

**MINUTES OF THE REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
OF THE SCHENECTADY CITY COUNCIL
February 13, 2023**

The City Council meeting was called to order by the City Council President Marion Porterfield at 7:00 P.M. in room 209, City Council chambers at City Hall.

Ms. Porterfield asked Reverend Brad Jones of Christ Church to offer the invocation.

Ms. Porterfield then called on Rebecca Paavola and students of the SEAT Center to lead the pledge of allegiance.

The City Clerk called the roll and the following members of the City Council answered to be present:

Present - Councilmembers: John Mootoveren, Doreen Ditoro, Damonni Farley, Carl Williams, John Polimeni, and Marion Porterfield

Also Present - Mayor Gary R. McCarthy, City Clerk Samanta R. Mykoo, and Corporation Counsel Andrew B. Koldin, Esq.

At this point, Ms. Porterfield asked if there were no obligations, she would like to take agenda item twenty-five out of order. There were no objections.

Resolution No. 2023-014 A Resolution Recognizing Black History Month 2023

The resolution was moved by Mr. Farley and seconded by Mr. Williams. The resolution passed unanimously.

The resolution was accepted by Adonis Richards, a Youth Development Coordinator for the African American History Records Project. He thanked the Mayor and Council for their recognition.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Porterfield asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the January 23, 2023 council meeting as submitted by the City Clerk. Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Farley seconded the motion.

COMMUNICATIONS PRESENTED TO THE CITY COUNCIL

Official:

None.

General:

From Camille Sasinowski, two emails dated January 23rd and February 10th, asking each of the Council Members to look out for the well being of the citizens of Schenectady urging them to vote against the Clean Slate Act.

From Reverend Nicolle D. Jean-Simon, an email encouraging Council Members to support the Clean Slate Act to help people gain access to employment, housing, education and other essentials as they start over & re-enter public life after incarceration

From David Giacalone, an email and letter addressing the ARPA funds for Sidewalk Improvements and the Creative Outdoor Advertising presentation. He asks that the funds for the sidewalk improvement not be approved without getting real numbers and cogent explanations because it will cost the City much more than expected and had questions to be thoughtfully considered before the start of negotiation for the Creative Outdoor Advertising.

From Martin Alan Greenberg, an email in support of the Clean Slate Act; there are a variety of safeguards in the legislation to ensure that community safety is maintained and the benefits outweigh any disadvantages

Petitions:

None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR (LEGISLATIVE ITEMS):

Ms. Porterfield invited all who wished to address the Legislative Agenda to come forward or otherwise submit their comments to the City Clerk:

Claudia Cavanagh - Asks that Council consider employers and property owners when voting on the Resolution to support the New York State Clean Slate Act. Also expressed concerns about the wording of the proposal in terms of which offenses will or will not be disclosed under the Act. Suggested Council refocuses efforts on the standardized test passing rate in the city's public schools.

Anthony Alexander - Stated that it is a group community effort to raise and shape our kids in order to give them the best possible chance of success. Also spoke about the lack of assistance and discrimination he's struggled with renting apartments in the city, and why the Clean Slate Act could ease that, even if parts of it need to be revised.

Seeing no other speakers come forward, Ms. Porterfield declared the Privilege of the Floor regarding Legislative Items, to be closed.

INTRODUCTION OF AND ACTION UPON LOCAL LAWS, ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:

Ms. Porterfield made a motion that Council approves the Consent Agenda, the motion was moved by Mr. Mootoveren and seconded by Mr. Williams.

Consent Agenda

- Ordinance No. 2023-01Adopted Unanimously
- Ordinance No. 2023-02.....Adopted Unanimously
- Ordinance No. 2023-03.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-014.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-015.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-016.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-017.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-018.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-019.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-020.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-021.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-022.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-023.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-024.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-025.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-026.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-027.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-028.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-029.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-030.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-031.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-032.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-033.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-034.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-035.....Adopted Unanimously
- Resolution No. 2023-036.....Adopted Unanimously

A RESOLUTION Declaring Support for the New York State Clean Slate Act

The Motion was moved by Mr. Mootoveren and seconded by Mr. Williams

4:3:0

Voted Aye: Mr. Mootoveren, Mr. Farley, Mr. Williams, Ms. Porterfield

Voted Nay: Ms. Ditoro, Ms. Patrick, Mr. Polimeni

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR:

Ms. Porterfield directed all who wished to discuss any items for City Business to come forward or otherwise submit their comments to the City Clerk.

Leonard DeMasi - Expressed concerns over the doubled costs of a new swimming pool to be built in Central Park, and asked what the city has planned for the existing pool. He suggested that a filtration system be used on the existing pool, fix the Casino building, and make a green area.

Rev. Nicolle D. Jean-Simone - Thanked members of the Council for attending the NAACP community prayer, which was held at Proctor's Theater, and extended an invitation to all members to attend a program commemorating Black History at the Bridge Church on February 26. Followed up by thanking the Council for passing the Resolution regarding the Clean Slate Act, and shared a personal memory of her journey to finding forgiveness for the murderer of her Aunt. Ended statement by sharing her response to a comment previously made by another speaker regarding the literacy rates of the city's public schools - pointing out that the Clean Slate Act most likely will affect many parents who were previously incarcerated, and grant them the opportunity to find jobs that allow them to provide for their children.

Rebecca Paavola - Shared her personal story about 3 kids that she took in 20 years ago, whose lives would be different had the Clean Slate Act existed. She talked about hardships she's faced raising them and expressed gratitude to Councilmember Farley for his efforts made to guide her daughter along the right path.

Shawn Young - Thanked the Council for the Resolution recognizing Black History Month and for passing the Resolution regarding the Clean Slate Act. Talked about the importance of education and of discussing race. Stated that many formerly incarcerated individuals are victims themselves, suffering from past traumas that might influence the choices they make, good or bad.

Kelly Williams - Talked about his experiences dealing with the administration at his daughter's middle school and how it's affected his family. Praised Councilmember Farley for being his family's saving grace by helping his daughter feel safe again and setting her up to have a prosperous education.

Robert Sanders - Expressed support for the Clean Slate Act, and suggested that the City form a Children & Families Committee to allocate funds to families in need.

Janice Rouse - Thanked the Council for passing the Resolution regarding the Clean Slate Act. Stated that the issue at hand should be bi-partisan and that as elected officials, there should be more empathy and forgiveness. Everyone is not bad.

Alfred Tompkins - Recalled his positive experiences working with Councilmember Farley.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL:

Carmel Patrick - Thanked to everyone who came to the meeting and reminded everyone about the ongoing senior citizen meal assistance program and Schenectady Shares program. Also congratulated 9 new police officers that recently completed training and will be joining our police force. Ended the statement by commenting on a recently passed Resolution regarding Bethesda House.

Damoni Farley - Thanked everyone for coming out and voicing their opinions regarding the Clean Slate Act and their positive comments regarding a recent article written about him in the local newspaper about his work with the School District. Concluded statement with some thoughts about the importance of leadership.

Marion Porterfield - Thanked everyone for coming out and voicing their opinions and invited everyone to attend the Bridge Church on February 26 for their Black History Program. Lasty, asked that people try to see the Council as more than just a debate about race. Explains that while it may be the topic of news articles in the paper, those articles are never written by actual members of the council and do not reflect their actual opinions.

Adjourned:

Seeing no further business to come before the City Council, Ms. Porterfield asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was moved by Ms. Patrick and seconded by Mr. Farley. The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

A true record

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Samanta R. Mykoo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**By Samanta R. Mykoo
Schenectady City Clerk**

Samanta R. Mykoo

From: Camille Sasinowski [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 5:03 PM
To: Samanta R. Mykoo
Cc: Gary McCarthy
Subject: Please circulate to Council members

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sorry for the tardiness of this request.

I would like to address the Clean Slate vote on tonights agenda.

I am asking each one of you who happen to be on the lookout for the safety and well being of the citizens of Schenectady to seriously consider how you vote.

Ask yourself, when I leave home this evening to attend the meeting, are my children safe with the babysitter, is my parent safe with the care giver, will my child be safe at daycare? The questions go on.

The Clean Slate law... Did they ask crime victims for their opinion? were crime victims of domestic violence asked, were youth serving agencies asked how likely they would employ a convict to work in their afterschool program or at their overnight camp if they can't do a background check, or has my childs bus driver has had a DWI or DUI?

I don't know about you, but truthly if I would be voting tonight, I would be voting NO.

Respectfully, ~Camille Sasinowski

Samanta R. Mykoo

From: Camille Sasinowski [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 12:10 PM
To: Samanta R. Mykoo
Cc: Gary McCarthy; Doreen M. Ditoro; Damonni Farley; John Mootooveren; Carmel Patrick; John Polimeni; Marion Porterfield; Carl Williams
Subject: Clean slate law

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Samantha,
I am asking you to enter this into the minutes of the 2/13 Council meeting.

Dear Council person, I would like to address the Clean Slate Law.
For starters, could you all leave your home today with no concern for a care giver that might be with your disabled, aging or a child in need of day care? With after school programs, are you comfortable with your child's participation at the non profit agency? Summer programs will soon be underway, do you know the Councilors? If you answer yes to the above questions, you can credit background checks. Children who have witnessed domestic abuse won't be protected from their abuser. Credit Clean Slate.
Our elderly and infirmed won't escape the potential for theft, violence etc... Credit Clean Slate.
This is not talking like the Boogie Man. It's talking and thinking like a rational and very concerned citizen.
Several members of Council have professed concern about the neighborhoods residents safety and well being. Think about it before voting this evening. Don't fall back on your campaign promises. In the past, many of you made promises on your vote for Smoke Shops, Bodegas etc... and later reneged on those promises. Your vote furthered the decline of our City. You were more concerned about the dollars these places would give to our economy.
In closing, thank for your attention to this law and oppose it.
I will work very hard to educate our voters when primary and election day rolls around.

Respectfully,
~Camille Sasinowski

Samanta R. Mykoo

From: Nicolle Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 6:44 PM
To: Mayors Office; Marion Porterfield; John Mootooveren; Carl Williams; Carmel Patrick; Damonni Farley; Doreen M. Ditoro; John Polimeni; Samanta R. Mykoo
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Letter from Schenectady NAACP (Urgent)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

January 23, 2023

Greetings Mayor & Council,

I am hopeful that tonight the council will vote to support the Clean Slate Act by way of resolution. With over 2.3 million New Yorkers returning to their communities looking to start over & re-enter public life after incarceration, I can only imagine the countless lives that will be positively impacted by the passing of this legislation.

Tonight, you can help to grant people their true freedom.

The Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is recognized by many as the formal abolition of slavery in the United States. However, it only ended chattel slavery – slavery in which an individual is considered the personal property of another. While formally eliminating the most recognizable form of slavery, the Thirteenth Amendment also enabled slavery to be transformed into something else that still has harrowing ramifications for especially poor people Black people and all people today.

Section I of the Thirteenth Amendment reads:

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

By writing this resolution you will be helping people gain access to employment, housing, education, and other essentials. Helping them to become productive citizens and stand-up New Yorkers. They can experience freedom in the true sense of the word.

I fully support our city council submitting this resolution in support of the Clean Slate Act and I hope that you vote unanimously tonight to do so.

Sincerely

Rev. Nicolle D. Jean-Simon

President of the Schenectady NAACP Branch 2175

Pastor of Duryee Memorial A.M.E. Zion Church

www.duryee.org



Samanta R. Mykoo

From: David Giacalone [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2023 3:59 PM
To: Marion Porterfield; John Polimeni
Cc: Samanta R. Mykoo; Mayors Office
Subject: from Tonight's Agenda: Sidewalk Expenses and Waste Bin Ads
Attachments: ArdsleyPHComments.rtf.zip

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Marion and John, Mayor McCarrthy, and all Council Members:

There are too many factual and policy issues on today's Committees Agenda for this old man to handle quickly, but I will try to address the main points raised by the two items mentioned above.

- I hope the Council Committes and Members will ask many questions and demand real answers, in writing and with actual numbers and explanations, before deciding to green-light the Creative Outdoor Advertising or \$55/plf sidewalks.

ARPA FUNDS FOR SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS

Of course, sidewalks are important and improvements need to be made. but it looks like the proposal is based on the same Sidewalk Assessment District model so maligned three years ago in the Polimeni-Wallin Sidewalk Plan, with none of the important questions addressed since then. The Mayor's memo tells us:

These sidewalk improvements would include a fixed cost of \$55 per linear foot of sidewalk for each property owner. The City would assume the additional variable cost.

Most important, the \$55 per linear foot number is the same one pulled out of the air in January 2020, with no explanation given, when trying to appease the homeowners on Ardsley Rd. Project. The City's subsidy for those homeowners was pegged at \$37,000 at the Jan. 7, 2020 Committees meeting. But, with no explanation (given to the public; nor the Council?), it ballooned to \$96,000 two weeks later, in coming to the \$55 plf number the homeowners would pay.

\$55 was 25% higher than the Polimeni-Wallin estimates that got the Sidewalk Assessment District resolution passed.

But, at \$55 plf, the City was taking on 2/3rds of the total expenses on Ardsley Road. Given so many items that have gone up in price since in the past three years, just how much is the City offering to pay so that a block might get new sidewalks (and needlessly have its mature shade trees removed). Given inflation since then, the City is setting itself up to pay well over \$100,000 per block. And, these are very likely to be in neighborhoods like Ardsley and DeCamp Avenues, and the Stockade.

- My comments to the Council in January 2020 are attached; they raised MANY of the questions that need to be answered to intelligently set a homeowner's cost.
- Also, see my post "**can the Sidewalk Plan be repaired**" at <https://tinyurl.com/SidewalkRepair>

Please do not approve this fund transfer without getting real numbers and cogent explanations.

CREATIVE OUTDOOR ADVERTISING PRESENTATION

There are so many reasons to go slowly with this idea. And, it is telling that the Agenda Item is listed without the word "Advertising".

Here are some questions that should be thoughtfully considered before negotiations start:

- How many of these large Bins are we talking about?
- What is the likely revenue stream to the City?
- Are we just creating bigger targets for all those in vehicles that now toss their litter at the current litter cans?
- And, *crucially*, how many dollars in revenue make it worthwhile to further inflate the **Visual Pollution** on our streets, with a cacaphony of hucksters selling their wares and services? (Dope shops? Lawyers? Realtors? Casinos?, *et. al.*)

There are many other issues, but I will end here by pointing out that our City Advertising Code [§264-62] specifically bans "OFF-PREMISES" signs: Advertising for services or commodities not offered at the location of the sign. Corporation Counsel may tell you signs on municipal property are exempt. But, the policy of preventing a rash of signs wherever we look (especially in our faces at ground level?) was adopted for the safety and aesthetic benefit of our residents and visitors.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

David Giacalone



To: Schenectady City Council
 Re: Ardsley Rd. Sidewalk Assessment issues
 Comments for Public Hearing, Jan. 27, 2020
 From: David Giacalone
 Date: January 27, 2020

There are a half dozen major subjects discussed below that I hope City Council and the Engineering Department will consider before finalizing the Ardsley Rd. assessments and accepting new petitions from additional blocks.

However, first, I want to point out that, as of 11 AM Monday morning, Jan. 27th, the City has not provided the new Project Cost Sheet to the public (it is Attachment #4; the original Contractor Bid is Attachment #3; Attachments #1 and #2 are side-by-side images to compare Project Costs and Individual Resident Cost). The lack of information makes it very difficult for interested Schenectady residents to make useful comments in a public hearing. I was fortunate to have received a copy over the weekend for my review. Neither that document, nor one showing the proposed per ft. cost for the Ardsley residents, \$55.44, is appended to the Jan. 27 online Agenda. Having to review and consider the new proposal at 7 PM tonight, without also having the original Contractor Bid sheet, is not a formula for helpful citizen participation. [By the way, the Agenda item does not even mention the word "Sidewalk", I believe agenda items should be as informative as possible within reasonable space limitations.]

MAJOR QUESTIONS

1] INTEREST RATE: The Project Cost sheet states that the costs shown do not include interest, and it appears that the City has not told the Petitioners what the interest rate will be. The proposal is to charge the Residents \$55.44 per ft. of frontage, meaning that a 50-ft. Sidewalk would cost \$2772 before any interest.

The comparable Polimeni-Wallin estimate is the \$2222 cost for a 50' sidewalk without interest, not the \$2700 figure mentioned by Council members, which includes 4% interest over ten years.

\$2772 at 4% for ten years equals total payments of \$3367 [25% more than Polimeni's \$2700]

\$2772 at 2% for ten years equals total payments of \$3061 [13% more than Polimeni's \$2700]

In deciding whether the City's proposal is reasonable, the Residents (and taxpayers) need to know the interest rate and length of repayment.

2] TOP SOIL & SEEDS: The Project Cost sheet shows that the actual Topsoil and Seeds used was 411.45 sq. yds for each, which is an astounding 11.7 times as much as the Contractor's Bid, which calls for 35 sq. yds. of each. Was that the Contractor's estimation error, or did the Request for Bids have erroneous specs that yielded such a tiny quantity of Topsoil and Seeds in the Bid? How did the small number of Top Soil and Seeds units in the Contractor Bid fail to alert the Engineering Office of this major problem?

- Top Soil & Seeds went from \$3,955 to \$46,493, an increase of \$42,538
- Top Soil & Seeds amount to 19% of the total revamped Project Cost of \$238K (City Share plus Residents Share)
- Is a percentage similar to 19% for Top Soil and Seeds likely to occur on other blocks, if the Program continues?

3] CONTRACTOR BID. The accepted Contractor's Bid underestimated Top Soil and Seed costs by \$42,538. How is it that the cost to the Residents in that Bid [\$4085 for 50'] was nonetheless already 84% higher than the Polimeni-Wallin Estimate?

What were the component costs that went into the Contractor Bid that made the totals per ft. so high even without the "surprise" Top Soil-Seeds expense? That is important, because such costs may underlie all future bids and sidewalk assessments.

If the Actual Top Soil & Seeds cost had been in the Contractor's Bid, the Total Cost to Residents would have been \$158,973, not \$116,435. That higher cost yields a cost per foot of \$111.56, or \$5578 for a 50-ft. sidewalk.

4] COMPARING Per Foot COSTS.

POLIMENI-WALLIN: \$2222 for 50' = \$44.44 per ft.

CONTRACTOR BID: \$4085 for 50' = \$81.71 per ft. (without the excess Top Soil & Seeds expense)

\$5578 for 50' = \$111.56 per ft. (If the full Top Soil & Seeds Expense were included)

NEW PROPOSAL: \$2772 for 50' = \$55.44 per ft. = 25% more than Polimeni-Wallin \$2222 Estimate

5] CITY SHARE: The City's share under the Proposal goes from \$63K to \$159K, an increase of \$96,000. But, the increase in Top Soil & Seeds PLUS the \$9,000 increase for two additional trees removed adds up to only \$52,538. What other items of cost, amounting to over \$40K, is the City picking up (subsidizing) of the Ardsley Project Cost that Residents would normally pay under the Sidewalk Plan?

- In order to reduce the Resident Cost to \$55.44 per foot, the City is taking on 2/3rds of the Total Ardsley project cost of \$238K
- How did the \$37,000 subsidy specified at the January 7 Committees Meeting balloon to \$96,00?
- Shouldn't the City show the public and the Residents how/why the original Contractor Bid was so high, how it came to the prices charged in the First Bills, and the breakdown of costs on the new "Actual" Project Cost sheet?

6] FOR THE FUTURE:

- Which expenses will the City take upon itself for any future Sidewalk Assessment District? What amount of subsidies is the City willing to pay for future blocks?
- Will the DeCamp residents be allowed to withdraw their Petitions, as was promised when the program was approved?
- What is the expected cost per foot of sidewalk for future blocks, once Residents pay for all the appropriate costs, such as Top Soil & Seeds?
- Save The Trees. Couldn't the City dedicate money for the maintenance of some of the shade trees that are on the Project streets, perhaps hiring a licensed arborist as a consultant for each Petitioning block? Since the Engineering Dept. removed all the mature trees when replacing sidewalks on N. Ferry in 2008, its policy appears to doom many valuable mature trees (at the cost of \$4500 per tree) that could very well survive and thrive after a sidewalk project with best practices care and maintenance. See my posting "Schenectady Needs a Tree Preservation Policy" at <http://tinyurl.com/TreePolicy>

Thank you for considering my Comments. Please write or call if you have questions.

David Giacalone

[L] CONTRACTOR BID COSTS and [R] NEW PROJECT COSTS:

ARDSLEY ROAD: Contractor Bid					
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	PRICE PER UNIT	TOTAL ITEM COST
NOTE	APPROXIMATION	EA	1	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
#110	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	2	\$450.00	\$900.00
#111	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$110.00	\$110.00
#112	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$15.00	\$15.00
#113	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
#114	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$18.00	\$18.00
#115	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$18.00	\$18.00
TOTAL PROPOSAL					\$5,143.00
CITY SHARE					
#116	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
#117	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	1	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
TOTAL CITY SHARE					\$3,200.00
COST TO RESIDENTS					
TOTAL PROPOSAL					\$5,143.00
LESS CITY SHARE					\$1,943.00
COST TO RESIDENTS					\$3,200.00
COST PER FOOT OF FRONTAGE					
COST TO RESIDENTS					\$64.00
TOTAL (PROPOSAL)					\$102.86
\$/FT					\$64.00

ARDSLEY ROAD: Project Costs					
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	ACTUAL QUANTITY	PRICE PER UNIT	TOTAL ITEM COST
NOTE	APPROXIMATION	EA	1	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00
#116	REMOVING OF TREES AND STUMPS 24 IN	EA	2	\$450.00	\$900.00
#117	CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAY	LY	2000	\$3.12	\$6,240.00
#118	MAINTENANCE REPLACEMENT	LY	218	\$4.00	\$871.20
#119	WORK ZONE TRAFFIC CONTROL	LS	1	\$27,000.00	\$27,000.00
#120	TOPSOIL	EA	411.45	\$75.00	\$30,858.75
#121	SEEDS	EA	411.45	\$8.00	\$3,291.60
TOTAL COST					\$78,661.55

COST TO PROPERTY OWNERS				
CONCRETE SIDEWALK	EA	2,025	\$5.44	\$11,016.00
TAXPAYER SHARE				\$11,016.00

CITY SHARE				
TOTAL COST				\$78,661.55
LESS COST TO PROPERTY OWNERS				\$67,645.55
CITY SHARE				\$11,016.00

ARDSLEY ROAD: Project Costs

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	ACTUAL QUANTITY	PRICE PER UNIT	TOTAL ITEM COST
#001	MOBILIZATION	FA	1.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00
#15-3	REMOVAL OF TREES AND STUMPS 24-36"	EA	10.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 45,000.00
#350-11	CONSTRUCTION OF 6" SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAY	SY	1000.95	\$ 112.00	\$ 112,106.40
#480	BAR/MESH REINFORCEMENT	SY	218.92	\$ 5.00	\$ 1,094.60
#700-01	WORK ZONE TRAFFIC CONTROL	LS	1.00	\$ 27,000.00	\$ 27,000.00
#851	TOPSOIL	SY	411.45	\$ 75.00	\$ 30,858.75
#852	M.T.D.	SY	411.45	\$ 38.00	\$ 15,635.10
TOTAL COST					\$ 238,194.85

COST TO PROPERTY OWNERS

DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	PRICE PER UNIT	TOTAL COST
CONCRETE SIDEWALK	LF	1,425	\$ 55.44	\$ 79,002.00
TAXPAYER SHARE				\$ 79,002.00

CITY SHARE

TOTAL COST	\$	238,194.85
LESS COST TO PROPERTY OWNERS	\$	(79,002.00)
CITY SHARE	\$	159,192.85

ARDSLEY ROAD: Assessment Cost by Address

ADDRESS	STREET	FRONTAGE (ft)*	SET PRICE PER LF	ASSESSED COST TO PROPERTY OWNER**** (Frontage x price)	ASSESSED COST DIVIDED BY TEN (10) YEARS****
1011	Ardsley	221**	\$ 55.44	\$ 12,363.12	\$ 1,236.31
1014	Ardsley	55	\$ 55.44	\$ 3,049.20	\$ 304.92
1017	Ardsley	100	\$ 55.44	\$ 5,544.00	\$ 554.40
1040	Ardsley	45	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,494.80	\$ 249.48
1043	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1046	Ardsley	45	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,494.80	\$ 249.48
1049	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1052	Ardsley	0	\$ 55.44	\$ -	\$ -
1055	Ardsley	0	\$ 55.44	\$ -	\$ -
1058	Ardsley	45	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,494.80	\$ 249.48
1061	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1064	Ardsley	0	\$ 55.44	\$ -	\$ -
1067	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1070	Ardsley	45	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,494.80	\$ 249.48
1074	Ardsley	37	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,051.28	\$ 205.13
1077	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1082	Ardsley	0	\$ 55.44	\$ -	\$ -
1085	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1089	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1092	Ardsley	120	\$ 55.44	\$ 6,652.80	\$ 665.28
1095	Ardsley	50	\$ 55.44	\$ 2,772.00	\$ 277.20
1345	Union	120***	\$ 55.44	\$ 17,286.40	\$ 1,728.64
TOTAL FRONTAGE		1425			

- * Frontage determined from Tax Maps.
- ** Additional frontage is for 20 ft on side street to connect to ADA ramps.
- *** Additional frontage is for 20 ft on side street to connect to ADA ramps as well as 100 ft along Union Street.
- **** These costs do NOT include interest.

****Costs do NOT include interest.

Samanta R. Mykoo

From: M Greenberg [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:30 AM
To: Samanta R. Mykoo
Cc: Nicolle Harris; [REDACTED] Carl Williams
Subject: Support for Clean Slate Resolution

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members

I am unable to attend the City Council meeting tonight, but want to express my support of the Clean Slate Act Resolution. The state legislation would seal the records of former incarcerated individuals convicted of felonies seven years from their sentencing and three years for misdemeanors, excluding any time they spent in prison. There are a variety of safeguards in this legislation to ensure that community safety is maintained to the greatest extent possible. Overall, I believe that the benefits of the proposed law greatly outweigh any disadvantages.

Please share my remarks with all Council Members.

Sincerely,
Martin Alan Greenberg, JD, PhD
Chair, Criminal Justice Committee, Schenectady NAACP
Adjunct Prof. of Criminal Justice, Law, and Behavior, Russell Sage College

;

|