



THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE NEW YORK

COMMON COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 3, 2022, 6:30 p.m.

Virtual

The Council Meeting was conducted using videoconferencing, as permitted by the NYS Open Meetings Law.

Welcome to the regularly scheduled Meeting of the City of Poughkeepsie Common Council the date is January 3, 2022, and the time is 6:52 pm.

I'd like to acknowledge that we are gathered, wherever we are, on the traditional territory of the Lenape people and this territory was a critical resting place along a popular trade route for people of the Lenape Nation and other cultures as is evidenced in the earliest derivation of the name 'Poughkeepsie' with an indigenous string of words, U-puku-ipi-sing, that, when translated, means 'reed-covered lodge by the little water place' or resting place.

Let's all recite the pledge of allegiance.

I. ROLL CALL - ALL PRESENT

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES:

Public Hearing Meeting December 20, 2021

Common Council Meeting December 20, 2021

A motion was made by Councilmember Cherry and seconded by Councilmember Menist to accept the minutes.

III. READING OF ITEMS by the City Chamberlain of any items not listed on the printed agenda.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Laurie Sandow, S. Grand Ave. – submitted written comments

I'd like to welcome the New Year and offer congratulations to the re-elected and incoming first-time councilmembers. Considering how many of those sworn in today have never spoken, and possibly never even attended a previous Council meeting, it's going to be fascinating to watch as you reveal yourselves.

The first fascination is what a bad start this council is off to, posting a deceitful agenda to the public that lists the Mayor's comments as the 6th item, while the Rules just passed at the Council's Organizational Meeting send the Mayor's comments to 10th on the list, the nextto-last agenda item, at the rear end of each meeting.

This not only leaves the public scratching our heads, it tramples the public's sensibilities as well as our interests. After being removed from the Council agenda in September 2020, the Mayor's comments were finally restored in August 2021. No sooner did that happen, when a certain childish Council faction began using those comments for a time-consuming, politicized game of "Gotcha". The very same council that itself, to this day, adamantly refuses to respond to, or otherwise open themselves to engage questions and answers from the public. This very same Council is now using their own self-created Gotcha delays as the excuse why they must defer the Mayor's comments until the end of meetings. Shame on the councilmembers, new and old, who consented and colluded with this new rule—whether conscious, clueless, or willfully deceitful.

The City Charter Preamble describes the Council as (direct quote) "representatives of the people of the City". I defy a single councilmember to defend this latest Rules revision as one representing the will of the people. Not only doesn't this Council oversee the City's daily operations, half the time members of this Council don't even oversee, or make public, their own operations. Let's take, for example, Chair Salem's recent letter regarding the Wallace Campus, or ex-councilmember Brannen's letter regarding a different development. Was the public consulted before these letters were written? Were these letters disclosed and released to the public after being written? No, of course not. Some new Councilmembers are anxious to get their first resolution on the books. Let me suggest you start by cleaning the Council's own house:

- Sponsor a resolution that will nullify all votes by any specific councilmember who shows up late, and/or leaves early, at any given Council meeting;

- Sponsor a resolution where councilmembers must remain visible on camera during a meeting's entirety;

- Sponsor a resolution requiring that the list of all Zoom attendees at Council meetings be made visible to the public while the meeting is in session, and that each attendee must register individually, and not through a list submitted by a third party or proxy;

- Sponsor a resolution requiring Open Data; and that City documents be posted with time stamps, using a text format that's searchable, as opposed to the current image format;

- Sponsor a resolution where any public hearing and any deadline for public comments at any City board, committee, commission, etc., must be prominently posted on the front (landing) page of the City website at least seven days prior to each and every hearing or deadline, and where relevant documents are linked to the notification;

- Sponsor a resolution where councilmembers must use only their City-provided Email addresses for all City-related matters, and not personal addresses and/or personal social media. Include a schedule of penalties that will be imposed if/when councilmembers block access and/or prevent viewing or comments by any member of the public;

- Sponsor a resolution where councilmembers who fail to attend public hearings cannot sponsor or vote on any future legislation related to the hearing(s) they did not attend;
- Sponsor a resolution that prevents motions for adjournment from being used as antidemocratic weaponry, including but not limited to quashing walk-on resolutions;
- Sponsor a resolution where councilmembers who don't have medical excuses don't get paid for meetings they fail to attend, and where the reasons for all so-called "excused absences" are made public;
- Sponsor a resolution getting rid of the Council's willful intimidation of the public via the presence of a Sergeant-at-Arms; Hold regular Ward meetings that are announced and open to all City residents. Welcome the public, rather than reject them. Keep the public informed;
- Start abiding by Freedom of Information requests. Whether yourself or fellow councilmember, stop breaking the law and/or aiding others in non-responsiveness and fraudulent responses to Freedom of Information requests;
- Always remember that you are public servants, and that Zoom has put a wall between yourselves and the public. The public is acutely aware of the lack of attention and chosen distractions of Councilmembers during meetings, which are documented on-screen— Council members texting each other, their friends and others while Council meetings are in session; councilmembers with loud TVs and other distractions in the background; councilmembers whose cameras are not properly set; councilmembers interacting with family members, etc. Stop complaining that it's comments posted by the public in the Zoom chat that are distracting you.

If you want to serve the public and make your mark on this Council and this City, there's an endless list of ways to do that. Begin your service by cleaning the Council's own house. Wishing you all a happy new year.

2. Ken Stier – submitted written comments

Happy New Year to Everyone & Congratulations to this new Council, especially to the new members.

There are three issues I want to mention briefly here this evening which I think need pretty urgent Council attention and focus. I will soon be submitting fuller comments on all three, including a letter I intend to send to the Dutchess County Supreme Court involving one of our community's longest standing controversies which is now bogged down in court – and where I think there has been some egregious legal shenanigans.

But first, the upcoming rehabilitation of two Fallkill bridges – at two key intersections: Brookside Ave & Garden Street, at the even more crucial five-way intersection at Washington Ave, Verrazzano Blvd, N. Bridge, Brookside and Fallkill Place. I have been in close contact with the City's engineering department, have a good deal of respect for them, but it is no criticism of them that I say that this multi-million dollar project is simply too darn important to be left just to them. Besides fixing the deteriorated bridges, this project offers a one-time opportunity not just to remedy traffic and pedestrian woes, but to truly transform these critical crossroads, so

heavily trafficked by out-of-towners visiting the Walkway, into something genuinely appealing. How many of us aware that two pocket parks are contemplated for the Washington intersection? That's why the Parks department (DPW) needs to be involved and others too, all overseen by the Council. (Scenic Hudson has also offered important suggestions.)

Secondly, the Wallace Campus planned for Main Street. With ~200 units it's big, and will have a momentous impact. It seems poised to be voted on soon and seems likely to be approved by the Planning Board. But again, such a hugely consequential project should not be left just to this one entity, a volunteer board which went out of their way to insist that economic and social impacts were not really part of their remit. That's why the Council has to quickly get up to speed on this, consult experts and maybe have their own public hearings.

I am agnostic about the project. I still need to do more reporting about its likely impact. But as it is now configured, I do have concerns. Dutchess County, the whole region, clearly needs more affordable housing. No argument there. But most successful affordable housing projects, especially in sensitive City locations, are mixed housing, including some market rate. This has none. Instead, it has 30 units of supportive housing which are for folks with major life challenges. They of course deserve decent housing, but I do question whether it serves Poughkeepsie's best long-term interests to have these folks smack in the middle of our City's central business district (CBD), on a block finally getting some revival traction.

Anyone familiar with day-to-day conditions there know they are pretty ugly. This project could easily metastasize that into a larger mess. I'm also concerned that there seems to be a disconnect between what police brass say about this area and future challenges and what rank and file cops know and tell you privately. In short, the City faces huge risks with this project which can only benefit from more independent analysis – including some already in the pipeline: a housing study underway at Patterns for Progress, and the City's own, long overdue comprehensive plan. A project of this magnitude should be subjected to all necessary deliberation, which I think has not been case yet. Remember the down-the-road consequences will be set and owned by this Council, on your Watch.

Thirdly, I have come to the conclusion that this administration of Mayor Rob Rolison is engaging in malfeasance – a word I don't use lightly. And it gives me no pleasure either to reach that conclusion. I like Rob, think he is a decent person, but he, and Marc Nelson - who I like even more – have, I think, gone over the line in support of the developers Steve Tinkelman and Wayne Nussbickel in their effort to build in Wheaton Park, in gross, repeated and aggressive contravention of the City's established regulatory processes. I will soon be sharing with you a letter which details why I think this is the case, and what it means for the Council.

Thank you.

Ken Stier
31 Verrazzano Blvd
845-345-9301
January 3, 2021

Official Minutes of the Common Council Meeting of January 3, 2022

January 7, 2022
Judge Hal B. Greenwald, J.S.C.
Dutchess County Supreme Court
10 Market Street
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Dear Judge Greenwald,

I write to bring to your attention highly irregular and I believe unethical submissions made in bad faith to the Court by attorneys on both sides in the case Pelton Partners, LLC v. City of Poughkeepsie, Common Council and the Historic District and Landmark Preservation Commission. (Index No.2021-50400). The Court, it appears, has been defrauded.

In one instance, Paul Ackermann, then still the City's Corporation Counsel, signed a stipulation of process (11/12/21 – NYSCEF Doc. No. 126) on behalf of his three clients, that they agreed to adjourn the underlying litigation for 90 days so that the Historic District and Landmark Preservation Commission (HDLPC) could consider an amended application from Pelton Partners. Actually, the stipulation, as you signed 11/22/21) commits that the application "will be considered and acted upon, by the HDLPC." The problem with that is that two of Mr. Ackermann's clients, the HDLPC and the Common Council, were not only not consulted, they were not notified of this submission made on their behalf. Furthermore, I feel confident to say that neither would have agreed to this adjournment if they had been consulted. It also seems clear that Mr. Ackermann, who has been intimately involved with this controversy from the outset in his decade's employment with the City, almost certainly knew this to be the case. It would seem then, that Mr. Ackermann not only violated professional ethics related to conflict of interests, but did so in bad faith. Knowing how City Hall works he would have almost certainly done this at the direction of City Administrator Marc Nelson, at the behest of Mayor Rob Rolison.

In another instance, plaintiff's counsel, Kenneth Stenger submitted what I believe was an intentional effort to deceive the Court. I refer in particular to his November 11, 2021 letter (NYSCEF Doc. No. 123) to the Court in which he tried to explain why a second stipulation of settlement (NYSCEF Doc. No. 125) was only signed by himself, not also by Mr. Ackermann. That lacunae, he averred, was simply due to "some confusion as we tried to wrap up in the midst of Paul's transition from public service to private sector." This seems a ludicrous explanation and I expect it raised red flags for the Court.

Although the stipulation of agreement was naturally conditional on HDLPC issuing a certificate of appropriateness, my reading of Mr. Stenger's letter was that he slyly tried to conflate the conditional with a purported actual agreement reached by all parties. "This submission is made on behalf of all parties," he wrote. Mr. Stenger, I believe, is too accomplished a legal practitioner to have not known that this was a

falsehood – viz., that in fact all parties were not actually involved in the decision, and that no such accord would have resulted if the Common Council and the HDLPC had been consulted. Most egregious it seems, of course, is his fairly transparent effort to mislead the Court.

If the Court is in any doubt about this version, I hope the Court will act on Mr. Stenger's offer, again made on Mr. Ackermann's behalf, that "Paul will make time in his personal schedule to appear on this issue." I believe that Mr. Ackermann balked at signing this second stipulation because it was simply a fiction too far.

The truth is that there has been considerable behind-the-scenes pressure from City Hall upon the Corporation Counsel office to try to advance the agenda of the opposing side (Pelton Partners) by making these mis-representations. I believe that Sarah Wilson, who resigned from the Corporation Counsel's office, effective January 7, 2022, could provide additional corroboration.

Another reason compelling this communication, is that Poughkeepsie's new lead attorney, Rebecca Valk, apparently sees no need to correct the record even though she has been appraised by the HDLPC that both stipulations squarely contradict the Commission's repeated position. It is also concerning that Ms. Valk serves on the New York State Appellate Division (2nd Department) disciplinary committee.

This Court will decide the matter before it on strictly legal grounds but why not benefit from the broader context, which I have reported on extensively over the three plus years since I moved my family from Brooklyn to Poughkeepsie and became aware of this issue, one of the longest running controversies in our community. (The article link below exposes City Hall's earlier sub rosa efforts in this case.)

It is bad enough that the plaintiffs have repeatedly demonstrated that they do not respect the statutory authority of the HDLPC (evidenced, inter alia, by submitting "amended applications" that do virtually nothing to address the multiple reasons the HDLPC cited for denying developers a 'certificate of appropriateness,' and instead offer entirely inappropriate inducements outside the Commission's remit), but now we are witnessing that City Hall is in open league with the developers over the interests of the citizens of Poughkeepsie. Under the latest charter revision, there are supposed to be co-equal branches of government, but by recent actions Mayor Rolison and his team demonstrate that they feel entitled to arrogate to itself the power to determine what is best for the City, in clear contravention of the City's established regulatory processes. This clear partisan support for the developers, rides roughshod over the mayoral-appointed HDLPC and the Common Council's overwhelming endorsement of the Commission, even to the point that City Hall is now willing to bend the law. This would seem to constitute malfeasance.

I am far from alone in hoping that this most recent demonstration of bad faith by the plaintiffs, and more shamefully, by City Hall, will hasten a Court decision to end this painful charade.

Respectfully,

Kenneth J. Stier

3. Naomi Brooks – submitted written comments

New year, new beginnings! I wanted to take a moment to welcome the new council members, and to thank the returning ones for continuing their good work. I was a resident of the first ward and am now in the eighth, but my interest lies in the open spaces throughout our city; the interesting industrial, social, and architectural history that exists in each ward; and the amazing geography we have access to along the Hudson River and the lands beyond.

I've been a pretty regular commenter at city meetings for the last 7 years. One of the projects that is still ongoing and has taken a lot of my attention is the plight of the city-owned Pelton Mansion at Wheaton Park. The shortest bit of background:

Eight years ago, Poughkeepsie was in dire financial straits. The city put out a request for proposals on the development and reuse of the Pelton site at 36 N. Clover Street, a 2.26 acre property in the Mt. Carmel neighborhood. A successful local developer submitted the accepted proposal, and for the last 7 years their project has, time and time again, come before the Common Council and various boards and commissions.

Why is it taking so long? In the same time frame, multiple projects representing close to 1,000 housing units have been proposed, evaluated, approved, and built. This project has stalled due to the developers' inappropriate original plan and subsequent meager revisions causing years of delays. Thoughtfully considering each submission has used countless hours of our city's administration and Common Council members' time, as well as the unpaid time of our boards and commissions. It is based on a contract written when the city was under a different administration, the Council had different members, and the city's financial position gave the developers the upper hand in negotiations.

The N. Clover project hasn't moved forward because it hit a stumbling block – the Historic District and Landmarks Preservation Commission denied a Certificate of Appropriateness, determining that the landmark's historical significance would be severely compromised by the inappropriate project. The developers responded by suing everyone, and the lawsuit is still pending.

I've sent the Chamberlain a short q&a I wrote 3 years ago this month with the slightly more detailed comments about this project, to be included in the minutes for this meeting. Please take a few moments to read it, because in 3 years nothing has really changed.

This city is in a very different position now, with a better bond rating and lower budget deficit, and new businesses being attracted at an accelerating rate. As a community, we cannot settle for mediocrity when great promise lies ahead for using Wheaton land and the Pelton mansion in a more creative manner that takes advantage of its open spaces and its history.

We are on the cusp of adopting a revitalization plan of the waterfront with an expanded definition of the area, and a city-wide comprehensive plan. Let's align a new request for proposals with the missions of those updated documents. It is time to hit the reset button for what to do with this property and building.

The appraisal on the property, done over a decade ago, was for an economic time now past.

The appraisal asked for the value of the property's "best and highest use", that is, to get the most money from the sale of the property. The "best and highest use" was to build new housing.

Why does this matter now? In 2008, the city was in dire financial circumstances with no substantial prospects for new development or business. This is no longer the case, and it would be better to look for longer-term revenue from this property rather than revenue from a one-time purchase. A new appraisal could address a broader range of uses, and have updated figures reflecting the current economic times.

The request for proposals was narrow and limiting.

The request for proposals was issued with very specific criteria, including type of respondent and type of project. The timeline for submission of proposals was so short that it effectively removed anyone without prior knowledge of the proposal, or immense resources to devote to answering the request.

Why does this matter now? In opening the request to a wider range of project types and entities prepared to create those projects, the city would invite innovative ideas that mesh better with current and future trends for using key properties such as this.

The current developers have many clauses in their contract that benefit them, not the city.

The contract of sale includes many ways that the developers can either lower their purchase price or cancel the contract, including if they are not allowed to build a certain number of residences and if they do not receive the tax breaks they request.

Why does this matter now? The process of bringing the project in front of various city boards is not over yet. This means that for years, the property has been left vacant and still owned by the city. Having the contract in place means that no one else can move other plans forward, yet the developers can opt out for a number of reasons.

There have been many objections to almost every aspect of this project over many years.

An outpouring of public comment against removal of this parcel of land from a park designation was the first in a vocal opposition. The Common Council, Planning

Board, and Historic District and Landmarks Preservation Commission all had major concerns with the proposed project, which necessitated public comment sessions and many revisions. The sheer number of times revisions needed to be made is an indicator of how poor a fit this proposal is with the criteria, guidelines, and visions that the city uses to approve new projects.

Why does this matter now? The city does not maintain this property as a park, does not have one-time income from the sale of the property, and does not have ongoing tax income from the use of this property.

If not this proposed project, then what?

Alternatives to a large residential project (44 units and 67 parking spaces) would be more in line with current research findings about urban planning. Residents and tourists are looking for walkable places, green spaces, and a variety of cultural, recreational, and shopping/dining experiences. This property is in a key geographical location, steps from the train station, walkway, and waterfront. It can be used as a key welcoming point to the neighborhood and the city.

Suggested alternatives include a visitors center, café, museum, art/performance space, gallery/shop, and more. State and Federal grant money to support endeavors like these, as well as area not-for-profits, can be combined to offer a competitive plan. In the long term, tax revenue from such endeavors could equal or surpass the current plan. Research has also shown that having a vibrant attraction in an area raises the value of surrounding real estate, a “ripple effect” return on investment to an alternate project.

What can we do to ensure the best use of this property?

Contact members of the Common Council, the City Planner, or Mayor Rollison. All phone numbers and e-mail addresses are on the city website. Ask that they re-open the process to entertain new ideas, and ask that they secure and maintain the building and grounds in the interim, as all property owners are required to do.

-Naomi Brooks , January 2019

V. CHAIRPERSON’S COMMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

I want to keep it brief tonight.

Happy New Year, everyone.

I hope everyone had a safe and enjoyable New Year celebration, holiday celebration and welcome to 2022. As we enter this New Year, we're in a different spot than we were in 2021. However, we are still experiencing a surge of COVID cases throughout Dutchess County, throughout New York State, throughout the country. And you know, it's a

little concerning. However, I feel optimistic in knowing that we did do a distribution of at home kits. I hope that the mayor will be able to fill us in a little later on when we'll be able to do a bigger distribution of at home testing kits. It's important, if you can, to continue to wear a mask in public places. Masks work. And if you're not boosted, if you're not vaccinated and you can get vaccinated and you can get boosted, go get the shot. It's unfortunate, you know, to see people end up hospitalized.

The majority of folks who are hospitalized don't have the vaccine and it could have been prevented, they could have just gotten sick, right? They could have just gotten a cough, could have had a fever, didn't have to go to the hospital if you just had the vaccine. But once you're in the hospital, it's too late for that. So it's critical to get the vaccine. And then, you know, will help, you know, help to kind of lessen the spread of the virus if we're all kind of pitching in together and doing that. I know getting an at home test, if they're not being distributed by a city government or the county, is expensive. Some of the tests cost upwards of 23 bucks for a box of two. That's a lot of money.

And knowing that you know the only effective way to limit this virus is to be able to test day after day after day. So taking one single test isn't, unfortunately, really going to tell you all the time whether or not you're testing positive. We need a supply of at home tests for everyone so that we can test on a weekly basis, on a daily basis, so that we can see it within the stages of, you know, I came in contact with the virus. Now I'm showing symptoms and now I know I'm either negative or positive. Otherwise we're just going to keep spreading it like wildfire.

Additionally, you know, beyond COVID, I feel very optimistic knowing that we have, you know, American Rescue Plan funds, or we can really dig in to programs throughout the community, to youth programming, our new division of Youth Development and Opportunity is being funded over a million dollars. That's thanks to the work of our previous council, and now it's up to this common council to ensure that those funds get spent and attributed correctly. But I feel that we're in a really strong position as a community, as a city, and I want to especially, you know, give a nod and congratulations to our incoming common council members who have never served on the common council before.

And I want to, of course, give a nod to our council members who have been serving for years, or maybe just even the last term. And I want to give a special congratulations just in case you didn't catch the organizational meeting to Councilmember Cherry for being elected our vice chair and Councilmember Menist for being nominated as the majority leader for us for this term.

And that concludes my comments.

VI. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND BOARDS:

VII. MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS:

VIII. ORDINANCES AND LOCAL LAWS:

IX. PRESENTATIONS OF PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

1. **A COMMUNICATION FROM COUNCILMEMBER FLOWERS**, on an Inter-Municipal Agreement with Poughkeepsie City School District and the City of Poughkeepsie on the Student Athletic Basketball Program

A motion was made by Councilmember Cherry and seconded by Councilmember Long to defer the below communications to Corporation Counsel.

2. **FROM CGR ASSOCIATIES LLC.**, a notice of intent for Los Amigos Mexican Restaurant of Poughkeepsie Corp. to obtain a Liquor License.
3. **FROM NATARA BUSH**, a notice of personal injury sustained on September 17, 2021.
4. **FROM EDNA RIVERA**, a notice of personal injury sustained on October 2, 2021.
5. **FROM MANDEEP SINGH**, a notice of personal injury sustained on October 7, 2021.

XI. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Thank you, Chair and happy new year to everybody both here in the council meeting tonight and to individuals that are watching and to all of the residents of the City of Poughkeepsie.

Give you an update on the home test kit distribution. As many of you know, we gave out over 600 home test kits. That's what we received on the day before Christmas Eve. The way that this went with the county and it's a state to county to local municipality distribution at this point, is on Monday the week before Christmas, we were advised that the county would be receiving test kits from the state. We were not. We didn't know how many there were going to be getting, approximately 11,000, and I don't think that that's what they ended up receiving. The test kits were going to be distributed to municipalities based on a percentage of population. We received a little over 600 on Wednesday. We had put a plan together prior to that to distribute them at 505, utilizing Police Department staff, which we did. All test kits were distributed. Then came the conversation about what would come next.

And it was a bit unclear when the next supply from the state would be coming to the county and when to the municipalities. We were under the impression early on that we would be receiving additional test kits the following week. We weren't sure when because the county didn't know when they were going to be getting them. We didn't know the number.

We were hopeful, as all municipalities were, that as the governor had had said that they were going to be ramping up the amount of kits that they were going to be getting and they'd be going down to the local municipalities.

I can tell you that a decision was made by the state and not too long after that was discussed amongst all of us with the mayors and supervisors that school districts were going to be receiving test kits additionally, as well. What happened was all of the test kits have gone. Well, what we thought would be coming to us and the school districts went to the school districts. We don't know as of right now when we will be getting additional test kits from the county through the state. We are ready to distribute. A lot is going to have to do with how many we get and obviously what the hours will be.

Our expectation is we do want to be agile in the locations that we can give them to and to the areas that they're going to be distributed. Also, we had conversations with the school district on, you know, on what they're doing. We don't want to duplicate. We want to make sure that test kits are given out so we're not, you know, we're not giving them to the places that they already have them.

This is really a bit of a work in progress. John Penney on our end and the emergency management team are working on this. As soon as we know we will let you know.

I think hopefully that as test kits become more available, we'll be able to do other things with them and have them say set in set locations where people can come get them versus, say, a drive up or a walk up, which 505 went really well.

From everything that was going on there that day, people were able to get the kits that they needed. And hopefully at some point in time again, when test kits become more available, we'll be able to do different things and we're and we will be working with the council members.

But right now, that's all we know. I know the federal government, the president has said about getting, you know, half a billion test kits and get them into the system. I think hopefully, as we saw early on in the pandemic when testing was critical and there were only certain areas that you could go and certain places to get tested, that it changed and they became more available. And that's what we believe will happen with the home testing as well.

I want to congratulate all the new council members tonight at the swearing in ceremony here at City Hall. It's always good to see that, you know, people, you know, coming on, getting excited about being able to be members of this common council, which you know is so important to the city of Poughkeepsie and, Chair, I'm just going to end with this tonight.

I'm not sure why I was moved down the agenda. All right. This was the first that I saw it. We didn't you and I didn't have any discussion about that. And certainly at some point in time, I guess we can. I don't think it makes a lot of sense to be at the end of the meeting, but that's me. I also think that I heard from several council people about the question and answer session that went on after I was removed from the council agenda, put back on the council agenda. And there was this Q&A that sometimes went probably longer than some people wanted. What I would respectfully say is we shouldn't be doing a Q&A, that there are times between council

Official Minutes of the Common Council Meeting of January 3, 2022

meetings when we can have these discussions, whether it's a phone call, whether it's an email, whether it's a leadership meeting. I don't think it does any of us any good, especially to have questions asked of the administration that we're not prepared to answer, because it just it's not a good time allotment for the public who are on these meetings and sometimes extremely long. So that's my feeling on that. I hope we can have some follow up dialogue on that. But again, for the first meeting of the year, I look forward to working with all you and thank you, Chair.

A motion was made by Councilmember Menist and seconded by Councilmember Cherry for a 5-minute recess due to the Chair's technical difficulties.

A motion was made by Councilmember Menist and seconded by Councilmember Long to resume the meeting.

XII. NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Councilmember Thompson and seconded by Councilmember Menist to adjourn the meeting at 7:42pm.

Dated: Tuesday, January 18, 2022.

I hereby certify that this true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Common Council Organizational Meeting held on Monday, January 3, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

**Jasmin Nicole Davis
City Chamberlain**

