

**PHYSICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

**(REMOTELY)
MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2021
3:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: Barry J. Cheney, Chairman
Leigh J. Benton, Katie Bonelli, James M. Kulisek,
Michael D. Paduch, Paul Ruskiewicz, Peter V. Tuohy

ALSO

PRESENT: L. Stephen Brescia, Chairman
Thomas J. Faggione, Legislator
John S. Vero, Legislator
Betsy N. Abraham, Legislative Counsel
Harold J. Porr, III., Deputy County Executive
Dan Bloomer, Director, Operations and Cost Control
Stacy Butler, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Erik Denega, Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works
Travis Ewald, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering Div.
Brian Titsworth, Deputy Commissioner of Infrastructure Services
(Buildings and Grounds), Dept. of Public Works
James S. Brooks, Commissioner of Parks, Recreation & Conservation
Deanna P. Crawford, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Parks, Recreation &
Conservation
Deborah Slesinski, Deputy Budget Director
Liz Delaney, Budget Analyst
Dina Sena, Budget Analyst
Andrea Nilon, Board Members, Friends of Hill Hold
Dan Vaughan, Board Members, Friends of Hill Hold

Chairman Cheney opened the committee meeting at 3:30 p.m. by asking everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. All committee members were present with the exception of Legislator Minuta who was absent.

Mr. Ruskiewicz moved to adopt a resolution of the Orange County Legislature Assuming Lead Agency status under State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) with respect to the Bank Street Bridge Replacement (BIN 3345180) in the Village of Warwick, classifying the action as Unlisted and determining that the action will not have any significant adverse environmental impacts, seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Denega explained this bridge carries Bank Street over the Waywayanda Creek in the Village of Warwick, has a 39-foot span, was built in 1936 and was partially reconstructed in 1982. The entire superstructure is in poor condition, so the bridge is currently closed to vehicle traffic due to the conditions of the outer beams and concrete deck. He added that the bridge replacement has been designed in-house by the Orange County Department of Public Works staff and construction would be anticipated to begin late summer of 2021.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Ruskiewicz moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget for the Bank Street Bridge Replacement (BIN 3345180) in the Village of Warwick. This project has been approved under the 2021 Capital Plan as Project No. 36. Upon approval, the funds will increase existing Capital Project No. 467, \$850,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Denega stated this request is to approve the funds for the Bank Street Bridge replacement.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mrs. Bonelli moved to adopt a resolution authorizing an Inter-Municipal Agreement between the County of Orange and the Town of Cornwall for improvements along Main Street (County Route 9), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Denega explained the attorney for the Town of Cornwall reached out to him regarding a grant the town received for pedestrian safety improvements along Main Street which is a county route. As part of the grant requirement, they need an IMA in place because the county owns the road. He stated there is an IMA already in place with the town for the sidewalks and curbs which is typically done with all municipalities in Orange County along the county routes. Mr. Chapman assisted the Department of Public Works to draw up the language which is relatively straightforward. They will also be paving this section of the road as well as making separate pedestrian improvements which is through grant funds.

Mr. Ewald stated one component of the IMA is the town will be maintaining the improvements being made.

Mr. Denega mentioned that this is also the dormitory authority of the State of New York.

Mr. Kulisek clarified that for this phase, there will be no cost to the county.

Mr. Denega stated that is correct, this is a town project based on maintenance.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Paduch moved to approve the request to accept and appropriate the Municipal Zero-emission Vehicle (ZEV) Infrastructure Grant Program, Round 4 award from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in the amount of \$88,701.12 for the Government Center, \$65,364.88 for 18 Seward Avenue, and \$64,924.88 for Thomas Bull Memorial Park for a total of \$218,990.88. Each will have its own separate contract. The source of funds is state grant

funds, and the term is two (2) years. The grant will be used for electrical upgrades, site work, and to purchase and install electric vehicle supply equipment for Level 2 charging stations with two (2) plugs/ports, seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Denega explained this is a project that they worked closely on with the Planning Department to come up with the grant funds that were recently awarded. As discussed, the three locations which were just indicated, each would be considered a separate project. They have had the staff go out and evaluate what types of electrical upgrade would be required for each charging station to make this work. The electrical upgrades that are included along with the way the application was written was to make the charging stations large enough for future expansion anticipating that these programs go well and there will be one unit at each site with a double port. He stated they would also look at potentially having enough of an electrical upgrade to expand each site as well since electrical vehicles are becoming more common. It is his understanding that at this point that this would be open for public charging and believes that because the grant includes the first two-years of electrical costs that the cost to charge would be zero to anyone deciding to use it. He also mentioned that some of the conversations he has had with New York State Counties Highway Superintendent Association have been about the Governor's Office and pushing out more fleets for all municipal and county government so there are more electric vehicles in the future. Furthermore, this is a good step for the county to get used to the chargers, the electrical billing, and the software. To clarify a question, the cost associated with each of one these individual sites are above and beyond the typical \$20,000 to \$30,000 just to install each unit. The electrical upgrades will vary from the three sites because there is more of an expense at Seward Avenue and the Government Center, but the grant funding also includes a lot of soft costs.

Mr. Titsworth added that the state also wants the county to report the reduction in emissions.

Mr. Tuohy asked what the anticipated costs will be after the two-year free period and how long will it take for a person to charge their vehicle.

Mr. Denega replied these are mid-grade charging stations which is a level 2, and it can take two to four hours to charge a vehicle. He stated they do make more robust units that take 20 to 30 minutes to charge which is much more powerful. The charge right now for example, at Seward Avenue would be 62 cents per kilowatt hour and multiplying that by 12 hours per day, 5 days a week at 52 weeks per year for two years, that cost came out to \$1,100.00. He pointed out this is the first time he is dealing with the charging stations; therefore, this is the information on the grant application, so he must do further research on the other numbers.

Mr. Tuohy clarified that Mr. Denega is anticipating that people would use the charging station for two to four hours and asked if this would work the same for employees.

Mr. Denega stated he would tend to agree and does not think there is anything that would keep someone from charging for a half an hour and driving away. Regarding an employee, he/she can plug in for a half day and then unplug at lunchtime and his understanding is that the charging stations will be open to the public and employees.

Mr. Titsworth mentioned that some of the sites for employees should have a time limit since it is a level 2, so there may be some sort of signage to encourage someone to move their car to let someone else be able to charge their car.

Mr. Tuohy asked if we are responsible for the electric bill or will it go directly to the customer.

Mr. Denega replied this is a reimbursable grant and the first two years of the electric bills are estimated in the grant reimbursement, so the county would get reimbursed for the first two years. After two years, this will have to be discussed internally as to the lessons learned from the first two years and the direction they should move in.

Mr. Tuohy suggested they look into what other municipalities are doing because it would be great information to have moving forward.

With the anticipated increase in electric vehicles, Mr. Kulisek asked how many charging stations will be installed at the Orange County Government Center.

Mr. Denega replied this grant covers one unit with the ability to charge two separate vehicles at the same time and that would be the same for all three sites.

Mr. Kulisek commented that when the Government Center was being built, he proposed that the charging stations infrastructure be installed at that time because the infrastructure costs would have been much lower. To put in one station with two cars being charged at the same time is not economically a smart thing to do. He stated as the car production of electric vehicles is increased, they will need to go back and add more stations, or they can put the infrastructure in now so more stations can be added when needed. He reiterated that there should be more stations for more cars in all three locations.

Mr. Denega stated that the plan is to put a robust electric grade in so it can be expanded for the future. It will grow and they will be applying for future grant funding.

Mr. Kulisek commented there is substantial rebate money for electric vehicles by municipalities from the State, so when they go to fleet replacement, they should start looking at charging stations at the Department of Public Works and/or more charging stations at the place's cars are stored. There is substantial money for rebates for electrical vehicles from the state.

Mr. Paduch stated that Mr. Kulisek said it all and he also remembers the discussion when the Government Center was being built. He asked for the breakdown of all three sites.

Mr. Denega replied the Orange County Government Center was close to \$89,000; 18 Seward Avenue in Middletown was \$65,000 and Thomas Bull Memorial Park was \$65,000.

Mr. Paduch asked who will design this.

Mr. Denega replied there are grant funds for a consultant.

Mr. Titsworth further explained the different locations and the placement of the charging stations at each one.

Mr. Benton commented that he wanted to say exactly what Mr. Kulisek said in terms of putting the conduit in the ground during the Government Center renovation so we could service more vehicles. He also thought it would have been good to do back then.

Mr. Cheney stated the county-share on this funding is at 25% which is about \$55,000 and asked where that is in the county budget.

Mr. Denega replied that would be an in-kind service, so some of it is listed as a fiscal manager working in-house. He stated a lot of it is already paid for from the operating budget.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mrs. Bonelli moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation for the purchase of a **½ ton roller used to groom** the Har-Tru tennis courts at Thomas Bull Memorial Park. This is Project No. 104 in the proposed 2021 Capital Plan, \$8,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Tuohy.

Ms. Crawford stated they are replacing a 30-year-old roller that has completely rusted out. This roller is used to maintain the clay tennis courts and is used frequently throughout the day to smooth them and keep them up to par for people using them.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Kulisek moved to adopt a resolution to grant a utility easement over a section of the Heritage Trail along Echo Lake Road (Tax Map parcel 12-1-7.12) in the Town of Goshen, seconded by Mr. Cheney.

Mr. Brooks explained that this originates out of an Orange and Rockland easement where they have to slightly move the powerlines to adjust the easement.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Ms. Crawford addressed the committee with a department update which included Parks 2020 Golf, Parks 2021 Golf, Facilities, and Parks Projects (see original minutes).

Mr. Paduch asked if the \$1.00 increase on each hole is also for seniors and veterans since they get a discounted rate.

Ms. Crawford replied the rate is going to increase by a \$1.00, but they will still get their discount.

Mr. Kulisek asked if there are any youth camps scheduled for this summer.

Mr. Brooks replied no, but they did try last year and the year before to create those types of services. Last year was tough because of COVID-19, but the previous year, they unfortunately only had two interested families. It is advertised on Facebook, on the Parks site and after reviewing it, the lack of interest stems from every municipality having their own type of summer program.

Mr. Kulisek then asked if there is a parks camp coordinator.

Mr. Brooks replied there is a position of Recreational Coordinator and again in 2019, they put together an entire package of two sessions, one at Thomas Bull Memorial Park and one at Algonquin Park for the month of June and July as well as the first two weeks of August and there was no interest.

Regarding renting the facilities, Mr. Paduch stated there were several discussions about making improvements, so the county generates more revenue. He asked if the Parks Department has been working toward doing that.

Mr. Brooks replied that all facilities are slowly re-opening now and he is open to any ideas. The only major improvements he has heard of is at the Amy Bull Crist Center.

Mr. Kulisek asked when the irrigation system work takes place.

Mr. Brooks replied that it would have to be completed by July 1, 2021 and if it is not completed by then, it would have to be done by October 1st.

Mr. Paduch asked if the golf revenue went back into the surplus fund.

Ms. Crawford replied it was put back into the general fund.

Mr. Paduch then asked if their budget was increased regarding the revenue earned from the golf course.

Ms. Crawford replied no, it was left the same.

The next agenda item was a brief discussion regarding Hill Hold project funds.

Mr. Cheney stated there is a roofing project that needs to take place and there have been some discussions between the Commissioner and Friends of Hill Hold regarding the use of county-owned property (see original minutes). He asked that Commissioner Brooks outline that and give the committee an update on where this stands.

Mr. Brooks explained that last year there were some leaks that were patched in-house because the total cost to repair the entire roof is around \$30,000.00 and his plea to the county is that there is a symbiotic relationship when it comes to Hill Hold that has taken place and will continue to work fine, but he does not see how the county can pay for everything if these groups are only doing fundraisers to support the property. The genesis of this discussion with the different groups is that they need to start exploring how they can work together, and the county can maintain these operations, but the realization is that they cannot pay for this operation of maintenance 100% of the time for every facility. For example, the Friends of the Arboretum have put up a few structures at no cost to the county and were able to pay for all the material for the parking lot they wanted, therefore, that is the background of the discussion taking place today. He has questions and concerns as to what happens when there is a major repair or issue with one of the facilities. Under the county budget, he is paying for two people who give tours, so this is an opportunity to have a discussion in how to assist with fundraising for these groups to help pay for maintenance and operation costs.

Ms. Nilon stated that Mr. Brooks is correct when speaking about the maintenance issues on all these buildings but regarding the roof, there are two things they are talking about. In 1969 when the county took title to the property, there was a resolution passed stating it was the responsibility of the county to maintain the structures that were there, whether that has been done appropriately is another issue as she understands it becomes a budget issue. She thanked Mr. Brooks for helping with the issues they have had and pointed out that they will lose that house if the proper roof is not put on. Furthermore, there is also damage to the plaster walls inside the house and even though they were closed this past year, Friends did a massive cleaning, sorted things out and identified some of the things they think are important to the county to maintain and keep. She reiterated that the roof needs attention.

Mr. Vaughan commented that he and Mr. Brooks reviewed a lot of the issues but did not take care of the electrical problems. He pointed out that there was a new roof put on the Brick-House Museum and the barn, but the main house is very bad. These roofs should last much longer than they are and should not have water leaks.

Chairman Brescia stated that the prices have increased and whoever is installing a roof, needs it to be installed correctly to uphold the warranty. Even though Mr. Brooks' long-range plan is to do improvements at Hill Hold, this needs to be discussed and not forgotten.

Mr. Brooks stated everyone has the hope for the material for the roof and the historical access can be taken care of, but as far as holding different event there, they can only charge a venue fee. He added that at some point there needs to be a discussion about how the county establishes a relationship with the different groups.

Mr. Paduch commented that they need to make the needed improvements to make the parks be in the best shape they can be to generate revenue.

Mr. Touhy clarified that the estimate for the roof and the materials is open-ended in case more work needs to be done.

Mr. Brooks stated if they buy the material direct, there will not be enough charged for the contract and yes, when the roof was repaired last time it was structurally fine.

Mr. Tuohy stated that the roof should be done completely and after that any other work that needs to be done should be looked at.

Mr. Cheney clarified that Mr. Brooks can move forward with this project and fund both components being the material and the labor.

Mr. Brooks stated that is correct.

Mr. Cheney stated that will put them in a position, not today, but at a later date, the legislature's philosophy going forward for improvements and future maintenance relative to our parks and the relationships we have with the Friends.

Ms. Nilon and the committee further discussed maintenance of the properties and how important it is to have funds for improvements in the budget.

Mr. Paduch moved to adopt a resolution confirming appointments of the nomination submitted by the Incorporated Orange County Chapter of the New York State Archeological Association to the Dutchess Quarry Sites National Register District Management Committee (S. Benson, B. Kass), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Cheney reviewed the resumes of two individuals for appointment to the Dutchess Quarry Sites National Register District Management that the Incorporated Orange County Chapter of the New York State Archeological Association submitted (see original minutes). He pointed out that this organization has been involved for many years and suggested this request be approved by the committee.

Motion carried. All in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.