Yeah. So, my, my, my suggestion is that, you know, I'm not saying don't give to, you know, People's Place, they do wonderful work there. And I know that they do, you know, certainly service people from a lot more than just Kingston and, you know, a handful of the towns around Kingston. But I, I just think that if we're going to hold every organization to a standard to tell us exactly how they're going to spend that money that should be equal across all the requests, and, and not allow one organization be generalized, as opposed to the rest. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I, I agree with Legislator Cahill and I and I recall that that being an issue in the last budget cycle as well. And when I spoke with our consultants, they said that, you know, the contract that we, we would be writing the contract to be a specific service. There would be for us because we're the ones writing the contract, correct? Natalie's nodding. So is Amber. But I have, I share those concerns.

I also, I struggle with this one because I, I share Legislator Ronk concerns. You know, in, in general, I don't like to see an organization that's specific to one area, particularly when there are multiple organizations across the county that do similar, similar work. And that's not to take away from the magnitude of the work that the People's Place does. And like Legislator Ronk, I haven't, you know, in all the years I've been here, I haven't brought forward anything, support, you know, for, that's my district centric, I haven't, I haven't brought an amendment asking for something for my district. In part, because it makes it to me, it makes it feel like member's items. But this this year, and this time, with this resolution in front of us, and the need being so great. I have a hard time, I have a hard time saying no. So, I, I don't know I'm struggling. I'm struggling with this one as well.

Chairwoman Archer: We just, we just had a point of clarification from Natalie, that the 2020 contract was very specific to food programs. Correct, Natalie?

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I think that's what we had asked for it to be.

Chairwoman Archer: Right?

Natalie Kelder: In the meeting last year. That is what you specifically asked for.

Legislator Bartels: We could direct it again this year, then.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I know, I get a little confused. When Legislator Walters was talking about the program. I think she was mixing them up with Community Action, on their, their request. In this case, here, again, I have to, you know, reiterate some of the ones I'd say Walters pointed out is the concentration of need. You know, the Kingston area is a very diverse area, you know. Now, there's a lot of people that economic, economically deprived, in many ways. You know, there's a race issue thrown in there. There's all kinds of things you get thrown in this particular spot, and what they do, and the programs that they push. And as I pointed out, 1,300, turkey, you know, things for turkey dinners was passed out in the past couple days, and they're continuing tomorrow. They bring him from all over. And they also do a number of other programs helping out, you know, people in need.

And I, I certainly understand and I think we should probably take a look at all the pantries and how they work. The reason this one is put forth is because of the, the number. It's a very large number, it's, you know, ending you know, it's you're not going to see this probably combined in all the rest of the county because they're great into concentration in this area. And they're actually, in some cases, some people actually coming on a bus to go to People's Place. So, it is something that is a little different and I certainly understand why people would feel a little apprehensive now because it's sort of Kingston centered. You know it's the population center.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, we have Legislator Gavaris then Ronk.

Legislator Gavaris: Thank you. So, to answer Chairman Donaldson point there. While there may be a significant amount of people in the City of Kingston, and I think Legislator Walter mentioned it before, my area is, is far more impoverished than the City of Kingston percentage wise. But none of the places in, in my district are asking for money either. Aroma Thyme has been doing an annual Thanksgiving meals for people, they serve almost 1,000 meals, no taxpayer money at all, completely done on donations. There's a food bank in Ellenville through one of the churches, again, never a dime of anybody's money. It's just donations. They run that weekly. And there's a soup kitchen run weekly through actually, Reverend Collins's church. Again, all done through donations, no taxpayer money. If we're going to do something, it's got to be for all, not just one location.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you. The 225 that I mentioned, Legislator Donaldson, you know, just in your comment about the 1,300 is just for the Loaves and Fishes Food Pantry, which is one of three food pantries that serve the Town of Shawangunk alone. As Legislator Gavaris said, there are several in, you know, Ellenville and Wawarsing. And, you know, there's two, at least two in the town of Lloyd, and there's some in New Paltz, and there's some, all over the county. So, I would, I would venture to say that, you know, from, from a Thanksgiving, you know, basket perspective, you know, the ones in the town of Shawangunk might come close to equaling what the, what the People's Place has been giving out. I think that if you added them all up around the county, it'd be in the thousands, not, not just less than, than the 1,300, you know, a number that you had mentioned. You know, like Legislator Gavaris said, you know, all these other food pantries are, you know, you know, they're raising funds for these things. They're getting donations, some of them, you know, my father is a pastor, you know, in Grahamsville in Sullivan County, just over the county border, you know, they're doing a reverse advent calendar, where you bring in a certain number of food items, you

know, each of the days in December to restock the food pantry after Thanksgiving. You know, there's a there's a lot of need across the county, I just have a concern about, you know, focusing our county dollars on this particular need in this particular place.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter and then Legislator Litts.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, thank you. So, yes, I see now, and it was very vague, but unfortunately, the backup for People's Place is the backup for Community Action. So, do we have the actual request for funding for people place? Because it was it's, it's labeled wrong.

Natalie Kelder: I can email that out to everybody right now.

Legislator Walter: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Litts.

Legislator Litts: Well, if we were based the dollar value going out on the poverty level, then Plattekill should get it all.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Just as a point of information, they do a great deal of fundraising. In fact, the 1,100 of those turkeys were donated by Diamond Mills out of Saugerties. Because there are people from Saugerties that go into the People's Place. So, I mean, I put it in because it was in from the year before. And I do know that what they do is pretty massive for the area. So, and I understand why people are reluctant to put into one area, and maybe we should start looking at another formula. I mean, I still support this in People's Place because the, just the mere numbers that they do serve.

Chairwoman Archer: So, right now we have an amendment on the table to reduce it to last year's funding. All in favor of reducing to last year's funding.

Okay. We have Maio, yes, Tracy Bartels, Heidi Haynes, Eve Walter and myself.

Opposed. Gavaris, Ronk, and Chairman Donaldson.

Okay, the amendment to \$5,000 passes. Let's all those in favor of the amended amount to \$5,000.

Opposed? Legislator Ronk and Gavaris. Thank you.

Next we have amendment 22 - Sawkill Fire Company. Take a motion to move it. Do we have a motion to move this?

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it for discussion.

Legislator Walter: I'll second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Second, thank you.

Legislator Cahill: I'll just, if you don't mind.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead.

Legislator Cahill: I, I, I'm still recovering from the bruises in the first meeting on this one, so, I'm okay with what we do here. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Any comments? Okay. All, all in favor of this amendment?

Opposed? Unanimous. Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: The next one, Budget Amendment No. 23 is Domestic Violence.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Seconded.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. You know, a question to Commissioner Gulnick, is he still on?

Commissioner Gulnick: I am.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, he is

Legislator Ronk: You know, it was relayed to me by the County Executive's Office that this funding for this program is in the budget, it would just take us extending the contract. Is that correct?

Commissioner Gulnick: I don't believe this is the amendment, Ken.

Legislator Ronk: Oh, sorry. My fault.

Chairwoman Archer: It's the next one.

Commissioner Gulnick: It's number 25.

Legislator Ronk: Understood. I thought it was both of them. Nevermind.

Chairwoman Archer: 24, 25. Okay, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I, I do believe that this is an important service to be provided. I'll be supporting this amendment. But I sincerely hope that when it comes to the floor, we can find another place to take it from.

Legislator Walter: My hand's up.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. Just want to point out to all of the other legislators that the Executive identified a different source. And so, that is, if you see the backup, it's now from Real Property Tax no longer from Tech City. So, I just want to make sure you all saw that. Again, the Executive's Office identified a, a source that they agreed to talk to Legislator Criswell about and he felt comfortable with.

Legislator Ronk: Sorry, I was looking at an old, an old amendment, so.

Commissioner Gulnick: Sorry to interrupt. It, it wasn't Real Property Tax. It is actually Auction Revenue, because we're going to have more parcels next year.

Legislator Walter: Okay, it says that.

Chairwoman Archer: We can make that change.

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah. It's just the category. Sorry.

Legislator Ronk: It says other real property tax items.

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah. Yeah.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah. Okay.

Legislator Walter: One more and that, that the two family, this one and the next amendment, just to say that that change.

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah. Correct. I was more concerned with the, the expense of the offset at the, the 101 Enterprise Drive in terms of the gas and electric there.

Chairwoman Archer: And do we have a projection on revenue for the auction?

Commissioner Gulnick: Lynn, I really won't have that until I know how many parcels will be in the auction, but I know I'm carrying all of this year in the next.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. So, your expectation is it'll be greater?

Commissioner Gulnick: Yeah.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. And is that revenue earmarked for anything else?

Commissioner Gulnick: It's just offset any general fund expenses per se.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. Any other questions? Okay, on this amendment, all in favor?

Opposed? Moved anonymously.

The next one is number 24 - Family Violence Option.

Ken Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Walter: I'll second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you, Chairman.

Okay, any other comments on this one? Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? Moved unanimously.

The next one is Budget Amendment 25. This is a Family Assistance. Move?

Legislator Walter: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Second it.

Legislator Bartels: Second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. So, yes, echoing what Legislator Ronk spoke about earlier for the other ones. So the Executive's Office identified that the funding for these programs were included in the DSS budget. We had our finance people investigate it to confirm that this is true and valid. And they did identify that it was true and valid that it is present in the DSS budget. I'm, I'm still not sure why then, you know, these, these programs were told they were cut by 50%.

So, what's going to have to happen is when the resolution comes in front of us, I know for myself and Peter, we will ensure that the full amount that we're asking for here is in that resolution when they go to contract. Unfortunately, because it is in the, it's in the DSS budget, but not so specifically, but it's there. We can't put in an amendment because it's already in the budget. But that said, we are going to watch this and it is our expectation to, again, when the contract comes in front of us, to ensure that the full amount that we're proposing here is what's going to be funded.

Chairwoman Archer: So

Legislator Walter: I wish there was another way to do this. I just want to say that I'm very uncomfortable with the idea that these, this agency has to just trust that we're going to do the right

thing. I have the commitment from Marc Rider. That this money is there and that we have, we will definitely have that capacity to ensure that they are fully 100% funded. It, it puts them in a very terrible position of having to just trust that it'll all go fine. I, I, I am sorry that it even had to come to this kind of circumstance where they're told they're being 50% cut. But unfortunately, I'm, I'm being told even by our counsel that there's, there's just, we cannot put an amendment in essence confirming that that money is available in the book.

Chairwoman Archer: So, Legislator Walter, do you have that in writing? Or was it a conversation?

Legislator Walter: So, I have a very brief message from Marc Rider saying that if we wanted to fund this in full, the money is available in DSS.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so

Legislator Walter: That's pretty much verbatim of what I have, I was hoping he'd be here today so that I can specifically ask I don't know if Burt wants to state it.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well Burt can answer that.

Commissioner Gulnick: The, the funding is in the expense line, the contracts within that were reduced because they are kind of a point of service contract. So, you know, DSS was going to see where those contracts stood. They would have to come to you to amend those contracts if the spending didn't escalate. But the funding is in the budget for those contracts.

Legislator Walter: But just to be clear, Burt, the contract has to come to us even initially, is that true?

Commissioner Gulnick: I you know, you're probably right, because I'd have to see when the expiration date was on the original contract.

Legislator Walter: That's, that's, that's what I'm trusting, you know, is that this, this contract has to come to us from the very beginning. So that, so that we can immediately add in the full amount, because I'm not comfortable. If it's if that's not true, and it's going to go in one way or another, then I'm going to just push this amendment anyway.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead.

Commissioner Gulnick: Understand, I will say too, Eve, in terms of the, the amendment that is in front of you. I did check with DSS. They are capped on this program when it comes to Federal Aid.

Chairwoman Archer: So current contract expires 12/31 of this year.

Commissioner Gulnick: And that I wasn't sure. But in terms of the amendment that you do have, the Family Assistance Program, as a federal flexible funding program, that is capped. So, even if you were to pursue this amendment, I would recommend you'd have to use a different revenue.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Criswell.

Legislator Criswell: So, I'm, I'm confused, I'm hearing that the money is in the budget. So, why are we not fully funding this? I just simply don't understand it. So if somebody could clearly explain that to me, I'd appreciate it.

Chairwoman Archer: Commissioner Gulnick.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think it's clear as mud, Peter.

Commissioner Gulnick: I, I will try to say that DSS reduced the contracts, because the services of those contracts are on an as-needed-basis. So, they didn't feel as you know, with COVID, that they would need the entire service.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter then Ronk.

Legislator Walter: I will add that even if it was fully funded, it's still on as-needed-basis, and that only if they requested the services, would they be reimbursed. So, there's no reason in my mind to not provide the full amount. It, that doesn't change it being-as-needed. That's just how these contracts are. And so, what it does do is it puts, it creates an insecurity for this program, where they'll potentially let people off and, and, and because they are not sure how this is all going to go down. So, I mean, I need, I would really want confirmation that this is coming. If I can't make this amendment now that this comes before us, this contract, when it gets reinstated after December 31st, which should be very soon after, that, that way, Legislator Criswell and I have the opportunity to make sure that the full amount is in that contract. Again, it's a fee for service. So that's, nothing changes.

Chairwoman Archer: I think the important thing to remember, as well, is that they are staffing to fulfill the needs of this program. If they are not going to, if their funding is being cut in half, they cannot maintain their current staffing levels. And if you let those people go and then down the road, we realize we need that we don't have the resources to cover it. So, it is a little disconcerting to be going out there and cutting a program and yet telling us that we have all the funding there. So, it is a bit confusing, Burt.

Commissioner Gulnick: That I am not arguing with.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah. Well, I'm happy to hear that. Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk: Thanks, you know, to the, to, to, to Legislator Criswell's, you know, comment about it being fully funded, but the you know, contracts being cut. You know, in the end, you know, if, if our, you know, our financial analysts have confirmed that the money is in the in the DSS budget, you know, the Legislature by resolution can enter into contract with the organization to fully fund the services. So, if 16 legislators say that this is a valid service and needs to move forward, you know, at the current level, we have the ability to do that.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I still see this is clear as mud. It doesn't quite give me any information that makes sense here. I mean, it's in the it's in the budget; it's not in the budget. We can fund it; well, we can't fund it. I'm, I'm, I'm pretty confused with this whole thing. I know, I was

originally confused when it was first put in, because they were advised they were being cut 50%. And then when I inquired about it, they said, no, they weren't being cut 50% it was still in there, but they may only give them 50% of the money, because that may be only what they're using.

So, it really it makes it kind of confusing to me. I mean, I would I have no problem with putting this amendment in. But I may not. I don't it's confusing whether we need it or not. And it just seems like whatever is said just seems to muddy the waters even more. I'm still not clear. Is anybody else? Could anybody else explain it to me to make my little pea brain gathered in?

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, it's my understanding, as far as this is, and anybody can correct me if, if I'm wrong, is that we do not need this amendment. But it's incumbent upon the Legislature to ensure that the contract is fully funded. So, this amendment is superfluous, because the money is already in the budget. So, we don't need to add more money into the budget.

But then it's going to be incumbent upon us, and as many legislators have said, you know, if it's a not to exceed contract, and it's based on reimbursements, then we're not going to pay out more services than they provide. So, we just have to ensure, and we have our, you know, contract, you know, financial staff, to be able to do so. And, you know, you know, we'll make sure that any, you know, funds that are, you know, are paid out are, you know, based on services that were rendered.

But I do not believe, Legislator Donaldson, that that this amendment is necessary if our budget analysts as well as the you know, budget director, have confirmed that the money is in the DSS budget for this contract.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: See the one thing, we're, we're just a portion of the body, we're not a majority of the body sitting here. And so, the one thing that concerns me is how do we... how do we communicate the confidence to the agencies that are right now making decisions about their staffing, and their caseloads, and the work that they can take on, without a formal something? And I'm not, I don't, I don't know the answer to that. I'm just posing it. Because I know that if I were in their shoes, I'd be concerned having heard from the Executive's Office that you're essentially, your budgets going to be cut by 50%. And now one committee is talking about re-establishing the full budgetary amount. But without sending something to the floor and getting a vote of the body. I know I would remain concerned.

Chairwoman Archer: Can we can we do a technical amendment basically identifying the pot of money and basically earmarking a, a a specific dollar amount to this group in the amendment?

Amber Feaster: Last year, we requested that monies be earmarked through a memorandum to the County Executive.

Chairwoman Archer: Clerk Fabella. Do you have an opinion on this, helping us navigate this? Because I mean that what we're talking about is trying to give a level of confidence to an organization who has to make important staffing decisions based on what was communicated to

them by the administration and what we're looking to try and get some agreement on. Or at least get to the floor to get agreement from the body.

Clerk Fabella: I let me talk to Counsel Ragucci about it. Tech, the money is already in the proposed budget. And so, there's nothing to really amend. What you're, you're asking for is a full amount of a contract. To me, again, the way to do that is when we get the contract in. And we can see there's already draft contracts in the system. We can see they're working on it. So, that is when we would take action. However, I completely understand what you're saying. So, I want to talk to Chris about some sort of statement amendment that we might be able to do to, almost like a policy, almost like a policy resolution. That is the policy that the county will fund this in full, but I got to wrap my head around it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All right. Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: I would just like to call a point of order with the public comments, I know that they're eager and that the resolutions are in front of us for the amendments. But we are convening a committee meeting right now. We don't typically take public comment at this point. Thank you.

Legislator Walter: My hand's up also.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. Yeah, I mean, I guess I, I agree with Legislator Ronk in that there is no need for this amendment given that they told us it's in the budget. But I also agree with Legislator Donaldson, I mean, it, there seems to be this like, tomfoolery, then like that, what is the reason for telling them? Why put it all in there and then tell them they only have half? And not expect them to feel nervous and insecure about that, is what I'm saying. And why not? You know, what, how can they feel, feel confident?

So, what I, I firmly request is that, and I'm happy to work with Vicky and, and the counsel in any way to identify if there is some pathway forward, that really allows us to assure that this this funding will be truly available to these programs.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: Thank you, and, and we have some time before the Budget Day to do that. I think that, you know, this issue has been thoroughly discussed here. You know, I think that we could bring up an, if there is a manner by which we can do that we can bring that up as a new amendment on the floor on, you know, what's at the seventh or eighth?

Chairwoman Archer: Eighth.

Legislator Ronk: You know, I just I feel like we've beat the proverbial horse to death here on this, you know, if we all agree that this amendment is not necessary, I'd like to move on if we can.

Legislator Walter: Can I just ask, can I post, can I make, does it make sense to make a motion to postpone this, just for now? Is that allowed?

Legislator Ronk: It's, it's going to go to the floor anyway.

Chairwoman Archer: It will come to the floor, yeah.

Legislator Ronk: Pass or fail, all these things are going to be voted on, on the eighth.

Chairwoman Archer: I think this is a placeholder till we get, let's keep this as a placeholder till we get an opinion from Clerk Fabella and the attorneys before we, we do anything with this. How's that? So, we'll keep it on our agenda. Should we vote on it, Clerk Fabella?

Legislator Ronk: Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. Okay. So, all in favor of a, of a Budget Amendment 25, in some variation once we get an opinion.

Legislator Ronk: Oh, no, no, no, no, no, it's in the current form. We're not voting on "some variation."

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, okay got it. Got it. That wasn't, that wasn't, I wasn't trying to play, be, you know, do any shenanigans here.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Sure.

Chairwoman Archer: So on amendment 25. All in favor? Opposed?

We have three opposed and 1-2-3-4 approve. Okay. Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: Amendment fails.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: The amendment fails.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah.

Budget Amendment 26 - Assigned Counsel Program.

Legislator Bartels: Can you just repeat what the amendment count was? I mean, what the vote count was?

Legislator Ronk: Four to four

Chairwoman Archer: It was four to, four to three.

Clerk Fabella: Legislator Maio.

Chairwoman Archer: She's not here.

Legislator Ronk: Oh, four to three.

Chairwoman Archer: And that passes.

Legislator Ronk: It passes, it passes until Legislator Maio returns.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah.

Okay. Assigned Counsel Budget No. 26. Move?

Legislator Walter: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Ronk: I'll second it for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Yes, thank you. So, just wanting to let you know that in my communications with the Executive Office. They were, they said that they would support it with the idea that current, that the two positions stay in finance for now. And the work gets done to create a department and ultimately move those positions out. I, from what I understand, and Burt, you can tell me if I'm wrong, they don't want it to stay in finance, either. But they do, they will support this if it stays in finance at this stage until the work is done to make a separate department. And again, I want to remind people that this is fully covered by the Office of Indigent Legal Services.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: You mean to tell me Burt doesn't want to run this department?

Legislator Walter: I believe not.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I don't think so either. Yes, thank you for putting this in. I think it's the best way to fund this particular type, I mean, to do this particular type of work rather than in a haphazard manner.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: I also just want to thank Legislator Walter for putting this in. I think it's going to bring an amazing asset to the county and for no additional county funds. So, I, I appreciate your knowledge and your work on this. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any other questions? Okay, on the amendment, All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? So everyone's in favor? I didn't, Okay. Thank you.

Next, we have Amendment 27 - Black Creek. Move for discussion.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Second, Legislator Walter. Legislator Walter, go ahead.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I don't know, Legislator Ronk. But well, I'll just say that I, at the end of last meeting, we were going back and forth as to whether the efficiency, whether it made more sense to put this in for the full \$2 million, or put it in for the upgrade. And, and, Legislator Ronk, correct me if I'm wrong, but when we discussed it, it sounds like the upgrade would hold this system up, keep it going for probably six, seven years, and maybe you know, maybe even a little bit longer. Because the upgrade will put it in today's day. And so, any extra parts or, or pieces that they need to have, they actually find. Like with the current system, they just can't find the parts to fix it. And while a full overhaul for \$2 million, might make it a 10-11 year program, especially because technology changes dramatically in a decade. And so, it's a matter of \$630K for six, seven years versus \$2 million for 10-11 that it made more sense to keep it at the \$630K.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk: I agree with Legislator Walter there. And you know, I'm going to support putting it in the Capital Plan, you know, being that, you know, it still has to come back to us to create the Capital Project and bond for it. I would be more comfortable putting it in the Capital Plan for 2022 rather than 2021. I would really be interested to see if the maintenance costs for 2021 exceed what the bond payment would be, you know, for the year. Because you can only, you know, I don't know, I don't know if, or is it going to, I don't know if we can bond it for six or seven years, because I remember hearing four or five, six, you know, there have been many iterations on how long the \$600,000 would hold it off. We can't bond anything under general municipal law for anything longer than its useful life. So, I mean, I don't see us being able to bond this for longer than five years. Again, I'll, I'll support putting it in the Capital Plan, but I'd be much more comfortable putting it in for 2022.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, I, I mean, I am some concerns because we did not really pick out the numbers properly to really get a hold on it. And I have a, you know, something about, you know, spending money on, on jail locks, you know, when we are really squeezing programs that are taking care of people. So, I have some concerns with that. And my concerns really is similar to what Legislator Ronk was pointing out. Was that it's not clear on where the savings are and where they're not. You know, and now it really gets broken out. And I really think we need to have that, a very clear breakout, of where it saves money. Or what point it begins saving money by fixing it. And, you know, does it make sense to go to the \$2 million. Is that, you know, more, more appropriate by, it's going to save more. I don't know. Because we haven't had those numbers really broken out in front of us.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter than Ronk.

Legislator Walter: Thank you, I'm, very concerned about pushing this off another year, the Sheriff had asked for this two years ago, and then again, or for the last budget. And then again, for this one. And as we heard in Law Enforcement and Public Safety, this machine is really just, it's like, it's being held together. And it's being piecemealed. And I'm, I think that the, the, the cost of not fixing this is

the savings, what we'll see is, unfortunately, you know, if there's a crisis, and whether that crisis is, is leads to some deaths or injuries, because the system has failed, and there's a fire or something horrible that happens. And so, you can't really put a dollar amount on it, you can't predict whether there will be something horrendous that happens that, but the idea is, and the Sheriff is committed to keeping people safe, not only people on the streets, but people who are in his jail. And those people deserve to be safe as much as anyone else does. And, and there's a real concern about their safety if this gets pushed off, and then the system completely fails, and there's no way he can fix it. And so, I'm, I'm just really worried. I don't think he would have brought this up as such an extreme concern, if he didn't have it. I, I can't predict the future. Maybe the system doesn't completely fail in the next 12 months, but maybe it does. And I'm just worried about what could happen. Thanks.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. I just want to point out yet again, that this isn't operating funds and this isn't in the operating budget. This is in the Capital Plan. And we're not actually spending any money until we create the plan, sign the contracts, and you know, and bond for the expenses. So, this is just to put it in the Capital Plan. When it comes, if it, if it comes forward in 2021. I'm going to suggest that we put it off until 2022. But I support putting it in the Capital Plan because we need the, we need the upgrades.

Chairwoman Archer: Chair Donaldson then Legislator Bartels.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, so I understand we need the upgrade. And I don't think it's a, it's going to be a situation if it fails at all, hell is going to let loose. There are manual backups on these types of things. And it would be more labor intensive when they're using the manual backup. But it's not going to put people at risk, but it still needs to be done. And I will agree with Legislator Ronk. I'll agree to put it into the Capital Plan, because it has to come back to us before we actually initiate it. But when it does, they're going to have to really give us those breakdowns.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you, I'm going, I'm going to echo what the Chair just said. I'm going to support putting it in the Plan because enough concerns have been raised. The financials didn't really, it doesn't make sense to put it in the plan for financial reasons. It's more the, the concerns of the risks raised by Legislator Walter and the Sheriff in terms of the possibility of a bigger failure. And so, if and when it does come before us, I'd like to have an analysis of actually spending the money for the, the full system, and holding off another year, and really looking at all of the financials. So, I can't commit to where I'm going to be when it comes before us. But I'll support putting it into the Plan because enough concerns have been raised.

Legislator Bartels: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: And I, I agree with everyone, all, all just the same, especially Legislator Walter, you know, you know, for saying what a health and safety issue this could potentially be. In the next year I'm hoping that maybe because we still have the issue of a monopoly being on the provider of this, this software system. So, maybe we'll come up with another vendor that we could, that the Sheriff would actually be more comfortable contracting with, in the meantime as well, because that was one of.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. So, is somebody's making an amendment? Legislator Walter, do you want to make amendment to move it to 2022?

Legislator Walter: No.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislator Ronk: I'll make an amendment to move it to 2022.

Chairwoman Archer: Is there a second? Okay. Legislator Haynes.

All in favor of the amendment to move it to 2022.

Okay, Legislator Haynes, Legislator Ronk.

All opposed?

Okay. On the amendment, as it stands, to put in the capital plan for 2021. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll be a yes. I mean, just for point of clarification. This is, this is just merely putting it in in the Plan which means we can put

Chairwoman Archer: It can, it can come before us or not next year,

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right.

Chairwoman Archer: yes, yes.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And we could actually put it, you know, put it off into the following year, when it does come before us. So it gives us that opportunity. That's the only reason I didn't want to take it out of the, you know, plan at this point. Because once we find out if we really find out, you know, the cost effectiveness, then it would make sense to do it then.

Chairwoman Archer: And I think that's, that's probably the next step for the Sheriff is to really help understand the implications of the options here. All right. So, I think we voted on that, didn't we? Nope. On the amendment. Okay. Good. Thanks.

All right. 28 - The Chief Diversity Officer. Move?

Legislator Walter: I'll move or second.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Legislator, Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thank you. So, as I said before, originally, when this was put in by Legislator Haynes and I, we did not there, we did not think that the position of Diversity Officer was going to be filled in the county it was filled several days ago. So, that said, we're willing to pull this for now unless there's a strong desire to push it forward. There are other revenues there. This is still a very important position. But we also recognize, again, that this is a time that perhaps it's not best to be adding more positions. So, again, unless there's this overwhelming desire to keep it on, I believe we're going to pull it from the amendment.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Next

Chairwoman Archer: Alrighty.

Next we have Budget Amendment 29, the Public Health Director of COVID Ops.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So, there's a, there's a few different concerns I have about this position.

So, the first one is, this is another situation where an individual was hired into a job title that was not appropriate for them. And given that salary, this was a Deputy Director of IS, and the, the, I was told by Marc Rider that he did not feel like he was necessarily suited for that position. He was basically given that title, a Deputy Director and a Deputy Director salary, but then a different job. And, and there's been several kinds of situations like this where someone's put into a job title, but that's not the job they're doing, but they're getting given that salary. So, that, that is and then when they move to the different job, they keep that same salary. So, that's one thing.

The second is the even that that salary exceeds many of our other department heads. Like it exceeds Purchasing, Public Works, Transportation, Mental Health and the, the Warden of the Jail.

A third thing is I feel like any, any new COVID positions, not only should be temporary, but they should be covered by the CARES Act or Article 6. Right now, we have three unfilled positions that are fully covered by CARES Act or Article 6.

And I think that there's a way, I know that they it's a, a Public Health Supervisor, as well as two Public Health Nurses. They're working on taking the two Public Health Nurses that require a bachelor's and moving it to an LPN, which would mean they would lower the salary, that would

potentially allow them to increase the salary for the Supervisor. Who the very job description is related to contract tracing and COVID outreach.

So, I, I, I feel like those, that's what we should be focusing on for any COVID positions. I'm also really concerned that if this person is if made like a communication specialist for DOH, like what, does DOH need a communication specialist?

Will, will they continue to use this person as a communication specialist after the pandemic? And if DOH, you know, it'd be a different thing if DOH is saying, no, we, we need this kind of person, no matter what to continue. That's another story. But even then at \$98,000, it just seems, it doesn't, it just doesn't seem appropriate. So, again, that's like four different reasons I have a problem with this.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Walter: Oh I'm sorry, I just want to say one more thing. I really appreciate the work that the Executive's Office and the county has gone through to deal with COVID. And I do feel that that's important that we do the right thing and continue to respond correctly. So, I am not against responding appropriately to this pandemic.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris then Bartels.

Legislator Gavaris: Thank you. So, I've, over the past several days sat on more webinars on pandemic response than I care to even tell you about but the more recent focus has been on the distribution of vaccinations that are scheduled to come sometime in December. The, I think the justification last meeting we had was they're going to be doing a lot with that distribution. What I learned yesterday is, that is not true, or cannot be true, really. Because New York State Health Department was the Deputy Commissioner for New York State, clearly stated several times in many different ways. The way the program is going to work is there's going to be 10 regional hubs throughout New York state that will receive the vaccinations. They are not allowed, under federal law, they are not allowed to then redeploy those vaccines further down the line.

So, that means for our area, for example, our regional hub is Westchester Medical Center. This is why Governor Cuomo had an issue with this, I believe, because how many people are able to get to Westchester Medical Center, it, it limits those who are going to be able to get it. But as it stands right now, for 2021, the plan is to distribute these there. But it was, the, the discussion last time was that the majority of the work was setting up these distribution points.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels then Ronk.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you. I mean, I have a leg, question for Legislator Gavaris. But let me just first back up and, and, and, and agree with the concerns that Legislator Walter raised. You know it, it concerns me that this person, which I didn't even know this person was in place in a, in a, as the Deputy Director of IS, and hired at that salary. And one thing that I think's interesting is that we're now proposing to pay this person, in the new role, more than the Deputy Director of IS because of that weird number of days issue. So, the Deputy Director of IS is, is going to be making less money if we pass this, as, as is, then the Director of COVID Ops.

My other concern is, so one, I have a salary concern. How do we evaluate what's the right salary for this job?

Two. How do we evaluate what's who's the right person for this job?

And three, why wouldn't we contract this job? So that if, like, so many of the other grants that have happened, there is a no claw back? I mean, a no fill it, whatever it's called, where you can't fill the positions. That we're, we're prepared for that. And we could, we could have it covered.

So, I haven't yet heard the issue of having it be a contract. Which could be the same person that we're talking about putting into this role. It's just we'd be hiring them in a different way. I haven't heard a final answer on that, particularly as it relates to the possibility of grant reimbursement or federal or state reimbursements.

So, I'm not comfortable with creating a county position and just leaving the salary at its current salary.

Chairwoman Archer: If I could. Burt, we brought this up at the last meeting. Do we have any new insights into that conversation?

Commissioner Gulnick: Not in terms of the grant funding and stuff? Not that I'm aware of, Lynn. I did not get any answers.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, did I think Legislator Ronk you had, and then Legislator Walter

Legislator Ronk: Yeah, I just want to make a point of clarification to Legislator Gavaris. It was never said by me, or Heidi as sponsors of this, that a major portion of the job responsibilities would be vaccine distribution. I believe that was mentioned in passing by the Commissioner of Finance as one of the things that they could be involved with, once the, you know, COVID hotline, and contact tracing, and all of the other things that they're doing have died down. So, it is not, you know, it is not imagined that that's going to be a large portion of their job duties.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter then Gavaris.

Legislator Walter: Yeah. So, with all due respect, the Executive presented this to us specifically saying it was for vaccine distribution. And even at the last meeting, I believe, Legislator Ronk, you got a message from Marc Rider, Deputy Rider, saying he surprised to hear that he's not going to be doing vaccine. I'll add

Legislator Ronk: That's incorrect. Point of information, that is incorrect. What, what I said, that Marc Rider had texted me was he would be surprised to learn that the county has no role in vaccine distribution at any point. That is what was said.

Legislator Walter: Sure. So, I'll just add to what Legislator Gavaris said, because I've also been on many of these meetings. And it's important to also note that initially, the vaccine is going to be distributed to those people who are first responders in the medical field. That, that medical providers have already had to submit proposals to the state to get approval to be the pass throughs.

So, if, if, if the county does get involved in vaccine distribution, if at all, it will be so far down the line.

I'll say in terms of the other elements that were discussed. The contact tracing, that's absolutely fully covered by the federal funding. And that's what we should be hiring, these public health nurse supervisors and the two public health nurses to do. That's exactly what they should be doing.

I will say to speak to Legislator Bartels' point, this person could not be put into those contracts. You do have to be a nurse. And so this person doesn't have, would not be able to.

From what I understand, you know, a lot of what this position does is kind of managerial oversight, which may very well be important. However, once you hire a supervisory nurse that's fully funded by that federal, federal funding, you wouldn't need that. So, I think that that a lot of that administration would be completely covered once we hired a, a, a public health nurse.

There's, I'm sure there is the website is probably an element of what this person does and to allow people to stay up to date. But again, this is, that's not a \$98,000 a year job.

And I, I'm still remain very concerned, I think, again, most of this will be covered when we hire that public health nurse supervisor and the two public health nurses. And there, it would be important to do that first and then see what remains needed. And then identify the right job at that point. But until we do those two things, I don't see why we would do this.

Legislator Ronk: A point of information. It's \$96,000. Not \$98,000.

Legislator Walter: Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris: Yeah, just to answer Legislator Ronk said for, I, I did not, if I implied that yourself or Legislator Haynes had said that. I wasn't trying to imply that it was actually Deputy Executive Rider who said they would be spending time on doing the pod distribution and setting those up. That's was his words. So, it did come from the Exec's office.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any more comments on this?

Okay. On the amendment, all in favor?

Opposed?

Okay.

Legislator Ronk: Madam Chair, if I could, we're, we're at two hours and 45 minutes. So, we're almost nine hours into this process. Is there any appetite to, you know, adjourn, and then you know, re, you know, you know, meet again, Just to, I, I wanted to put that out there as a thought. I know, Legislator Maio had to drop off. I've got about 15 minutes before I've got another commitment.

Legislator Gavaris: I have five minutes.

Legislator Ronk: I then I would make a motion that I would make a motion that we adjourn and you know and schedule another an additional meeting to finish off the amendments.

Chairwoman Archer: Well, I the only problem I've got is, go ahead Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Well, I just don't know when, when are we going to do that?

Chairwoman Archer: Well, that's the challenge.

Legislator Bartels: I have a pretty tight schedule, but if there's a time we can come up with, losing two more members in the next 15 minutes is

Chairwoman Archer: Not going to help us, right.

Legislator Bartels: I mean, if we could get through a little bit more, but I'm just again, I don't know what what's, what's everybody's availability?

Chairwoman Archer: So, does anybody want to throw a, does, when do you want to pick this up?

Legislator Gavaris: Monday, four o'clock good for anybody? Or tomorrow, four o'clock?

Chairwoman Archer: Tomorrow is not going to work for me.

Legislator Gavaris: Monday?

Chairwoman Archer: The rest of this week is pretty much out for me.

Legislator Gavaris: What about Monday, four o'clock?

Legislator Bartels: Monday doesn't work for me either.

Legislator Walter: Can I just ask, can we just try until you have to drop off? Because we aren't, we aren't that far

Legislator Bartels: Yeah

Legislator Walter: there's only six more. I think a few of them will be very fast. And then we'll have a better sense of what we really need.

Legislator Bartels: I agree.

Legislator Walter: take the time and just, even if it's email.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Maybe we can

Chairwoman Archer: Let's see how

Legislator Gavaris: I'll rescind, I'll rescind my second.

Legislator Ronk: I'll rescind the motion but at, at, at seven o'clock I have to jump off.

Chairwoman Archer: Let's see how quickly we can get the next couple of things going here and limit comment, if possible.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Limiting, limiting comment maybe the way to go.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah well, okay, so the next one is Discovery Resolution 30.

Legislator Walter: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, any comments, questions? Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? So moved

COSSAP.

Legislator Walter: Move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Resolution 31. Moved it. Second?

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. All in favor?

Group: Aye

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? So moved.

A Fire Coordinator number, Number, Resolution Budget Amendment 32.

Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Second.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Second

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye

Legislator Bartels: Can I ask a question on this before I vote of Legislator Ronk. I mean, it's a, it's a modest amount of money. But can you describe what this person would do that a current county employee doesn't already do? Or wouldn't do?

Legislator Ronk: Yeah. Right now, there's nobody whose whole job it is to ensure that training happens properly at the County Fire Training Center. And I'm not talking about the courses being taught that's done by State Fire Instructors and County Fire Instructors. But I'm talking about not burning too hot, not causing damage. Not you know, having people trip over each other. There's nobody that does scheduling. So, you know, a lot of these, a lot of these duties might be farmed out to different people at different times. But I feel like we just built an \$8 million County Fire Training Center. And it's important, you know for a, for a modest amount of money like this, to have somebody whose whole job is to make sure it doesn't go to shit.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yep, well

Chairwoman Archer: That's a technical term?

Legislator Ronk: It is.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I agree with Legislator Ronk except for the, the very end comment.

Legislator Ronk: It, it, it is. Yeah, and it is a technical term. I think that if you've visited a couple of the County Fire Training Centers in adjacent counties, you'd find that

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, he's exactly right. So

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It's a modest amount of money to protect our asset.

Chairwoman Archer: Any other questions? Any other questions? Okay. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed? So moved.

Okay. Budget Amendment 33. Enterprise West, this is moving the Capital Plan to start in 2022 versus 2021. Move?

Legislator Ronk: I'll move for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Second?

Legislator Bartels: I'll second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Any questions? All in favor?

Opposed?

Okay, doesn't pass.

Retirement incentives, vacancies,

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Resolution 34.

Legislator Bartels: Sorry to step on you, I'll move it for discussion

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you.

Legislator Ronk: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Any, thank you. Any questions?

Okay, I do want to make a comment on this. Because I think it's important to be clear. I thought there was some good conversation last week. My intent was never to move these positions into contingency. But to ensure that backfilled dollars for these, necessary, were used to fill backfill these necessary positions, and not to defund the position. The legislature, you know, didn't have an opportunity, from my perspective, to discuss the retirement incentives and I thought this would give us a good opportunity to have a better handle on the backfills. A 125 positions were individuals, took the incentive. 85 positions are being backfilled. Now some of them are reimbursable. And I think that's important to identify. But those were not part of this piece.

So, since there is no appetite by us, as legislators, appropriators.

I'm sorry?

Legislator Bartels: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chairwoman Archer: That's okay. I'm, and given the, you know, uncertainty, particularly on the revenue side, I'm withdrawing this amendment. And, but we'll be keeping an eye on the hires and the salaries that we bring these people in. And for the proposed 2021 budget, and I trust that our elected officials are going to do the right thing with regard to backfilling these positions. So, thank you.

All right. The next one is 35. And that is the same. Evidently, there was a, they were included in the budget, and therefore I'm not going to put that amendment in. And withdrawing that one.

And Budget Amendment No. 36.

Legislator Ronk: I'll move it for discussion.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Walter: I'll second.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Any questions on this?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Is this the, we're on the one with the insurance, right?

Chairwoman Archer: Correct.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah, what I'd, I'd like have a, I think they did. Did they make the change to put that into a, back to what it was supposed to be, an accountant, correct? Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: Any other, Legislator Bartels?

Legislator Bartels: So, you know, when the Insurance Department came to Laws and Rules to talk about the budget, the, the loss of the previous accountant position was something that was discussed in terms of 23 years, I think she said, the person had been in the position, and she had taken on a lot of the duties. She also said that before the employee retired, she trained the, the confidential secretary to do a lot of the inputting. But that's still, she had, had to, had to take up a lot of the accounting work.

When I was looking into it today, I realized that the position wasn't even in the Insurance Department. Along with our fiscal analysts, we were trying to figure out where actually the position lived, because the insurance department was basically a solo operation, along with the risk officer, who was moved out of the insurance department. And it appears that that person, that that lived in personnel, is that correct, Amber? The personnel department?

Amber Feaster: Purchasing.

Legislator Bartels: Purchasing. Purchasing. My "P", who lived in the Purchasing Department. So, I don't know, not having had the time to discuss with the, the head of Insurance. I don't know how that working arrangement functioned. And I only say that to say that, I don't, there wasn't a full-time position in this office prior to this year. There wasn't a confidential secretary, but there wasn't a full time accounting position either. So, I'm just not really sure without a discussion with the department head how to how to, how to proceed.

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson then Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Well, there was a position that did accounting, and that's what was requested by the County Executive last year. And so, we filled that position, but somehow they moved it and changed it. And my understanding is with the Insurance Department that they need an accountant would be the right person for that particular position. And I believe that's what they requested last year. And that's what we did. But then somehow it got changed. So, I feel we need to go back to where it was. It was an accountant position, and I, I respect that that's what they needed. And as you pointed out, Legislator Bartels, the insurance people pointed out, they do need somebody doing that.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Ronk then Bartels.

Legislator Ronk: Thanks. One concern that I've had with, with this move is the change from CSEA to managing confidential which happened, you know, outside of action by the Legislature, which I'm not certain is legal. I think that to reclassify a position from CSEA a to, to non-union requires, you know, a vote of the legislature. One of our counsel can confirm that but I'm relatively certain that's the case.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Well to Legislator Ronk's point. I mean, we don't, do we have any counsel, any of our counsel on? We don't, no.

Chairwoman Archer: We don't.

Legislator Bartels: Okay. So, that would be a follow-up question. And to, to Chair Donaldson, again, this is like the confusing part for me, because when I look at the 2020 budget, there isn't, there isn't an accountant in there. There, there, there is there are two positions. And that's it. And the second position is the Risk Officer, which moved to a different, which moved to health, essentially. So, I don't, I don't see, I don't see where, other than knowing from our financial analysts' research today, the accountant that was doing the work for 23 years in that office was, lived in Purchasing, not in the Insurance Office.

So, I, I'm just, I'm a little confused, I have to admit about, about the move. And while the head of the department stated to us in the Laws and Rules meeting in terms of the budget, her budget presentation, she talked about the loss of a 23-year employee and the accounting that she had to pick up and do. But she wasn't coming to the meeting asking for something, she was, it was just part of her presentation.

So, I'm just, I'd, I'd like to know, I'd like to one, to know an answer to Legislator Ronk's question, in terms of the legal question but we don't have, we don't have our attorneys here.

Chairwoman Archer: So we'll have to, Legislator Walter.

Legislator Walter: Thanks. So, I also, I guess, and it's less about this particular position. But, and I've said this several times. There's about five different positions, where I feel like what I've heard is, in the past year, the Executive's Office put somebody in a position with a different title. And then that they were not necessarily fitting into, and then gave him that salary and moved them. Like the COVID example that I just talked about was one of them. And there's been several of those that are very disconcerting of the idea of taking somebody and just putting them in a job title, and giving them that salary.

So, that said, I guess I would like to know, is this that example? What was this person? Because, you know, when I asked about the COVID one, they said, well, we've made them Deputy of IS because we had to find some slot to put them in.

Was this position originally like we have with the finance person in that was actually a communications person. Like, was this person given the title of accountant and that's why this is the same salary? Or was this a completely new job title that didn't exist already?

Chairwoman Archer: Chairman Donaldson.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: As Legislator Ronk pointed out, and I was pointing out prior, was the position requested to be an accountant by the County Executive last year. We put the position in the budget as an account. The position then was changed, which, you know, we have to, in talking with our attorney, Chris Ragucci, it was clear, that it was not that we felt it was clear. Chris Ragucci said it was pretty clear that it was not legal to take a CSEA competitive positions and turn it into a non-competitive, non-competitive position. Easy for you to say, couldn't spit that up, non-competitive position. And that was the problem. And it was this and in a number of other positions that were done similar to like Legislator Walters was pointing out. And I mean, this one, the problem was that it really, instead of just changing the title; it changed the very nature of everything from a CSEA position to a non-competitive position with no Legislative approval whatsoever.

Chairwoman Archer: So, Legislator Walter then Bartels.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, so, I guess I'd like clarity, because again, is it that they added a position that we never approved? Or did they truly change one? And I'd also, whether, whether from the perspective of the, of the, the head of insurance, would that person say, actually, I need both positions? Or was that you know, like I, I again, I'm not quite clear whether this was a conversion of a job title or an adding of a different one. Like just because the accountant was zeroed out doesn't mean it's not necessarily its own. So, I don't know if I'm getting across. Again, it was different, some of these other ones where they actually stuck the person and kept that title, like Deputy Director of IS, even though they weren't really doing it. This, I, I would love clarity as to whether they really put this person as this new title, or just did they add a whole other position, and just happen to remove one? Again, I'm not sure if that's clear.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yeah, I'm looking for that clarity, too. Because I'm, I see in the 2021 Budget, the accountant and the zero line in the Insurance, that the chair is talking about. But in the 2020 Budget. There's no accountant there. So, did this happen mid-year that an accountant line was created? When did this happen?

Chairwoman Archer: I think we probably, I don't know. Can you respond to that Amber?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It was mid-year, it was mid-year.

Amber Feaster: Tracey are you looking at the Recommended Budget Book? Because the Adopted Budget Book, because this was added, the accountant position was added during the budget amendment process that the Legislature voted on, amended the budget, and adopted as amended, with that account position in there.

Legislator Bartels: I'm looking at the Operating Budget.

Amber Feaster: Recommended or Adopted?

Legislator Bartels: It doesn't say Recommended or Adopted. It says Operating.

Amber Feaster: The Adopted Budget has the accountant position in it. The Recommended Budget does not.

Legislator Bartels: Okay, so, it happened during the budget process?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's what I, Yeah. Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: It happened last year in the amendment process because I'm looking at the Adopted Budget and it is an accountant and the Insurance Officer.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right, Yeah. I distinctly remember when they came before us and requested that position for Insurance.

Legislator Bartels: Can I ask a question?

Chairwoman Archer: Sure.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And we amended the budget and put that in. And then we adopted that budget as amended, which was that, that position.

Legislator Bartels: Was the accountant position ever filled?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: I think it was.

Chairwoman Archer: I, I don't know about that.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: It, it, they changed the position from a, from a,

Chairwoman Archer: From an accountant

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: competitive to a non-competitive.

Chairwoman Archer: Alright, so we need to do a bit more research.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: And I, and I brought that up with the County Executive. I told him it was totally illegal that he was doing that. And because I felt that you just can't take a non, a competitive position in the CSEA and change it to a non-competitive position. I, I don't see how anybody can do that without Legislative approval. And that's, that's the whole point that I made when it was done.

Chairwoman Archer: Well, that that was the second time it was done. It was done earlier as well, correct.? That same issue.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: In another, yeah. Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: So where, So, where do we want to go with this? Do we feel we need more information before we can vote on this amendment? Or

Legislator Walter: I would say, can, sorry.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead.

Legislator Walter: Yeah, I, I would love, especially because I know that if he's not already gone, I think we've lost a couple people. There's a lot of questions. So yes, I would

Chairwoman Archer: We still, we still have a quorum though, correct? Yeah, we still have a quorum so we can move this.

Legislator Walter: I feel like there's a few things that are outstanding that we, I know I would love to understand a little bit clearer.

Chairwoman Archer: So, should we move it though for, to take it to the floor?

Legislator Walter: I guess that's, yeah

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Can I ask for clarification on that as well? So, does everything, as I recall from last year, everything goes to the floor, whether it passes or fails, correct?

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah.

Legislator Bartels: Heidi's nodding, Yes. That's, that's what I recall. I feel like it got blamed on, on me.

Chairwoman Archer: I think we did blame you, Tracey.

Legislator Bartels: Maybe. And maybe it is my fault. I'm not, I, I'm not, I'm not shirking the responsibility yet. But, so everything goes, whether it passes or fails. I mean, the person I'd like to speak to again is, you know, the Deputy Insurance Officer just to really understand the request for the accountant. And, and maybe equally importantly, to understand the, the relationship, because when she spoke about the employee had been there for 23-years. She spoke about that employee as if that employee had been in, I took it for granted that an employee was in the office for 23 years. Today, to find out that that employee was in Purchasing, but obviously had been splitting their work. But I'd like to have a better understanding of what actually that employee did that is now, or may now be missing from the office.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so what so, so, let's, let's, why don't we. What do we want to do? Do we want to, should we vote on this to go to the floor or not? I mean, it doesn't matter. Everything's going to the floor anyway, we just have some follow up questions that we need to get clarification on. So, we'll vote to put it to the floor doesn't change anything, because once it gets the floor, you'll have the opportunity to vote. Right?

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Yeah. I'll move that.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, Legislator Litts.

Legislator Litts: Before you vote, wouldn't you want to know whether the move that was made was legal or illegal?

Chairwoman Archer: Well, that's true. Yes, thank you. It's been a long day. Legislator Bartels

Legislator Bartels: If we take no action on it, can we still send it to the floor? And in the meantime, get the legal questions answered? And potentially, I mean, however, whatever the format is, I'll definitely, I'm going to be reaching out to the, you know, the Department Head to ask the questions that I just mentioned, which I can report back, if the committee chooses, but if we take no action then to Legislator Litts' point at least, we, we find out if.

Chairwoman Archer: Get all the information that we need before the floor.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: When we, when you, when you take a look at the legality of it, that would be, it would ask me something that we would have to challenge, if they're going to stick to the idea that you can just automatically change that. And my position is you cannot automatically. I have no problem if the County Executive wishes to come back before the Legislature, or someone for that matter to say, you know, I want this position changed. And then this should be the position that we should have. I don't believe that they should be able to just create a position and then change the position. That basically negates our ability, you know, to control the budget. And our ability to as policy makers when you're going to automatically change these things without approval. I have no problem if you want to change and you can justify that. Then let's go for it. My problem lies in taking the position from a CSEA competitive position and turning it into a non-competitive position with no input from the body.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Bartels.

Legislator Bartels: Yes and I'm, I share your concern. And, and, you know, I think that this has been a pattern. You know, as, as Legislator Walter pointed out earlier, to one of my amendments that had to do with title changes. It's a pattern that exists, without a doubt. We've seen it in multiple cases.

But on this, in this case, I, I just, I would feel more comfortable speaking to the Department Head to get a sense, first of all, what had happened in the past and what's missing, what's missing in the office right now, before I go ahead and pass the resolution making a change to the, to the office.

You know, that said, your concerns I agree with. And I think in terms of policy, we're going to, you know, for many years, we kind of took it for granted that things were understood based on what was said in the Charter. And maybe they're not understood. I mean, this has happened with the changes in salaries. This Executive has, has set the salary ranges, outside of Legislative, outside of Legislative awareness essentially. If we didn't have financial analysts that were regularly digging and investigating and providing us with information.

You know, speaking about the, the Deputy County Attorney, we wouldn't have even known that salary was changed. That that's how he was hired at a higher rate than was approved by the Legislature in the budget.

So, I think moving forward, we're going to have to think through some ways to proactively address this through policy. But for myself, I'd feel more comfortable speaking to the Department Head.

Chairwoman Archer: So, let's get some more information and take no action.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: That's good. Yes then, Tracey, then we should empower her to call the Department Head.

Legislator Bartels: Oh, thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Walter

Legislator Walter: Just to confirm it. Tracey, I mean, and I don't know if this is the Department Head or the Executives Office. But what I want clarity, is this an addition, or an exchange?

Legislator Bartels: Okay.

Legislator Walter: Again, just because one's in and the other is out doesn't mean it was necessarily viewed as an, an exchange. Two things that might happen at the same time might not be causing each other. So, is, is this an addition that happens to couple with a subtraction? Or is this truly a takeaway to put this in; an exchange.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay.

Legislator Bartels: Which I will

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator, go ahead,

Legislator Bartels: I was just going to say, I would need to determine, that was a new position in 2020. We need to determine if it was if it was filled in advance of being changed. That's the, that's the first thing. And then I think we'd also need to understand the relationship to the Department of Purchasing. And with the retirement of the 23-yearlong employee, if that relationship is continuing. It did not sound like that at the, at the was a budget, but I don't know.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Cahill, and then we're going to move on to the closing out the other resolutions. Go ahead.

Chairman Cahill: Thank you. And I won't be long. Thank you. I just think it's important that we recognize that, that to me, this is just a another way that they're working around the CSEA. You know, that, you know, this is a very high skill position, and one that people in lower levels of CSEA aspire to. And when the administration goes ahead and takes those opportunities for other employees away, then you know where they're going to go, right?. So, especially folks who want to stay in the CSEA. And there's a vast majority of our employees are CSEA members.

And it seems to me that at every turn, they're just not being represented. They're not being represented by the Legislature, not being represented by the union themselves, not being

represented by the administration, to have a fair shake at things. I mean, I don't ever hear anybody from the union coming out and, and, you know, demanding that, you know, they're heard.

You know, it's kind of absurd to me that, you know, all of these actions taken place where the CSEA and other unions are affected, and then you really don't hear from them, you know.

So, I'm just going to stand here now and tell you that I am going to be a voice for those folks, when the time comes. And we have an opportunity to speak out about things like this where the administration is taking away a CSEA position and creating a management position and thereby taking away a promotional path for a current CSEA employee, or multiple employees. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. All right. And you'll get back to us Legislator Bartels, once you get all the information.

Chairwoman Archer: Legislator Haynes.

Legislator Haynes: I was supposed to pick someone up at seven. If I leave, you won't have quorum anymore, right?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. And we've got just to go through those last resolutions.

Legislator Haynes: Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: We'll do this. This is easy. Okay.

So, a motion to, I'll take a motion for resolution 429 –

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it.

Chairwoman Archer: Ratification of Tax Rolls?

Second?

Legislator Bartels: Bartels.

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed?

Resolution 430, Levy for Unpaid Sewer Rents. Moved?

Legislator Walter: Move it.

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it, Bartels.

Chairwoman Archer: Second, Walter.

All in favor?

So moved.

Resolution 431 - Levy for Unpaid Water Rents. Moved.

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it, Bartels.

Legislator Walter: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Second, Walter.

All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed?

Resolution 432 - Approving Complete Tax Rolls and Directing the Execution of a Delivery of Warrants. Moved.

Legislator Walter: I'll move it.

Legislator Bartels: Move.

Chairwoman Archer: Second by Bartels; moved by Walter.

All in favor?

Opposed?

So moved.

Resolution 433 - Authorizing the Commissioner of Finance to Make Transfers of Funds and Budgetary Amendments. Move.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Moved.

Chairwoman Archer: Second?

Legislator Walter: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Walter.

All in favor?

Opposed?

So moved.

Chairwoman Archer: Resolution 434- Adopting the Ulster County Budget For Fiscal Year Commencing January 1, 2021 And Making Appropriations For The Conduct Of County Government. Move

Legislator Bartels: Amber has her hand raised.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes, Amber.

Amber Feaster: This one will have to be amended for the changes the committee decided on today.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so it will reflect the changes when we go for 8th, correct? Okay.

Legislator Bartels: We're meeting, won't we be meeting on that day? Like can we, we're meeting on the 8th, is that the next, our next meeting?

Chairwoman Archer: 9th? 8th? 9th?

Amber Feaster: Oh, Ways and Means has a regular meeting of the Ways and Means Committee on the 8th.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, so, so, so we will have the amended version at that point?

Amber Feaster: For the budget, the Special Budget Hearing to the body, this will be amended, and the backup is attached.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. So, as amended.

Legislator Bartels: Hold on.

Chairwoman Archer: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Legislator Bartels: I just want to clarify because I'm, don't we normally go through every, every one of these amendments on, on the day that we're voting on the budget?

Chairwoman Archer: Yes.

Amber Feaster: Yes. So, what, what happens is the backup is prepared in advance, you change it, I change the backup after the, the special session, after those actions are final. But the Ways and Means votes do get presented to the body before that point.

Legislator Bartels: Right. Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay. So, we're voting on it as amended?

Amber Feaster: Motion to amend.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes.

Legislator Bartels: No, right now.

Chairwoman Archer: Right now. Now, we're just voting. You're, I'm confused as to 434. What are we doing? Are we voting on this?

Amber Feaster: We need to take a motion to amend it, for the budget amendments voted on today.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Right. And then, but we're not going to actually vote on the budget until December 8. And then, then it would go to the floor.

Amber Feaster: This is the resolution to present the budget to the body.

Chairwoman Archer: Okay, as amended.

Legislator Bartels: I'll make, I'll make a motion to accept the amendments that were approved.

Chairwoman Archer: Today.

Legislator Walter: I'll second it.

Legislator Litts: Right. As amended as of this

Chairwoman Archer: As amended. Right. As amended of this moment. Thank you.

All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Opposed?

Resolution 435.

Amber Feaster: And then to vote, vote on the resolution's approval?

Legislator Bartels: Not yet, that's now.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh yeah. So, approval of Resolution 434, as amended.

Legislator Bartels: I'll move it

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: We're tired.

Legislator Bartels: We're going crazy.

Chairwoman Archer: It's been a long, long, everything

Legislator Walter: Don't we have to do the same for 435?

Legislator Bartels: Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: Yes. Same the thing for 435.

I'll take a motion for Resolution for 435, as amended, based on today's

Legislator Bartels: No. No. I'll first move it. I'll move it first.

Legislator Walter: Second it.

Chairwoman Archer: Seconded.

Legislator Bartels: Then I'll make a motion to accept the amendments that were approved in today's meeting.

Chairwoman Archer: And seconded.

Legislator Walter: Second.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. All in favor of the amended,

Legislator Walter: Herb

Chairwoman Archer: I'm sorry, I'm my brain is, is stopping right now.

Legislator Walter: Now we get to go.

Chairwoman Archer: Now we get to go now a motion to adjourn.

Amber Feaster: Now vote on the resolution, as amended.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh we, okay. Resolution as amended.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Motion to adjourn.

Chairwoman Archer: Pardon me? Thank you.

Amber Feaster: Okay.

Chairwoman Archer: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Listen, I'm so

Legislator Bartels: It's because Herb is here.

Chairwoman Archer: Yeah, I just I know everybody wants to go. But I just want to say thank you. It has been a grueling budget cycle. I so appreciate all your time and effort. It, we, you guys have gone above and beyond. So, thank you for all your hard work. And our team, our finance team

Legislator Bartels: Yes, thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: and all their hard work. So, thank you. Thank you, everyone. Motion to adjourn.

Legislative Chairman Donaldson: Lynn. Before you adjourn, Lynn, thank you for what you're doing a great job tonight. It was a pretty tough one. But you pulled it off pretty well.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you.

Legislator Bartels: Thank you. Thank you Chair.

Chairwoman Archer: Thank you. Thank you, everyone. Good night.

Amber Feaster: Do you guys want to know the values?

Legislator Walter: Oh, wait.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh, you have it. Okay.

Legislator Walter: And also Amber, don't I have to give you votes for a bunch of things?

Amber Feaster: Yes.

Chairwoman Archer: The first seven, the first seven.

Legislator Bartels: Well, we'll have to unadjourn.

Amber Feaster: Yeah, it doesn't change the disposition on any of them.

Chairwoman Archer: No.

Chairwoman Bartels: Okay.

Amber Feaster: But the ending value in contingency is \$300,600, I'm sorry. \$362,926.

Savings from the non-county contract agencies is \$298,695.

Legislator Bartels: Okay. Thank you.

Chairwoman Archer: Good. Thank you.

Amber Feaster: You're welcome.

Legislator Bartels: Night everybody.

Chairwoman Archer: Thanks everyone. Good night.

Legislator Litts: Everybody have a great Thanksgiving, be safe.

Chairwoman Archer: Oh yes, same to you, same to you, Herb.