

UCIDA

Ulster County Industrial Development Agency

Ulster County Industrial Development Agency Minutes March 12, 2014

A regular monthly meeting of the Ulster County Industrial Development Agency was held at 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 12, 2014, Karen Binder Library, 6th Floor, Ulster County Office Building, 244 Fair Street, Kingston, NY.

The following agency members were present:

Paul Colucci	Assistant Chair/Assistant Secretary
Michael Horodyski	Chair
John Morrow	Secretary
Steve Perfit	Treasurer

The following agency members were absent:

Robert Kinnin	Assistant Chair/Assistant Secretary
James Malcolm	Assistant Chair/Assistant Secretary

Offices of Business Services Staff:

Linda Clark
Suzanne Holt

Ulster County Finance Office:

None.

UCIDA Attorney and Bond Counsel:

A. Joseph Scott Hodgson Russ LLP

Additional Attendees:

Lynn Archer	Ulster County Legislator, District 21
Thomas Briggs	Chair, Ulster County Economic Development and Tourism Committee
Paul Brown	New Paltz, NY
Jim Carminucci	LemeryGreisler LLC
Richard Frankel	Iseman, Cunningham, Riester, & Hyde, LLP
Sean Griffin	Harris Beach
Josh Honig	New Paltz, NY
John Johnson	New Paltz, NY
George Lithco	Attorney, Town of New Paltz Planning Board
Hugh Reynolds	Ulster Publishing
Tim Rogers	New Paltz, NY
George Sifre	Seakill Builders
Theresa Skaine	LemeryGreisler LLC
Dan Torres	Councilperson, Town of New Paltz
Susan Zimet	Supervisor, Town of New Paltz

Chair Horodyski called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The members of the Agency participated in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

READING OF THE UCIDA MISSION STATEMENT

Chair Horodyski read the Mission Statement of the Agency.

The mission of the Ulster County Industrial Development Agency is to advance the job opportunities, general prosperity and long-term economic vitality of Ulster County residents by targeting tax incentives, bonding and other assistance to foster creation and attraction of new business and the retention and expansion of existing business.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Horodyski announced that each individual wishing to address the members of the Agency would be limited to three minutes.

Tim Rogers, Town of New Paltz. Mr. Rogers had a question with reference to the New Paltz School Board Resolution that the Agency received in December, 2013. He asked if the Agency had responded at all to the New Paltz School Board and also the points that were raised in that resolution that have to do with the tax levy, the tax based growth factor. Has the Agency looked at the financial impact to the school district as it relates to tax cap legislation and how that affects PILOTs, tax based growth factor calculations and taxing limits. He was also curious if the Agency had asked the applicant, Wilmorite, if they had done any financial assessments to see how the tax cap legislation affects local school districts as it relates to the concerns that were highlighted in the New Paltz Central School District's resolution that was passed back in December.

Chair Horodyski responded that yes the Agency did receive it and yes we have begun to look at what the impacts in general to PILOTs are.

Mr. Rogers asked as it relates to this project?

Chair Horodyski responded in general.

Mr. Rogers stated that he was particularly interested in the numbers as it relates to this project. He thought that the school board was anticipating a response. This is the largest project that is under consideration that would affect the tax levy limit for the school district right now.

Chair Horodyski responded that he did not think that there was any anticipation of the Agency responding directly to that letter other than we will take it under advisement as we would take all other letters received in regards to a specific project.

Mr. Paul Brown, Town of New Paltz. Mr. Brown stated that tonight, Wednesday night in New Paltz, the New Paltz Village Board is meeting to discuss an offer from Wilmorite. This was presented or talked about at a meeting with Mayor West of the village and there is a signature line for Mayor West and Paul Wilmot. It is going to be discussed by the village, but it is a little confusing to the town in the sense that in the agreement proposed by Wilmorite to the village

it talks about the village shall declare itself as lead agency and supplement the findings. He did understand that the Agency is a deliberative board, not an administrative board in that the work that is done goes to the heart of the quality of the application and the character of the applicant and so forth. He believes that this adds to the materials that may help. It is information that may help in the deliberative process. To further confuse the issue, Monday night, and this is not hearsay, there is a member of the Planning Board here, the Town Planning Board asked the representatives of Wilmorite on Monday night about this agreement and about the meeting with the village tonight and the applicant representatives there said that there has been no further discussion of this conflicting and wholly outside the application details that the Agency has on their records. Perhaps in your deliberations you could clarify those issues.

John Johnson, Town of New Paltz. The college currently has 8,000 students; they claim that they can only house 50% of them. That means that 4,000 students currently live off campus. 4,000 living off campus between Wilmorite's project and the 230 bedroom dorm that they are currently building, that is roughly 1,000 additional students. We have currently 4,000 students that are living off campus, housed by small business owners. We are going to add 1,000 more bedrooms to the mix, so there is a potential of a 20% vacancy rate throughout the village. As a small business owner he is not afraid of the competition. What he is concerned about is he currently pays roughly 1/3 of his rents towards paying the local property taxes. If you grant a PILOT to Wilmorite, they will be able to either under cut him by 1/3 or thereabouts, making it impossible for him, as well as the other small business owners and when he says small business owners, he includes people with accessory apartments. A family that is dependent on renting out their accessory apartment they will not be able to do so. Either way we can not compete. The community that has been paying taxes for years and years will not be able to compete or the profits that you will be giving away will go straight up to Rochester in the form of dividends. Please don't grant this PILOT. Even with them paying their full assessed value, this project is going to wreak havoc on our small community.

Susan Zimet, Supervisor Town of New Paltz. Several individuals yielded their time to speak at public comment to Supervisor Zimet. Supervisor Zimet stated that she comes to these meetings to find out what is going on with a project that is in front of her town board. You were all here last time when she learned about Wilmorite's offer to the village relative to water and sewer. She guessed that this morning, she just found out that something new is happening and she will have to change her plans from going to a Clean Water Open Space Meeting to go to the Village Board Meeting to learn what is happening with a project that is in front of her Planning Board. She stated that if this doesn't show you the caliber of the client that we are dealing with, she does not know what does. This is really quite remarkable. She is the supervisor of the town and she has to learn what is going on in her town with the "biggest project" from a columnist. She thanked Mr. Brown for coming and suggested that he could be the liaison between the town and village board and Wilmorite because he seems to know more than the rest of us. Last Friday, Wilmorite sent out a press release stating that Wilmorite agreed with their agreement presented to the Town of New Paltz. The "news" in Wilmorite's press release is that they agree with themselves. Simply said, Wilmorite has proposed a tax agreement to the town, however, in that agreement, thank God, Wilmorite finally recognized that the impact to the town with regard to police and other emergency services and has offered to cover these costs declared by the town. That is a remarkable place that we have gotten to. She thanked the Town Board for what they have been doing on this. Unfortunately, they are doing this at the expense of the other taxing jurisdictions, the New Paltz School District and the county. Yesterday, Councilman Barry, legal counsel and she were on a conference call with Wilmorite to discuss the estimated assessed value of the Park Point Project and trying to understand the thought process behind Wilmorite's PILOT offering. As you are all well aware, the New Paltz assessor has valued the project at 53.4 million. Based upon that assessed value, the taxes of the town, county and school district would be approximately \$1.5 million. Wilmorite itself claims that their construction costs will be almost \$16 million. It seems that our assessed value estimate is correct. Additionally, Wilmorite developed a similar student housing project at RIT Rochester. It is a little larger, 918 beds versus 696. We know that they have retail in New Paltz, but Wilmorite's own website estimate valued it at \$71 million and last fall at \$100 million. Yet Wilmorite claims that the assessed value of the New Paltz project should be \$11 million and that it

can't be built if it is assessed for more. When we tried to ask yesterday to justify the \$11 million which was the purpose of the call, they didn't provide any reasoning whatsoever other than the fact that we can't build it if it isn't \$11 million and that's what we want. She thought that the purpose of the telephone call was for our assessor to understand how you could justify \$11 million, but they never received one justification. This differential helps Wilmorite avoid paying 75% of the taxes it would pay without a PILOT. With 31% of the community already off the tax roles, each new exemption is pushing the collective community and individual home owners off the cliff sooner or rather the Shawangunk Mountains. What is known is that Wilmorite is stating that they want the project assessed at \$11 million and based upon that they will pay \$388,000 rounded. Their stated and recent offers, the town can ask the UCIDA to apply the \$275,000 for impact fees thereby leaving \$69,000 for the New Paltz School District versus what would have been \$950,000 if we used our assessed value or \$15,000 for Ulster County versus \$250,000. Since the UCIDA did not define units in their UTEP Policy, Wilmorite uses beds in some calculations and kitchens in others. They apply the definition depending on whether or not the town is asking for a full impact fee. So she gathered that they, as a town can define the Policy, based on whether or not they want an impact fee or not. She was not sure; she thought the Agency defined policy. Depending on how we want the numbers to "play out" we can define the policy. Can we also define the \$450-\$750 range and say that we want that range to be different too. She would like to have that option. She understands that the UCIDA used beds as a definition as units when granting a PILOT for Golden Hill. Is this definition arbitrary or does it apply here too? It is important to put into context why the 388,000 taxable payment is truly inequitable or the UCIDA needs to take a hard look before they agree to offer this to Wilmorite. This spring, finally and thankfully, the Hampton Inn will be breaking ground in New Paltz. That project used the UCIDA for tax breaks and sales tax and mortgage tax. However, they will be paying full property taxes. Their assessed value is 4.8 million and they will be paying 131,000 in property taxes. Understand that they could be exempt from property taxes, they choose not to be. CVS is in front of the Planning Board as we speak; they could also ask for an exemption from property taxes, but they are not. They plan on paying their full property taxes based upon the assessed value that is determined by the assessor, which is their estimated assessment at 3.6 million and they will be paying \$132,000 in property taxes. Together those two projects will have an assessed value of 8.4 million and will be paying \$305,000 in taxes and both projects will be creating jobs and will not be taxing the emergency services of our town. On March 20th at 7:30 p.m., she invited the members to come to New Paltz Town Hall where a project will be presented to the community and the New Paltz Town Board. This project has already been assessed by our assessor at \$75 million. They are going for a standard 485(b) PILOT; they are working with the UCIDA right now to firm the numbers up. She has been authorized to say that the first year they will be paying \$1 million in property taxes and by year ten they will be paying over \$2 million in property taxes. They will be bringing in 250 jobs into our New Paltz community, as well as tourism dollars, with very little demand on services. Park Point is a \$60 million project and wants to dictate their assessed value and determine how much they will chose to pay in taxes. The Hampton Inn and CVS are not being offered that same opportunity to name their assessment and then telling the taxing authorities how much they want to pay.

At this point, the Chairman called for time and Town Councilperson Dan Torres continued with her statement. Continuing, Wilmorite is touting that they will be the largest taxpayer in New Paltz, yet the money that they are willing to pay the town just covers the costs of services that the project will demand. If the UCIDA grants a PILOT to this project it will be the homeowners who will be subsidizing the tax break as we the town, school district and the county have no vote and if the project has an effect on the occupancy in the village, there potentially can be an economic loss to the community that is not even factored in. In an attempt to understand this PILOT, the New Paltz Town Board has questions they would like answered. Should we tell the applicant that is coming to present to the Town Board on March 20th to go back to the Ulster County IDA and tell you that they too cannot build the project if you don't grant them a PILOT for whatever arbitrary number they provide or should we tell them that the New Paltz assessor and the Ulster County IDA know that they are doing and the \$1 million that they will be paying in taxes for year one is just great. The Town Board is trying to understand what you, the Ulster County IDA is going to do. We want to understand the rules

that are applying. To that end, we submit the following questions and hope that you will have answers by the next meeting. (1) How did the UCIDA come to adding the Category 5 to the Uniform Tax Policy; (2) On what basis did UCIDA create the terms of the PILOT – i.e. length of PILOT for 25 years for \$450-\$750 range for payments, the use of CPI which differs from the other categories; (3) Why did the UCIDA allocate the PILOT payment to taxing jurisdictions the way the UCIDA did? (4) How will you define units; what is your justification; (5) Units were defined as beds in the Golden Hill IDA; would that not set precedent and does the UCIDA intend to comply. (6) Why is Category 5 set up different than Categories 1-4 with a matrix that values jobs, while this one has no criteria at all for job creation. (7) Does dormitory housing have to be owned, controlled or sponsored by colleges or institutions of higher education. (8) When reviewing projects before the town, we have commercial projects that bring in jobs and do not burden the town with services. The assessment determined by our assessor – where is the logic allowing this project to be treated differently. (9) How do you justify having one applicant having to operate under the town's assessment for the purposes of a PILOT, while potentially determining a PILOT for another PILOT that is manufactured by the client without justification. Throughout this process the New Paltz Town Board has yet to hear any justification for the granting of a PILOT for this project. We do not think you have either. Again, under the current proposal, the New Paltz Town Board is delighted that Wilmorite finally acknowledged that at the very least the town's expenses should be covered and have agreed to pay an impact fee. However, the Town Board will not allow the needs to be balanced on the New Paltz School District and the taxpayers of Ulster County. The community of New Paltz would agree that giving one corporation an unfair financial advantage is an unsupportable advantage. The Ulster County IDA must deny the PILOT as proposed and ask for full taxation as assessed by the New Paltz Town Assessor. This project and the PILOT offered do not come close to being a benefit for the community. It is the benefit for the college and that is great. We all want the college to benefit, but if the applicant is unable or unwilling to build it, the community would hope that the State of New York will support the needs of SUNY New Paltz. Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

A copy of the questions was presented to the members of the Agency.

George Lithco, New Paltz Planning Board Attorney. Mr. Lithco stated that the Planning Board has been engaged in the review of this application for approximately three years. They are in the process of trying to complete the Findings Statement. They have been in that process since the public hearing closed on January 6, 2014. This is the first anniversary of the applicant's application to you. He has been reading the Minutes for almost that time, since they found out that they had made an application. Since January 6th of this year, Mr. Griffin has been engaged in the process; he has been making proposals to the town. He thinks that the applicant recognizes that the application for a PILOT, that was originally made, he believed proposed about \$106,000 in payment was not going to be sufficient to cover the costs for the town alone and that was suppose to be divided up between all the taxing jurisdictions. We, as the Planning Board, are looking at the Findings with that in mind. They are looking at these proposals that have been received and trying to understand the impact on the town and the other taxing jurisdictions. We have a responsibility as the lead Agency to make a complete and accurate statement in the Findings and we are in the process of doing that. They have an annexation proposal that was received about two weeks ago. They are trying to understand how that relates with the process. He was here on behalf of Chairman Calimano, who could not make it because of family commitments. They will have a draft at the next Planning Board meeting and they anticipate that that draft will be something the Planning Board can consider taking action on. We are working diligently to complete the process, but it has been a bit more of an adventure than the typical findings statement. The second thing is in trying to understand the impact of the project, he has had some conversations with your counsel for some questions that he has put to him regarding the authority; whether this is going to become a deviated PILOT processed by that rule undertake the number of units. He understood that the Agency was going to consider the number of units for this project today and how that definition, or how units will be defined with respect to this project. He understood that the Agency has done that with Golden Hill and he was here to listen to that part of the conversation. If there are any questions that you have about the process of the Planning Board that you would like to inquire about, he could attempt to answer that.

Supervisor Zimet informed the members of the Agency that she just asked him what the meeting with the village tonight does to the process with the Planning Board. His response was that he was not sure.

Sean Griffin, Harris Beach, representing the Park Point Project. He stated that they appreciated the UCIDA for the opportunity to hear them out on this. They have worked hard to try to work with the town. He was on the call yesterday; it sounds like it was a different call. They did spend some time talking about other comparable properties. There are hundreds of examples of exempt dormitory properties around the State of New York. Four years ago when Wilmorite first came, they said that they would pay the costs to the community of the project. They are still on the same theory. They showed them the SU; they gave them a copy of a Syracuse PILOT for a dorm they have there that is existing right now. It pays at a cost of \$160 a bedroom or \$550 a kitchen. They then showed them the RIT PILOT; they walked them through it; walked counsel through it; walked George's partner through it. That facility pays \$432 a bedroom; \$1,325 a kitchen unit. The community study that was done during the SEQRA process shows their community on average pays \$1,300 a kitchen unit. They did not break it down by bedroom in that study. Their proposal, the proposal that has been before them was originally during the SEQRA process, \$101,000. When we got involved in that last few months, we worked with them on the costs; they thought that the cost impact to the town is around \$50,000. They presented a proposal and sat with the Town Board in open session and talked to them about a schedule and a technique where they can be paid an impact payment first, and subject to the IDA approving it, the balance of the amounts of the then 377 would be distributed around to the taxing jurisdictions. Yes, we clarified this yesterday and that time we were trying to determine how the IDA amount would be calculated. They went to a later calculation, so wait a minute, let's say after that three hours in front of the Town Board we came back and sent them another schedule. We said alright, if you decide and the IDA decides you really have to have \$75,000 in costs, there is another way to do that. Long story short, no matter how the amount is calculated at 388 we are offering \$557 a bedroom, \$1,654 a kitchen unit. That is significantly more than the community average; that is significantly more than the RIT existing facility and the PILOT that is in place. It is significantly more by multiples than the Syracuse PILOT that is in place. This is not abnormal. They cannot build an asset in excess of even \$5-\$10 million in a community in New York State with an overburdened local tax rates and have it wide open to an assessment times those overburdened tax rates. It cannot be done; it will not exist and so without the assistance of the IDA this project cannot proceed. They would ask you to keep that in mind. Two final points. He has a letter here from the Monroe County Sheriff's Office which is the responder for the RIT facility indicating that they did not have additional costs or additional equipment. That has been a bone of contention for the town somewhere between we think 50,000 and they think 275,000. But actual experience, not a little bit larger, the RIT facility, 50% more units, no additional costs for the policing; no additional costs for the equipment. Last point, there was a mention of the village meeting; he met with Paul. He thought that this was at least an open idea. They wanted all issues on the table. Several weeks ago he met with the village. Several years ago this developer was told that the town was interested and they were doing a planned corridor on 32 South for commercial smart growth. They wanted to have access to water and sewer. This developer started their planning at that point several years ago. There are millions of dollars in that \$60 million number to create a sewer system that is redundant to the village and create a water system that is significantly redundant to the village system. That would allow the town to be able to control their own destiny. They were willing to do that and more recently, especially since October, when he became involved, the town has been acting that this is not a benefit to them. It is a significant benefit. The additional water capacity that the town would have access to for \$3,500, you buy these little filters, \$3,500 would increase the water capacity by 50%. They would set it up expandable and made it available to the town. They have presented to the village. They have not heard anything from the village. He didn't doubt that they were talking about it. He encouraged them to talk about it. They thought they were making progress with the town the other day; the supervisor has indicated that we are not. They look to the IDA for some type of direction. If a community has as a given, tax rate growth or growth in the budget, the school and the county, mainly because no matter how hard that school board tries, or the county tries, most of it is Albany based costs. If that's growing, you cut services, increase rates or have some growth within the community. They are offering growth; they

are not building exempt. They are offering to pay the 388; but we can't pay more than that and we are not building it if it is wide open to assessment. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Paul Colucci asked to respond to one comment that the attorney made. With respect to last meeting that we had in your office, you had made a comment, a developer or one of your representatives, about the impact on the police being called to that site. The response was SUNY police would be the first responders.

Mr. Griffin responded that he was incorrect. There is a dispute in their contract negotiations.

Mr. Colucci stated that an hour after you left we were able to discuss that with SUNY and he wanted to clarify that.

Josh Honig, Town of New Paltz. Mr. Honig stated that what he heard Mr. Wilmont saying is basically we should have our residents have their quality of life go down just so they can build their project. It doesn't matter how it is going to affect our community. WE need to tighten our belts more which is what communities our size have been doing now for the past few years due to all the cuts in federal and state aide and everything else. That is one thing and we have mandates and that is true. Our costs are going up and up. A cost of a PILOT, if you put it in, doesn't take into account the future as to things going up. But to tell us that we should have our quality of life suffer and just loose more services and not have the best education for our kids is ridiculous if we have to do that to accommodate these guys.

Mr. Steve Perfit expressed his comments. A lot of the items in the discussion we have heard before. We went to a public hearing; we digested all the materials; we have a CD that is "humongous" to listen. We have heard the comments; we have been lobbied by politicians on both sides of the aisle, apartment owners, citizens, email blasts; we have heard an awful lot. The Agency has no skin in the game. We are not going to negotiate with the town, with Wilmorite and be in the middle. We have a UTEP, for whatever reason it is in place. We may have to stop and define certain parts of it, but his feelings are, you can lobby us all you want. We are going to make a decision as to what is good for the county economically and we will take into account all the comments from the developer and the town and the school and the county. He really appreciated all the brow beatings; we've heard them all. They keep getting re-hashed. He sat in a Pattern for Progress breakfast a couple of days ago, there are two counties within the Hudson Valley, one of them the most prominent county and financially stable county – Orange County is now being downgraded. They are talking about bankruptcy. Dutchess County is this far away from bankruptcy. This county is fiscally sound. His town in this county is fiscally sound; his school district is fiscally sound. They have made serious deep cuts to their budgets to make it work. He understands mandates, but we all have to make it work if we want to bring economic development to the State of New York which is hurting major league. We have programs going on right now to bring jobs and industry back to New York State. Listen to what is coming from the top, not your small microcosm where you are. It benefits everybody.

Mr. Colucci stated that he was not being touted by any politician from any side of the aisle.

Chair Horodyski responded that he wished he could say the same. Between cell phone calls, email he receives them. He wished to echo Mr. Perfit's comment that we accept the comments. We opened this thing up and we are going to take under consideration as to the timing of our public comment. This may be better served at the end of the meeting given the current state of affairs. But with that said, it is a deliberative board, we have an approved UTEP that went through the process to be approved, we are going to deliberately look at this application and one way or another move forward. But as an IDA we are here for the benefit of Ulster County. We take into consideration affected jurisdictions, no question about it. This is an Ulster County Board; this is for the benefit of Ulster County.

Mr. Lithco, Attorney, New Paltz Planning Board. Mr. Lithco had additional questions. He stated that Mr. Griffin said that Park Point Rochester is 50% larger. If his information that it has 918 units is correct, it is 31% larger. He recognizes that it is larger, but numbers do matter in this process. Second point of clarification, his understanding is that members of the IDA did meet with Mr. Griffin and Mr. Wilmont and had opportunity to review the pro-forma. Typically when members bring information to the board process that has been garnered outside the actual meeting, there is some disclosure of the circumstances and the conclusions. He recognizes that there is a Confidentiality Agreement, but if there is to be discussion about the pro-forma and the conclusions that you are going to draw from the pro-forma, he believed it would be appropriate to have discussion of that meeting.

Mr. Perfit responded that he saw some discrepancies in the numbers of labor in the application versus some other materials that were given to us. Those questions were answered to him and the application labor figures are correct and the other two examples they brought in a multiplier. In other words if you pay \$10 million, he explained that he is a commercial real estate broker with a CCIM degree, there is a multiplier effect so if \$10 million is paid to payroll in the community that regenerates more jobs and more income into the community. They buy groceries, food, they may bank here and that is a known fact. In the CCI Institute they have a multiplier effect. The third set of numbers involve other counties that are affected, which he didn't care about. But brought in other numbers to bring it up to 21 million, or whatever, meaning that money will be spent in Greene County or Orange County with labor spending money in the whole Hudson Valley.

Mr. Lithco stated that that was consistent with the CGR Report that evaluated that.

Mr. Perfit responded that that was the question. Why was the CGR Report different than the original application.

Chair Horodyski stated that this is the Camoin Report and they have the CGR Report. There is a discrepancy between the impacts and the generation of jobs. That has all been provided.

Mr. Perfit stated that his question was why those numbers were different.

Chair Horodyski closed Public Comment.

HUDSON VALLEY FILM COMMISSION

Mr. Laurent Rejto addressed the members of the Agency. A copy of his presentation is on file. The Hudson Valley Film Commission is a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization that creates sustainable economic development by attracting, supporting and promoting local film, video and film production in the Hudson Valley/Catskills. The Film Commission is successfully positioned in the Hudson Valley as a prominent venue for film and television and associated high tech activity by attracting working producers, directors, industry personnel and new business. To better reach these goals, HVFC collects and analyzes regional film production data, tracking total impact of productions by exploring information such as: number of nights spent by film crews in the region; total amount of money spent locally; numbers of indirect jobs generated and the like. In 2013 the Hudson Valley Film Commission worked with over 125 productions versus 62 in 2012. That is the most we have ever worked with. Eighty of those productions ended up working in the Hudson Valley region and forty of those productions filled out our data request. Based on those forty results, HVFC tracked over \$7.8 million in direct spending. The local spending does not take into account multiplier impacts of direct spending which is exponentially much larger as money is spent over and over again locally. Based on the forty results, 525 production days were tracked, 323 scouting days were tracked; 328 locations were used; \$7.871 million were spent regionally by these productions; 315 part time jobs were created; 14,000 rooms were rented at local lodging establishments and partly due to the 35% state post production credit, which in Ulster County is actually 5% more than

in the metro counties. A lot of post production facilities have now started moving especially into Ulster County. One of the biggest companies has actually moved to New Paltz, which is good news for New Paltz. It is a very small office, Crazy Horse Effects. They have other offices in Venice, California. They do effects for Boardwalk Empire, all the biggest movies and they are moving here because of the extra 5% post production tax credit that the state is offering. They are also in negotiations with Technicolor Post Works which is one of the biggest companies in the world, to move their post production facility to the area. Typically the Film Commission receives 1-10 inquiries a week. He dealt with three yesterday. They are trying to bring a \$2.4 million film from Illinois. We are always competing with other states trying to show them why the Hudson Valley would be a benefit to them. The benefits include, we have some of the best crews in the country and the best casts in the country. We have amazing A-list actors in the area – Daniel Craig, Melissa Leo and Liev Schreiber, Judd Hirsch, the list goes on and on. It is a great place; the incredible landscapes. You can do anything here except desert. We are always soliciting productions fighting with other states and/or commissions to try to increase productivity when it comes to film production. We do this by using every angle we can, the internet, whether it is a U-Tube video, Facebook, Twitter, Blog, you name it we do it. We send out newsletters to 15,000 people; we are always in touch with film makers, whether they are college film makers, they are tomorrow's big spenders or large production. Their track record shows that they can continue to bring sustainable economic development to the region. The Ulster County IDA rightly made it clear that we needed support from other counties in the area. We service six, seven counties. In 2013 support was also provided by Dutchess County at \$15,000 and Orange County at \$10,000. They just had a great shoot in Orange County. Most of the days were spent in Kerhonkson, but they had a few days at the Orange County Emergency Services Center where they turned the Emergency Services Center into Mission Control for a space launch. Dutchess County and Orange County have both committed to 2014 as well. He was available for any questions.

Chair Horodyski stated that when he was first on the Agency, he was probably lukewarm to the idea of the Hudson Valley Film Commission. Our fellow board member Steve Perfit, who has been a very vocal supporter of your efforts swayed him to say, yeh, let's see how it is. We pushed you to go out to other counties and "beat the drum". You have been a victim of your own success now with the other film commissions that are popping up around the area. As one person you have turned him in the sense of what this is doing for our county. Many congratulations and continued success. This has already been included in the 2014 budget.

Mr. Perfit expressed his thanks to John Morrow, who has been on the "travelling road show" in Dutchess, Orange and Columbia counties. We tried but Columbia County did not have funds in their reserve account to give a grant. Mr. Perfit is a big proponent. The treasures we have in this county are beyond belief.

Counsel A. Joseph Scott clarified that the UCIDA's support for this is through a Contract for Services whereby we are providing financial assistance to the organization and the report from Mr. Rejto today satisfies the requirements of that Contract for Services in terms of telling the Agency what they are doing and their deliverables today reflect the requirements of that Contract for Services.

Mr. Perfit noted that the financials are included.

Motion: Steve Perfit, seconded by Paul Colucci, moved to enter into a Contract for Services with the Hudson Valley Film Commission in the amount of \$40,000 for 2014.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

Chair Horodyski wished Mr. Rejto continued success.

Mr. Rejto stated that 2014 has had a huge start. They have had five regional films that were made in the area at Sundance. That is more than any regional commission can say and they have already had four features shot. It has really been a great year so far for them.

MINUTES

Motion John Morrow, seconded by Steve Perfit, moved to approve the Minutes of the February 12, 2014 meeting. A copy of said Minutes is on file.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

FINANCIALS

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Paul Colucci, moved to approve the financials for the period ending February 28, 2014 as presented. A copy of said financials is on file.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Audit Committee. Committee Chair Steve Perfit reported that the Audit Committee had not met.

Governance Committee. Committee Chair John Morrow reported that the Governance Committee had not met.

Ready2Go. There was no report from the Ready2Go Committee.

PROJECTS

ARHC BCKNGNY01,LLC – LaSalle Benedictine

ARHC NPNPZNY01,LLC – LaSalle New Paltz

Counsel Scott stated that representatives from both the purchaser and also the tenant were in attendance. What is going on today with LaSalle is that there are two projects. One in New Paltz, one in Kingston. We did them originally many years ago and in 2007 the company for both projects wanted to sell to a new entity and we approved that conveyance in 2007. What is happening now is that a new company is coming in and looking for essentially the same transaction. The existing company wants to sell to a new entity and we are following the same process that we did in 2007, which is to get an application describing the new company and that has been distributed to the members and also to describe what they are going to do at the site in terms of whether there are going to be any changes in jobs, changes in the operation. That is the background. They are coming to the Agency to request conveyance of the property and the reason that they are coming to us is that they want the existing UCIDA documents to follow the new company.

Chair Horodyski stated that our documents require that on transfer, we basically get a re-look. The fact that you would have the ability to transfer projects would have to come back before the Agency regardless to ensure that the Agency was comfortable in allowing UCIDA benefits to flow through to a new purchaser.

Counsel Scott stated that that is an important protective device we insist upon in our documents. He invited the representative of the new company to detail what they were going to do and then we can talk about the issue that relates to this assignment.

Mr. Colucci stated that he had read the description of the project. It says that they are purchasing approximately ¼ acre of land.

Counsel Scott responded that that was the original project. Essentially what they are doing an existing structure is just being conveyed to a new company.

Mr. Colucci asked just the structure; not the entire hospital.

Counsel Scott responded just the structure; not the entire hospital – the office building.

Ms. Theresa Skaine, LemeryGreisler LLC, addressed the members of the Agency. James Carminucci was also with her and as Counsel Scott mentioned, there are also representatives from Benedictine Hospital. In both of these applications before you the project that you approved initially and then approved an assignment to the LaSalle entity remains the same. So the owners and operators of those facilities remains the same. There is no new financing; no new acquisition; there is no new project. All of the job counts remain the same; all the uses are the same. They are requesting, as Counsel Scott mentioned, consent for the sale to a new entity and also an assignment of the PILOT Agreements and the Lease Agreements. The purchasing entities are two separate LLCs. They are subsidiaries of a real estate investment trust called American Realty Capital Healthcare Trust. That is where you get those acronyms in the purchasing entities, but they are fully owned subsidiaries of that real estate investment trust. That is most of the background of the two. She realizes that there may be questions and they are here to answer them.

Counsel Scott stated that his next point is, with that as background, as part of our due diligence on this we check to make sure, and when you look at the resolutions that provide for this, we make sure that the existing company(ies) are in compliance with our existing documents. Namely, under our existing documents they need to make annual job reporting information available to us. If obviously, they were in default in that we would remedy that situation here. Another important issue that we confirm is that they are current with PILOT payments. We certainly don't want to be approving a transaction where there is, among other defaults, a default in PILOT payments. This is the segue to the issue involving the City of Kingston project where there is an issue with respect to PILOT payments.

Mr. Jim Carminucci stated that when the UCIDA approved this project you basically broke the building into an exempt portion and non-exempt portion. He was speaking of the Kingston project, not New Paltz. The exempt portion of the building is the building that the hospital was occupying for its purposes and he believed that the UCIDA's approach at the time was that if the hospital owned this building directly and there was not a private owner in the ownership change, that portion would be exempt for real property taxes so the PILOT Agreement provides that that portion is exempt. The portion of the building that is being occupied by private, for-profit entities did not receive an exemption under the PILOT Agreement and it is required to pay what would be normal taxes if the UCIDA did not have an interest. What has happened, is that apparently when the building was being built, the prior owner, which was First Columbia, made an application to the City of Kingston for a 485(b) abatement with respect to the non-exempt portion of the building that the hospital was not occupying. That is a type of commercial construction abatement that is available in jurisdictions. Apparently that application was approved by the then assessor for the City of Kingston and for that non-exempt portion of the building that abatement was put into place. So the taxes that are being paid on that non-exemption portion of the building are being abated under a 485(b) statutory exemption. More recently the City of Kingston stepped in, for reasons that he is not aware of, and took a second look at what was done way back when and decided that that abatement for the non-exempt portion of the building should not have been approved and essentially invoiced our client, LaSalle and the tenant who is responsible for paying all taxes on the building for seven-eight years worth of back taxes based upon that abatement not being in place. We did bring that to Counsel Scott's attention when we started discussing this issue. It is their hope, on behalf of LaSalle, that we can obtain the consent of the UCIDA for the transfer without it having to be involved in that discussion. Rich can fill you in on the fact that they have attempted to have communication with the City as far back as this summer and it is only very recently that a meeting has been set up to begin to discuss that.

Mr. Rich Frankel, Iseman, Cunningham, Riester & Hyde LLP. Mr. Frankel is representing Health Alliance, the tenant. Jim pretty much went through the history.

Counsel Scott stated that the hospital is responsible for paying.

Mr. Colucci asked if Mr. Frankel worked for the hospital or was he an attorney for the hospital.

Mr. Frankel responded that he is outside counsel for the hospital. Continuing, the PILOT Agreement is about ten years old and for seven, eight or more years, the PILOT has been properly being paid. The amounts were basically a pass through with the hospital paying for them, but the non-exempt portion was receiving the 485(b) business incentive exemption and then out of the blue, basically, a letter was sent to the hospital saying that we are going back retroactively and take back this exemption. They have communicated with the City Attorney. He has had at least one conversation with him. A meeting is now scheduled for this Friday in the afternoon. He has exchanged letters in our position paper on this matter. The hospital, believes that the exemption does in fact apply. That contractually there is no reason for it not to apply under the Real Property Tax Law and to now seven or eight years later to all of the sudden to go back retroactively and try to effectively re-assess for those years is not proper and on a going forward basis, it should also receive that exemption. That is where they are. They are in a position to try to talk and resolve this amicably through Corporation Counsel working with the City Counsel and the assessor.

Chair Horodyski asked have you made and have they accepted what would be the 485(b) exemption payment each year. The money due under the 485(b) you continue to pay that.

Mr. Frankel responded that the 485(b) – there is no PILOT amount – but yes we pay the 485(b).

Chair Horodyski stated you continue to do that.

Mr. Frankel replied yes.

Chair Horodyski stated and they are accepting those payments.

Mr. Frankel responded that it is the delta that they have not paid.

Mr. Perfit asked if this was the medical office building that sits in front of Benedictine.

Mr. Carminucci responded that this is the one furthest from Mary's Avenue. The one also known as the Thomas Dee Cancer Medical Pavilion. This one was constructed around 2003.

Mr. Perfit questioned the purchasing entity who are they actually?

Ms. Skaine responded that they are a subsidiary of a real estate investment trust.

Mr. Perfit replied OK; he just wanted to know if they were related to Health Alliance.

Ms. Skaine responded no, not at all.

Mr. Perfit asked if it would be detrimental to you if we just "shelved" this until next month while you continue negotiations with the City of Kingston. Will the new entity accept this contingent liability that the results of the case will prevail.

Mr. Carminucci responded on behalf of LaSalle which is the seller. We have entered into a contract to sell this facility as well as several others. They are under a time frame to keep the process moving and it would be detrimental to the overall timeline if we were to have to wait until the April meeting.

Chair Horodyski stated that the Agency would like to see how they make out with the City because we would like to see at some level, to get this rectified. That is not to say that we are not prepared to necessarily move forward or not move forward. We are not hedging our bets or anything like that. He thought that they would be inclined to see how you made out at the Friday meeting and if need be, he believed that they could convene a special meeting to help affect whatever transfer may be needed from your standpoint to get that done. If that is OK with the members of the Agency, he would really like to see how the Friday meeting plays out.

Mr. Colucci stated that he found it hard to believe that they had not talked to the City recently. You have finally set up a meeting and it seems like you are at the eleventh hour where you are trying to facilitate this closing which he respects. He asked counsel if he had research case law; is there any case law that you feel that you can stand on here that supports your opinion that they are not entitled to this "claw back" or whatever they are trying to do.

Mr. Frankel responded that long before they were aware that LaSalle was selling we have kept them in the loop going back into the summer. We have communicated directly through email and through correspondence with the City Corporation Counsel and he has personally spoken to him. They have exchanged cases, but he was not here to argue the case. To answer the question, this is not at the eleventh hour for them. They have been attempting to resolve this amicably going back to last summer. The fact that it has now reached this level is because of the circumstances.

Mr. Colucci apologized for the eleventh hour statement. He looks at it as the eleventh hour for the UCIDA because the Chair just said that he wants to hold a special meeting in two weeks. He feels that he has a "gun to his head".

Mr. Perfit asked if the purchasing entity has a rep and warranty from the selling entity that you will indemnify them. He would prefer postponing this.

Representatives asked if it would be possible to have a special meeting.

Chair Horodyski responded that it is really going to factor into how your meeting goes on Friday.

RESOLUTION CONSENTING TO AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF THE BENEDICTINE LASALLE MEDICAL OFFICE, L.L.C. PROJECT

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Steve Perfit, moved to **table** the resolution(s) until more information is received from the City of Kingston.

Mr. Morrow revised his motion.

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Steve Perfit, moved to **table the Kingston resolution** until more information is received from the City of Kingston.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

Representatives asked if they should report back after the meeting.

Chair Horodyski responded that they should have conversations with Counsel Scott and he will instruct him to send an email to the members of the Agency to see where we are at.

NEW PALTZ LASALLE PROJECT

Ms. Skaine stated that this is the same purchaser, but a different LLC. They represent the seller.

Counsel Scott reviewed the resolution with the members of the Agency. He directed the members to Page 2, the WHEREAS paragraph describes the background. Again, this project was originally done in 2004; we permitted and consented to the assignment from the original company which was First Columbia New Paltz Group to the current company which is New Paltz LaSalle Medical Office LLC. Similar to the discussion with respect to the Kingston project there is a new company coming in looking to purchase and be the assignee or the existing UCIDA documents. The meat of the resolution really begins at the bottom of Page 2 where they make some findings. If you flip over to the top of Page 3 there is no new project here, no change in the operations and that has all been validated and/or confirmed through our due diligence by getting the application from the company. There is no new financing, no mortgage recording tax, no new financial assistance being granted here. It is a continuation of the existing status quo if you will. Section 2 has the approval of all this on Page 3 of the resolution and there is a slew of conditions. These are the protections that we impose as part of this assignment. We confirm that there are no unpaid taxes, no unpaid PILOT payments, no unpaid water/sewer assessment; that they are current with their job reporting and other provisions under the UCIDA documents. We confirm that they have the requisite insurance that is required under the original

documents. We require payment of the UCIDA fee and that is the blank in Sub clause 7 and we have an open item under Item 9 in case there are any additional conditions that are identified in connection with our discussion. Section 3 and 4 authorizes the Chairman to sign the documents and then Section 5 indicates that the resolution goes into effect immediately. This resolution follows the same format of what we followed in 2007 when they first came to us for the first assignment over. Again, we are following our past operating procedures, by both requiring an application from the new company and essentially following in the same format by way of the resolution.

Mr. Colucci stated that his understanding is that all we are doing is selling the same company. The entire property of the project. There is no new construction.

Chair Horodyski responded all they are looking to do is to assume the benefits that we provided to the old project.

Mr. John Morrow stated basically a name change.

Mr. Colucci stated that we are aware that these are not related.

Chair Horodyski responded these are separate projects.

Mr. Colucci stated that we are aware that the company that is selling is not selling to a company that is related to them.

Representatives responded that there is no relationship between the current owner and the purchaser.

RESOLUTION CONSENTING TO AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF THE NEW PALTZ LASALLE MEDICAL OFFICE, L.L.C. PROJECT

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Steve Perfit, moved to approve said resolution.

Vote: The Chairman requested a roll call vote.

Voting Yes: John Morrow, Steve Perfit, Paul Colucci, Michael Horodyski

Voting No: None.

Absent: Robert Kinnin and James Malcolm

The motion was adopted.

14 PINE STREET, LLC – (BLUE HAVEN HOSIERY)

Chair Horodyski explained that this gentleman was here in February. It is a sales tax exemption only PILOT; he is not looking for any additional benefits to this. What we are trying to do is make sure that Ellenville, as we do with all of our PILOTS, make sure that jurisdictions have had their say. They “neg dec’d” it two nights ago so from a SEQRA standpoint it was “neg dec’d”. There isn’t “a lot of heavy lifting” with this application. It was an existing warehouse that has burned down and they are basically looking to reconstruct and at this point for sales tax abatement. He would like to entertain the project for approval today unless there were any objections.

Mr. Colucci stated and we have heard from the taxing jurisdictions.

Ms. Suzanne Holt stated that correspondence is at the end of the application. The village invited her to meet with the business owner. They have been pushing from the beginning for the UCIDA to be as helpful as possible.

Chair Horodyski stated this is one where everybody is getting along.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE 14 PINE ST LLC PROJECT (SEQRA)

Motion: Steve Perfit, seconded by Paul Colucci, moved to approve said resolution.

Vote: The motion was adopted

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE 14 PINE ST LLC PROJECT

Counsel Scott stated that we did get a letter of support from the village. We have evidence of their SEQRA and because the project is relatively small, less than \$100,000 in benefits, we do not have to hold a public hearing.

Mr. Perfit stated that this company has been looking at other counties and other places; so we want to keep them here in Ellenville.

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Steve Perfit, moved to approve said resolution.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

OLD BUSINESS

Ulster Commons. Counsel Scott stated that Ulster Commons has not closed they are still working on the sound issue. He will have more details at the next meeting.

Hudson Valley Economic Development Corporation. Ms. Holt reported that Ulster County Development Corporation is the actual member for the county. Previously they have been paying \$20,000 per year. She was at a New York State Economic Development Council Regional Meeting in Albany a month of so ago and had opportunity to speak to her counterparts in Dutchess and Rockland and learned that they pay \$10,000 per year. She wanted to speak to UCDC first as they are the member and the UCIDA has agreed to pay half. Without HVEDC being able to explain why a smaller county with less population and less budget should pay more, the UCDC Board of Directors met last month and voted to pay \$10,000. She did call to request objective criteria and did not get it. She put before the Agency for consideration a payment of \$5,000 for this year.

Motion: Steve Perfit, seconded by Michael Horodyski, moved to pay Ulster County Development Corporation \$5,000 as half payment of the 2014 dues for Hudson Valley Economic Development Corporation.

Vote: The motion was adopted.

Park Point Application. Mr. Perfit would like to take the Park Point application and send it back to the applicant for further review. The reason for it, the Agency received the Application in February, 2013. We had a very good discussion about the definition of a unit in our Minutes of our May 2, 2013 meeting where he brought up the point as to what is a unit. His motion is basically to kick this back to Governance to define what a unit is. His point is that there have been numerous discussions with the developer, we have heard comments from the town, a unit is not a door to a building. A unit is a door to a bedroom or a pillow in a bedroom. They submitted an application on the number of units; some are fourplexes, some are duplexes. He thought that it was disingenuous to say that a unit is a door to a building. An example is that let's say that he was dorm developer and he built one building six stories high and he put 200 bedrooms in that dormitory and I say that is only one unit. What does that do to town/municipalities as far as the

number of people in that building. His argument is this. He has talked to other IDAs; they define a unit as a pillow. He is willing to accept a unit as a door to a bedroom, not a door to a unit. Let's bring it down some. Let's say it is a townhouse with four apartments on each floor, each apartment has four bedrooms. That is sixteen bedrooms. Let's say there are two per bedroom; that is thirty-two. Do you consider that as one unit or sixteen units or thirty-two units. He would like to have Governance define a unit as a door to a bedroom for dormitory purposes because if we don't set the precedent now, there will be a developer coming in here one day that says he is building a dorm with 200 bedrooms and one door so it is one unit. What does that do to the town and the multiplier effect that they must provide. This has nothing to do with the application and what is going on in New Paltz. He thought that had nothing to do with the Agency; let them negotiate their own tax deal, he doesn't care. When an application comes in that was submitted wrongly and we didn't review it back then and he told everyone to shelve it until the SEQRA process was done, we are reviewing it now. They submitted 230 some odd units or there will be 528 bedrooms. Is that fair.

Chair Horodyski stated that he was willing to pick up that mantle today given that 2/3 of the sitting board is not here, he chose not take this up on the Agenda today. He agreed with Mr. Perfit's synopsis.

Mr. Morrow stated that as Chairman of Governance they will take that up at their next meeting which they are going to scheduled in the near future.

Chair Horodyski stated that honestly he thought that in April they will come out and made a determination. The issue here is that everyone is saying that we have precedent in Golden Hill. It is nice to say that, but if somebody comes in here and builds a senior housing complex and they are three bedroom senior housing complexes or a two bedroom apartment, are we going to hit the senior housing complex for two? Would we really do that? Would we consider that to be two units when it is a single person living or single family living in that, but if we use Golden Hill as the example we use bedrooms. There is a need to review the UTEP and reviewing the stratification ...

Mr. Perfit stated that he really thought that the application should be "kicked back" as it has never been accepted.

Chair Horodyski stated that some of the questions provided earlier during Public Comment would have been well served during the update of our UTEP.

Mr. Perfit responded let's talk about the application. We didn't recognize the application when it was given to us because they had not started the SEQRA process. He remembers that distinctly. He said that he did not recognize Park Point because it doesn't exist until it is done with the SEQRA process. So who reviewed and approved the application. Here is a list of people that were here that are no longer here David O'Halloran, March Gallagher, Melinda Beuf, a consultant, a possible legislator. Who helped them with that application that was submitted incorrectly. He thought that it was incorrect. He thought that two things should occur. (1) Kick the application back to Park Point and ask them to amend it, we are defining what a unit is, and bring it back again and (2) Governance to address the unit issue.

Mr. Morrow asked should we send the application back before Governance has an opportunity to define a unit so that they can correctly fill out the application. How can they rightfully complete the application without that information.

Mr. Colucci thought that was a good point.

Chair Horodyski stated that his feeling is that Governance is going to call a meeting. A determination will be made as to a recommendation, which, when we have a full board here, we will certainly review. He thought it was disingenuous to vote with only four people here of the six.

Mr. Perfit stated that we should inform Park Point that we are not comfortable with their definition of a unit and we will be defining it clearly.

Mr. Morrow stated that Park Point should not be defining a unit, we should be.

Mr. Perfit agreed. We will define it. Here is the application and you need to put it in the format and if they don't accept the UTEP then it is fine. Let them negotiate it.

Chair Horodyski responded there is no negotiating. What we will do is define a unit, if it fits under our UTEP we move forward; this is off our plate. It will not be negotiated.

Mr. Perfit stated that we have "no skin" in the game.

Mr. Colucci stated that it is not fair to any applicant if this Agency can not convene a full board. He doesn't want to come here next month and find out that we are still missing two board members.

Mr. Morrow stated that there is no reason members are missing meetings.

Mr. Perfit stated that we are short one member and two are missing.

Motion: Steve Perfit, seconded by Paul Colucci, moved to send the Park Point Application back to the project applicant for review and/or amendment

Mr. Perfit withdrew his motion.

Chair Horodyski directed Governance to call a meeting, let's hammer the unit part out, let's bring it in April.

Mr. Morrow stated to be clear, Governance is only going to make a recommendation.

Counsel Scott will prepare a draft of a proposed resolution.

Post Closing Costs Policy. Counsel Scott reported that the post closing costs policy that was discussed, is also in the works.

REPORT FROM THE OFFICE OF BUSINESS SERVICES (OBS)

Ms Holt reported as follows:

- There is a business interested in purchasing a building in Saugerties. That should be coming to you very quickly.
- The Town Supervisor mentioned a meeting in New Paltz on March 20th, 2014 at 7:30 p.m., potentially another huge resort project that we have been working with for quite a while now. They were looking at property all over Ulster County; the piece that they are most interested in is in New Paltz. It could potentially create 250 jobs.
- She was hoping that the Nevele would be coming to the Agency. The County Executive hosted a big press event last week at the Ellenville Hospital in order to really show the support of all of Ulster County, the towns, the businesses, etc. in having the Nevele Casino. She has met with the Nevele to discuss UCIDA benefits.
- Williams Lake Rosendale Project has also requested a meeting.

- We are diligently working on PARIS. Melinda Beuf has resigned and she is gone. She was hopeful that they will meet the March 31, 2014 deadline.

Chair Horodyski stated that the PARIS filing is a huge part of their contract and what the Agency expects from the Office of Business Services. We need to keep in compliance.

Mr. Colucci asked how we can assist or what do we have to do. He understands that OBS is one person short right now.

Ms. Holt responded that the Finance Department has assigned a staff person. Ms. Beuf got as much as she could in shape before she left, but we have to get data from all the projects and some of the projects have not submitted the required information even though staff did a herculean job requesting all the information from everybody. It all has not come in. The Finance Department has assigned a staff person, but there is a learning curve in completing the PARIS Report. It would have taken Ms. Beuf dozens and dozens of hours. It is going to take this person even longer.

Mr. Colucci asked if the Agency needs to look outside the box for outside independent help.

Chair Horodyski responded not at this point. Unfortunately, we are going to exude the pressure of our contract with OBS and Ulster County to say just live up to your contract obligations.

Mr. Colucci asked are we going to have dialogue about that, aside from this meeting today.

Chair Horodyski responded that he was actually going to have the dialogue outside this meeting today and basically express the fact of the expectation that we stay in compliance.

Continuing with her report:

- The Office of Business Services will be hiring two positions – one is Ms. Beuf's position, Business Services Specialist. Right now we do a good job assisting businesses one on one. We haven't been able to do a great job with outreach to all of Ulster County's businesses so she would like to hire someone else to really focus on webinars and outreach to make sure that all of Ulster County's businesses know that the Office of Business Services is here to help. Ulster County businesses have a wide variety of needs.
- On the Job Training Program. The Office of Employment and Training normally has funds for on the job training, but because of sequestration they held back and now they have a lot of funds. The County Executive has created this program that will give businesses up to 90% of the wages during the training period for new employees. We are really hoping that this will spur new jobs. Any new employee that is hired, and the training can be any kind of employee and depending on the length of the training depends on how long they get this funding. That is available right now.
- In addition, the County Executive has heard from numerous manufacturers ... if only I could find somebody with such and such skills I would hire them immediately. He has heard this over and over again. He has created the Guaranteed Jobs Program. There was a meeting with 15 manufacturers last week to ask what exactly their needs were. SUNY Ulster and BOCES have committed to putting together a training program based upon what their needs are. The goal is if there are people that are trained to meet the needs of the employers, at the end they will be guaranteed a job at a decent wage for at least a year.

- The Office of Business Services has an intern and she is doing some research/study on PILOTs. She was hopeful that she would be able to come to the next meeting and present some of her findings.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: John Morrow, seconded by Paul Colucci, moved to adjourn the meeting

Vote: The motion was adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Morrow
Secretary