

## NAME

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YZ49UkdOhtY>

## DATE

April 2, 2021

## DURATION

1h 13m 16s

## 12 SPEAKERS

Rose Woodworth

James Malcolm

Richard O. Jones

Diane Eynon

Orlando Reece

All

Daniel Savona

Michael J. Ham

Faye Storms

Joe Scott

Eric Millard

Matt Tripoli

## START OF TRANSCRIPT

**[00:00:00] Rose Woodworth**

I want you to know now we're live on YouTube.

**[00:00:02] James Malcolm**

OK,

**[00:00:03] Rose Woodworth**

Well, I'm still letting people in because there's a lot of people here. OK, everybody is in, Chair.

**[00:00:13] James Malcolm**

All right, fine. That brings us to financials.

**[00:00:21] Richard O. Jones**

Go ahead Rose.

**[00:00:24] Rose Woodworth**

Sorry I'm trying to go with that page now. OK, so we're on the accrual basis as a reminder. So the annual administrative fees that were billed out, this is what was billed out, not necessarily collected in January with thirty six thousand dollars. And then you can see we also have an application fee that was for Apherea Inc. that came in, in January. The seminars, conferences, the PPE Grants. I do want to say you'll see when we get to the grants at the end, that we're essentially going to be out of money coming from the IDA assuming that you pass or approve the ones that we have for this meeting. But then we still have money left in the CRC to be able to use for grants. Um. The checking accounts balances in the CDs were at six hundred and twenty six, six hundred ninety six thousand dollars in money in the bank, and we had some accounts payable at year end. It was legal fees and some administrative staff fees that were due at year end that are now paid up.

**[00:01:50] James Malcolm**

Quick question. What do we have in the CRC as far as leftover grant money?

**[00:01:55] Rose Woodworth**

I think that's I hate to say to you in the CRC packet, so I'm not 100% sure. I want to say it was maybe sixty thousand fifty thousand dollars.

**[00:02:05] James Malcolm**

All right. Well, we'll. I don't know where it's appropriate on their finances or under old business, new business, but I think we should address that and maybe move that over. It's been a good beneficial program and we get a lot of nice response back from people over things we've done. So I guess we shall take that up in old business. How would that be? Good, all right. That's it for you for financials?

**[00:02:37] Rose Woodworth**

That's it.

**[00:02:37] James Malcolm**

Do you have any question, make a motion. We set the financials as presented,

**[00:02:42] Diane Eynon**

Make a motion. We accept the financials as presented.

**[00:02:47] James Malcolm**

To have a second?

**[00:02:48] Orlando Reece**

Second.

**[00:02:50] James Malcolm**

All those in favor.

**[00:02:52] All**

I.

**[00:02:52] James Malcolm**

Opposed. Carried. Thank you. The chair's report. Well, we've been very, very busy. A lot of new things. A lot, a lot of what you would characterize as housekeeping. You know, updating, going over our policies, new businesses approaching us, established businesses approaching us, and just the normal order. But it's been a busy year so far. So that's my report. OK, that brings me to the CEO's report, Rose.

**[00:03:30] Rose Woodworth**

Ok. So as I was writing this, I realized in finishing it up last night, this this one wins the prize for my longest report yet. So I apologize.

**[00:03:43] James Malcolm**

Oh Rose, less is more.

**[00:03:44] Rose Woodworth**

But there's a lot going on. I'm going to try. I'll talk fast. At last month's meeting, it was not completely clear as to who made and who seconded the motion to approve the annual housekeeping resolution of twenty twenty one. So I wanted to confirm on record that Daniel Savona, you made the motion and that Mike Ham seconded it.

**[00:04:03] Daniel Savona**

I did.

**[00:04:04] Rose Woodworth**

OK. Mike.

**[00:04:07] Michael J. Ham**

OK.

**[00:04:08] Rose Woodworth**

Thank you. M&T bank transfer, we got our second batch of checks from M&T Bank, but they have the wrong address on them this time, so we sent them back and are waiting on corrected checks before switching banks. On the bright side, after months of fighting with Capital One to get a credit card due to issues with mail going to our P.O. Box and no official documents with our physical address on it. We were finally able to secure a credit card with M&T Bank. It was approved on February 11th and we should expect it in the mail by the end of this week or early next week. The Open Meetings Law, The governor passed an executive order which includes the extension for public meetings and hearings to be held remotely for another 30 days until February 26th. And as COVID positives are remaining high, we expect our meetings to remain on Zoom until further notice. If the executive order runs out and it is not renewed, we'll obviously keep you all updated.

**[00:05:06] Rose Woodworth**

We received another FOIL request that I'm working with Joe Scott on to complete. The project closeouts: Kingston Hospitality, it was recorded on January 5th and we received copies on the twenty fifth. Rocking Horse Ranch, or Tee Bar was recorded on January 7th and we received copies on January twenty seven. Elna Magnetics. This was recorded on January 7th and we received copies on January twenty seven. Spotted Dog Ventures. Meredith, both Maggie and Meredith in Joe Scott's Firm have been in touch or tried to be in touch with company counsel for Spotted Dog Ventures, but she's not been responsive. She has what needs to be done in order to finish closing out the project, but we're still waiting on it. Another potential project is submitted their application for Prescreen. I believe there's also one business in the town of Ulster that is still working on filling out their application to start the pre screen process. The director of the Department of Economic Development, Tim Weidemann, and deputy director Kate Heidecker and I are meeting every other Friday to keep in touch on various projects, as well as trying to work together on common goals. It was brought to my attention that we may be due money back from the Schrade study in Ellenville. However, this past week, Director Reederman told me that he thought what we had done was very important for the site and Ellenville because of the study, he's been able to attract interest in the site and engage in discussions with site selectors that otherwise would not have occurred. This was all before

me and I'm not knowledgeable enough about this yet to speak much on the subject. However, if the board is concerned about the study, Tim said he was happy to discuss with the board at a future meeting. I know that some few of you here have mentioned that we were due money back from this because if there wasn't anything that turned up within three years that we were entitled to our money back. But Tim had thought that it was important. What we had done and that it wasn't for no reason. If anybody had more questions, you could let me know and then I can reach out to Tim to provide more clarification. After a few, after our first meeting a month ago, Director Weidemann saw to it that I was added to a health care consortium consisting of professionals from the county, SUNY, Ulster and Ulster BOCES and more. That is working on the shortage of health care professionals needed in our county. This group was of great interest to me as the shortage is something that was brought to my attention in late twenty nineteen by one of our projects. Aside from wanting to make a difference by adding good jobs to the county, I think it's also important that we offer our support to our projects. A couple of years ago, Ulster BOCES lost their CMA teacher due to cost caused by shortage in the industry. This has in turn caused less CNA professionals to be available in the area. Last Thursday, the consortium sent out a survey to local medical agencies to find out exactly what is needed before we can try to fix the problem. Unfortunately, they only got two responses so far, so I've subsequently reached out to the projects that we have in the industry, like Westchester Medical, Goldendale, Woodland Ponds and Albany Med, Emergent Care and urged them to respond, especially since several of them have expressed concern about the lack of medical professionals in the area. Two of them have already written back to me since last night and are now looking to respond to the survey and are extremely interested in what we're doing. As you know, we are working diligently on gathering the year end, reporting information from our project so we can report to New York State by the end of the month. Unfortunately, a number of projects have not sent in all of their information yet, although it was due back January 31st. I've been in touch with our chair of governance about this. We're sending out letters today with late fees to the following projects, Amthor Welding Service, Golden Hill Acquisitions, which is the old owners, Kingston Medical Properties, Viking Industries and Ulster, NH Realty. Again this year we've tried very hard to not be punitive and we did not issue any late fees for those that were late up to 15 days, although our policy calls for it. However, letters are going out to these projects that were late but have since submitted everything. Reminding them of the importance of timely reporting. A few of the projects have submitted everything except their fourth quarter NYS-45's as they've not been able to get them yet from payroll companies. And we have not said late fees or non-compliance letters as they've been keeping in touch and actually trying to resolve the issue. Legislator Brian Cahill, chairman of the Economic Development, Tourism, Housing, Planning and Transit Committee, has invited us to attend the next committee meeting on March 2nd. It has been his hope that we stay in touch quarterly. Annual site visits, I finish up the site visits with all the projects. I'll compile finished compiling the report, along with the information that was reported back by projects for Paris. As a reminder, all of this information will go to the audit committee and then it'll go to the governance committee for any issues. Our insurance policies are up for renewal next month. We're working on trying to house all of our insurance with one local broker as to ensure that we do not have any lapses in coverage. Earlier this month, I provided the audit committee with an update and post closing affidavits from projects that are done with construction and finished using their sales tax exemptions. Brooklyn Bottling's affidavit show that the project went over their estimated cost, so they submitted a payment of five thousand five hundred ninety five dollars ninety nine cents to us. We'll reconcile their affidavit with their audited financials once they are completed. And we're now waiting on responses from Henry Stout, which is a Full Moon Resort, Saugerties Hospitality, Landmark Preservation and PODS. I want to thank all of you for sending back your acknowledgments of fiduciary duties and responsibilities for the IDA and the CRC. And we need board approval in order to pay the final invoice from Hodgson Russ in the amount of seven thousand three hundred thirty dollars and fifty one cents for their work during the third and fourth quarter of twenty twenty. A copy of this invoice was sent out prior to the meeting and I have reviewed each line.

**[00:11:36] James Malcolm**

Ok, what I'd like is a couple of things. Number one, on the reporting, hopefully we can go through governance and if we have people who aren't doing that and then come back to us looking for another benefit, they're precluded meeting any sort of benefit until they're in compliance.

**[00:11:56] Rose Woodworth**

Yep.

**[00:11:58] James Malcolm**

I don't know what kind of language we need, but, you know, fool me once, shame on me right or fool me, whatever kind of the other thing. The other thing you vetted them do we have, I like just maybe Rick and Diane to just, you know, vet them as well. Joe stuff, because three sets of eyes are better than one set of eyes, and that's no reflection on you. I'd like to get a motion to pay council's bill contingent on the vetting showing no issues there. Can I get a motion.

**[00:12:40] Faye Storms**

I'll make that motion.

**[00:12:42] James Malcolm**

Can I get a second?

**[00:12:43] Richard O. Jones**

I'll second.

**[00:12:45] James Malcolm**

Any question on that? And we'll expedite Joe, and thank you so much for all those in favor.

**[00:12:53] All**

I.

**[00:12:54] James Malcolm**

Opposed? Carried. I need a motion, too. Are you done?

**[00:12:58] Joe Scott**

Thank you very much.

**[00:13:00] Rose Woodworth**

No. Not done. Sorry. Wishful thinking. The audit committee asked me to total the amount of money spent on administrative staff for the Kingstonian, and my best estimate to date is nineteen thousand four hundred dollars. This does not include the time spent during board meetings around meeting documents that may have included the Kingstonian. However, it does include one thousand five hundred and fifty dollars on FOILS so far relating to the Kingstonian. Did you get that Diane? OK because I know you would ask specifically, so I want to make sure you heard it. So with all of the new projects coming in and the constant housekeeping policy changes that are happening with the idea and CRC, our firm decided that we needed additional staff for our office. So if you happen to stop in or call the office, please feel free to introduce yourselves to Wendy Quinn. She'll be transitioning into providing more support staff that I need for the IDA and the CRC. Ulster County Controller Marg Gallagher has asked the agency to participate in her annual risk assessment process as she did last year. Although it's not mandatory, we will be participating in the survey and then in a follow up interview for transparency purposes. And last but certainly not least, I've been working over the last couple of months on bringing awareness to the issue that the school districts, faced with pilots and the tax cap. I've had a few conversation with the New York State Economic Development Council's Executive Director, Ryan Silva, about the issue. He's provided more insight on the subject for me. And it was my understanding that at the time there was a bill passed a few years ago that went through the state assembly and Senate, but it did not make it off the governor's desk. The belief is that the bill was not signed by Governor Cuomo because at the time the tax cut formula was temporary and the governor did not want to change a temporary formula. Mr. Silva believes that there's a real chance of getting a bill passed now that the tax cap is permanent. Since our initial conversation on the subject, he has reached out to the original sponsor and co-sponsors of the bill to try to bring it back before the state Senate and Assembly. I personally had a phone call with Republican State Senator Peter Oberdorfer and sent him a copy of the bill. He's aware that I've been trying to get in touch with Democratic State Senator Michelle Hinchey and intend to speak with State Senator Jim Tedisco about the matter as well. There is an agreement that education and ensuring the funding for education is a great thing to be a bipartisan issue. So I'll continue to keep in touch with the senators about the issue and we'll be urging the Ulster County legislature to try to push it as well when we meet with the EDTHPT committee next month. And I'm personally grateful to the board of the Kingston Consolidated School District for bringing the issue to our attention when discussing the Kingstonian PIOLET. And I look forward to our agency doing everything we can to help the issue so that we can help economic development in Ulster County and assist school districts and IDA's throughout the State.

**[00:16:07] James Malcolm**

That's great work, Rose. Great follow up there. Thank you.

**[00:16:17] Richard O. Jones**

I have one question from your report.

**[00:16:20] Rose Woodworth**

Yes.

**[00:16:21] Richard O. Jones**

But I think the audit committee had put in place different fees or had suggested different fees for FOIL request. Did that come through or was that stalled because one of the FOIL requesters had a major problem with this?

**[00:16:39] Rose Woodworth**

Yeah, it was. It was it went through governance and it was stalled before coming to the board so that council could review it to be sure that we weren't doing anything against the law.

**[00:16:49] Richard O. Jones**

Ok, so it's still being reviewed?

**[00:16:52] Joe Scott**

Yes, I'm working on that, Rick. Thank you.

**[00:16:56] James Malcolm**

That it rose?

**[00:16:58] Rose Woodworth**

That's it. Finally.

**[00:16:59] James Malcolm**

Can I get a motion for concurrence and receipt of the CEOs report.

**[00:17:06] Faye Storms**

I'll make that motion.

**[00:17:07] James Malcolm**

Thank you. Faye, can I have a second? Anyone on the question? I made the second thank you on the question. All those in favor.

**[00:17:19] All**

Aye.

**[00:17:19] James Malcolm**

All right, Larry, thank you very much for committee reports, Dr. Eynon Audit.

**[00:17:28] Diane Eynon**

All right, have a few things to report on today, as you've heard, we've been busy going through all of our policies between governance and audit and making recommendations for amendments to some of these policies to reflect where we are right now and what we think is necessary to do our work. I'll start with Loewke Brill. You'll see the report on page 17. What happened during our audit meeting in this came out of our last month's meeting is that we asked the question. Rick asked the question how was it to clarify criteria for reporting to us on these on these jobs? And so Kevin Loewke came and visited with us, and we had a good conversation with him, a long one, about how this reporting is put together for us each month. And essentially what we learned is, is that he will get weekly headcounts from the contractor. But what happens is they're using it on daily sign and logs that then become part of the weekly count, that then become part of the monthly report that comes to us. And what we discovered is and this is because we made a decision as a board, not this board, but previously, to reduce the number of actual site visits that Kevin will do on any given site because it was a cost issue at that time for the board. And so what he will do is bi-monthly, he will show up on the job site and actually look at the sign and logs that each of the contractors do to sign it, etc.. And what we've discovered is that, for example, this month you'll see in our report on page 17 is that you see a 90 percent monthly compiling compliance average, and that is based on weekly labor reports that are submitted to him any given month. But what we also saw is that when he actually did the site visit at the end of January, 42 percent was the compliance rate. So clearly what's happening is these weekly logs, right, are getting pulled together. They become the monthly compliance rate based on weekly logs reported to Loewke Brill. But when he actually does site visits, you can see that there's some discrepancy there only because he's there on that particular day to capture the information. So one of the things that we want to do, in audit will continue to have this conversation and with governance is looking at perhaps increasing the month to a monthly visit on these job sites and not bi-monthly, given some of the information that we're trying to do that we're starting to get and have a better understanding of what we're really looking at. So I just want to be clear that you're seeing a 90 percent monthly compliance for four January based on what's been submitted to Loewke Brill. But the actual site visit showed forty two percent compliance. The overall compliance since the inception of the project for this group for Inness is seventy nine point seven two percent. So they're just right under that 80 percent mark overall as a project. The other thing that we're going to discuss further around, Loewke Bill, what we're doing is Jimmy asked the question around contractors and subcontractors and ten ninety nine. Why is that important? Because if folks are in ten ninety nine, there's insurance issues related to that. And we need to get a better handle on who those workers might be and also around wages. So I think that's pretty much a summary of where we are with Loewke Brill. Jimmy, I think you wanted to add based on the conversation we had.

**[00:21:17] James Malcolm**

Just have a quick question and I get it. You could have you could pick a day where you go on to a job site and whatever people aren't there kind of thing, but. If that ends up being the case, how actual is that seventy nine point whatever number, you know, because it's well, you're never going to get it. We're never going to get it perfect. It's garbage in. Garbage out.

**[00:21:45] Diane Eynon**

Clearly.

**[00:21:46] James Malcolm**

I ask we make them we make them sign an affidavit and anything like that. To me, I'm not looking to reinvent the wheel.

**[00:21:58] Diane Eynon**

Right. I think these are the things, Jimmy, frankly, we need to talk to continue to talk about an audit. I know Rose and I were back late last night with Kevin email, trying to kind of sort some of these things out. And it is a bit it's a little confusing at times. But I think what we would like to do is we don't have I think the contract with them ended in November, but I think we just roll into the next year with them. And I think this is an opportunity for us to think about what we're asking them to do and the information that we want to get reported back in the frequency of that in terms of site visits and look at redoing the contract and putting those things in the contract.

**[00:22:37] James Malcolm**

Just something. And I say simple because it was part of my purview myself, Mr. Ham, over the years is, you know, if you're going to have an employee log, you can have a certified payroll. If one doesn't match up with the other, then then there's a concern. But again, these are all good ideas and good working points. I think some of the changes that have been put in place and I can't tell you how good I think the audit committee is doing on this stuff because it's not easy. We're essentially changing a culture a little bit and, you know, we're going to have some stumbles along the way. But good job. With your committee.

**[00:23:19] Rose Woodworth**

I want to add part of the reason it was 42 percent and it did increase for that site visit is some of the workers didn't have their driver's licenses on them. So those licenses were submitted back to to Loewke Brill for whoever they had the names for after the fact. And I did also want to add that when we I'm sure most of you remember when we did this, we didn't really know what we were doing and we were trying to get an idea. And I think now we've done it for a year. We understand what's going on. We see where some of the issues are. So like Diane said, it is a good point to now re-evaluate and maybe we should change the terms of what we're doing.

**[00:24:00] James Malcolm**

We're going to continually be tweaking until we get what is best serves the board, the county, whatever. In a perfect world, everybody would be one hundred percent honest and up front. And, you know, but we're doing our due diligence, so we're further ahead than we were a couple of years ago. Right. OK, Dr. anything else?

**[00:24:25] Diane Eynon**

I have a couple of the amendments that resolutions to change some language in some of our policy. So I'll try to get through these pretty quickly. On page 18, we have the background check policy and we would like to make an amendment to that policy, which you can find on page twenty one. Essentially, what we talked about was the fact that for application submission we wanted to look at that we have part of the requirement is that we require audited finances to be submitted to us when during application submission and what we realized that for smaller companies, this can be a terrific burden for them financially because a single audited financials is usually ten thousand dollars so far, requiring three. That is thirty thousand dollars potentially, that the applicant has to pay to submit the audited financials. So what we talked about is, is you'll see on page twenty one is to make an amendment to this, to reflect our concern for that. And saying that and this will be in Section four, the applicant submits three years of audited financial statements provided, however, if the applicant has five million or less of assets. So in other words, we are putting this at five million dollars or less. You don't necessarily have to submit audited financials. Your tax returns are adequate for us, although we have the discretion to require the audited financials if we see anything to do our due diligence that make us think that we might need the actual audited financials. And then this way we have lee-way to do one thing or the other. But we're hoping that with the tax returns, which a tax accountant will be signing off on, it's verified and vetted that way that we have some protection there, but we have the discretion to require the audited financials if we think we need to. So that is the amendment we would like to make to this policy.

**[00:26:40] James Malcolm**

Ok, would you like to put that in a quick form and make a motion chair? And that way I can get a second and we can move on.

**[00:26:47] Diane Eynon**

Yeah, I'd like to make a resolution that we change the background check policy to reflect that applicants can then submit three years of audited financial statements provided, however, the applicant has five million or less of assets and that financial statements are not required unless requested by the agency.

**[00:27:11] James Malcolm**

I have a motion. Do I have a second?

**[00:27:14] Richard O. Jones**

I'll second.

**[00:27:15] James Malcolm**

Thank you, Rick. Anything on the question? All those in favor.

**[00:27:19] All**

Aye.

**[00:27:22] James Malcolm**

I need a roll call. Jimmy. Sorry.

**[00:27:24] James Malcolm**

I'm sorry.

**[00:27:25] Rose Woodworth**

James. Malcolm.

**[00:27:27] James Malcolm**

Yes.

**[00:27:28] Rose Woodworth**

Diane Eynon.

**[00:27:29] Diane Eynon**

Yes.

**[00:27:30] Rose Woodworth**

Faye Storms

**[00:27:30] Faye Storms**

Yes.

**[00:27:31] Rose Woodworth**

Michael Ham.

**[00:27:32] Michael J. Ham**

Yes.

**[00:27:33] Rose Woodworth**

Orlando Reece.

**[00:27:34] Orlando Reece**

Yes.

**[00:27:35] Rose Woodworth**

Daniel Savona.

**[00:27:37] Daniel Savona**

Yes.

**[00:27:38] Rose Woodworth**

Richard Jones.

**[00:27:38] Richard O. Jones**

Yes.

**[00:27:40] Rose Woodworth**

Thank you.

**[00:27:41] Diane Eynon**

Thank you. The next policy that we want to make some recommendations for change is a procurement policy. And your. Find that on page twenty two, and if you go to page twenty five, you will see the proposed amend language to that. And Mike, if you don't mind, would you walk us through that in terms of what you wanted to we discussed about breach of contract and why this is important to to include in our policy.

**[00:28:08] Michael J. Ham**

Yes, so we know from what we went through here back a couple months ago. With what was the name of the company again? Ellenbogen. OK, so we've seen how that was problematic for us. So what it is, is I took language that we're used to doing in contracts, and Jimmy's probably familiar with it, too. Now, I did present this language and I did say to have Joe take a look at this, because Joe could probably tone it, you know, squish it down a little bit. Mine's a little long. And Joe could probably get to the point a little better than I do. That's what he does. So in it, it just says basically all parties shall perform their obligation strictly in accordance with this agreement in case a violation of this agreement, the breaching party B shall compensate the non breaching party A for the losses and the responsible for all other responsibilities as imposed by law. Whether or not this agreement is terminated, the non breaching party A could notify in writing. And writing requests to rectify and correct such a breach of contract if the breaching Party B cannot take any action to satisfy the non breaching party, A, and rectify and correct such breach within 14 days upon the issuance of the written notice, the non breaching party A. could take the actions pursuant to this agreement or any other measures in accordance with laws. If Party B cannot repay any advance pursuant to this agreement, Party B shall pay a rate of zero point two percent per day for any outstanding amount of advance to party A. Calculated from the request date for repayment by Party B and shall also indemnify Party A in full against economic damages due to the breach of this agreement. Failure to perform in conformity with this procurement policy shall and will constitute a breach of the contract and shall result in breaching party to be responsible for all damage incurred by the agency.

**[00:30:10] James Malcolm**

I don't know how you could squeeze that down, anyway.

**[00:30:14] Michael J. Ham**

You know, sometimes I Jim, the world we live in, the broader we have it,

**[00:30:24]**

(Inaudible)

**[00:30:25] James Malcolm**

It's like the words, but not limited to.

**[00:30:25] Michael J. Ham**

Yeah, yeah, exactly.

**[00:30:25] James Malcolm**

But listen so if council would be as eloquent to give us a quick synopsis of what the chair governance just presented. Good luck with this one Joe.

**[00:30:43] Joe Scott**

So what I did was I, I, I use the language verbatim. I did correct a couple of there were a couple of tweaks that I needed to make. But if you if you see if you go to page twenty five of the of the of your PDF. I actually have the language outline there, but I have introductory language, you see how I say under Section six, I say language and substantially the following form shall be used. And that way that gives me some flexibility to work with Rose to put what we need to put in the act or in the actual document.

**[00:31:20] James Malcolm**

Ok, so in lay terms. All right. So everybody understands the motion we're making.

**[00:31:27] Diane Eynon**

And Mike would do

**[00:31:30] James Malcolm**

Just a quick overview. This gives us the authority to.

**[00:31:37] Joe Scott**

Right, well, to collect fees and to basically go after someone who has defaulted on a contract with us, candidly to the Ellenbogen, you know, the contract that Mike was talking about, I mean, it was a small contract. We now have model language that will drop into everything. We have language like this actually more expansive in our straight lease documents, but they're large, you know, complicated transactions. So we're protected with this kind of language in our in our typical straight lease documents. What this does is bring that same level to smaller procurement contracts.

**[00:32:19] James Malcolm**

Ok, so everyone has an understanding of that. Can I get a motion to adopt that change?

**[00:32:27] Diane Eynon**

I make a motion that we adopt and accept the new Section six. It's going to be added to the procurement policy as reflected on page twenty five.

**[00:32:39] James Malcolm**

I have a second.

**[00:32:41] Faye Storms**

I'll second.

**[00:32:42] James Malcolm**

OK, roll call.

**[00:32:45] Rose Woodworth**

James Malcolm.

**[00:32:47] James Malcolm**

Yes.

**[00:32:50] Rose Woodworth**

Diane Eynon

**[00:32:51] Diane Eynon**

Yes.

**[00:32:51] Rose Woodworth**

Faye Storms

**[00:32:51] Faye Storms**

Yes.

**[00:32:51] Rose Woodworth**

Michael Ham.

**[00:32:52] Michael J. Ham**

Yes.

**[00:32:53] Rose Woodworth**

Orlando Reece.

**[00:32:54] Orlando Reece**

Yes.

**[00:32:54] Rose Woodworth**

Daniel Savona.

**[00:32:57] Daniel Savona**

Yes.

**[00:32:58] Rose Woodworth**

Richard Jones.

**[00:32:59] Richard O. Jones**

Yes.

**[00:33:00] Rose Woodworth**

Thank you.

**[00:33:02] Diane Eynon**

And I have one more policy change recommendation. We've been we've been busy. If you go to page twenty six, proposed changes are to the enforcement of projects policy. And if you go to page twenty nine in your packet, you will see the it's rather long, but what you'll see is any text that is underlined is the actual additions or amendment that we want to make to the existing policy. So if you go down here, some of this is really a lot of this is about aligning the policy to our actual practices. So if you go to Section B five, for example, we're changing from within 60 days to thirty one days because that reflects actually how much time that we need Rose needs then to take this information and create reports that she needs to do. The same is true in B applicant requirements number six, again taking it from sixty days to a thirty one day requirement. If you go down to page 30, the same thing, number seven is changing it from 60 to thirty one days. If you go further down on page thirty B, section 4A under monitoring number one, what we would like to do is again to reflect our practice, which is we actually perform a monitoring visit of every active project, at least every year, because that is what we do. So that is the proposed change. Underneath number three Rose, you want to talk a little bit more about what you're requiring here for the purposes of having information you need for reporting?

**[00:34:54] Rose Woodworth**

Yeah, the only thing that we were really adding here was what we already do, which is asking for copies of the payroll journal summarized by employees showing the hours worked and the growth we just told of my employee and project applicant for the year in question. The reason for that is without the payroll journal and the hours worked, you're unable to calculate, verify the full time equivalent. So we would take that information to actually figure out the full time equivalent. The rest of what's here is pretty much what was already in the policy, we're just stating it a little bit more clearly, as well as outlining that it's at this moment one hundred dollars for the cost of the CPA verification rather than just blankly leave, saying CPA verification.

**[00:35:46] Diane Eynon**

Thanks Rose and then the last proposed changes at the bottom of page thirty one section C number one. So as you know, we have required 80 percent compliance and we are talking about for compliance related to existing jobs and compliance related to jobs by the applicant. So what we had a long discussion about the fact that when we do our cost benefit analysis, we base the cost benefit analysis on one hundred percent compliance for existing jobs and new projected new jobs. Yet we benchmark at 80 percent for the the project. And we believe we believe strongly that we need to increase the percentage related to projected new jobs because we are at 80 percent that the bar seems rather low and the gap between one hundred percent to 80 percent on any given project and the number of jobs can be somewhat significant. We also don't want to incentivize our projects right to to really be aggressive in terms of their commitment to to projected new jobs. And so we would like to increase it to 90 percent of projected jobs have been retained or created after three years from closing with one hundred percent for existing jobs and will be subject to review and possible enforcement action. So we are proposing that change to our policy.

**[00:37:18] James Malcolm**

Ok, can I get a (inaudible)

**[00:37:23] Joe Scott**

Sorry, Chair, may I make a comment?

**[00:37:26] James Malcolm**

Sure you can.

**[00:37:27] Joe Scott**

Thank you. When I prepared this language and I discussed it, obviously with Rose, you'll see that the way I addressed the retaining portion of the change is that I just I didn't use the word retaining because you'll recall that there was quite a bit of discussion some time ago about what the definition of retained jobs are. So I basically said maintain its original job, employment level. The issue there, though, is that oftentimes our pilots in 10 years, sometimes longer, we might want to be thinking a little bit about the evolution of a business and or an industry and whether there's a change in their technology that results, unfortunately or fortunately, depending on your perspective of a change in employment levels and whether this will actually create a negative impact, because it won't provide for or allow for or promote technological improvements in whatever the business is using. So I just want to flag some of these issues for you. The other thought was, you know, 80 percent to 90 percent. What that potentially will do and I think you're being responsible is that we'll, it will potentially increase the amount of time that you spend with enforcement issues. And that's certainly something that you've take very seriously. But obviously there's a cost to that. So and as Diane properly indicated, this isn't a bright line test. I mean, if they fail to meet the 90 percent, that doesn't necessarily mean that you implement you know, you're sick, the lawyers and them, so to speak. At the risk of being flippant, it still gives you flexibility to have discussions with the project applicant and to and get a better understanding of what's going on. So those were my comments as I looked at that language.

**[00:39:38] Faye Storms**

Right. But, Joe, we're looking for FTE's so over the long term. Correct. That's why they're getting the incentives. So if because of technological advances they're losing those jobs, then I think the incentives have to be lessened for them because I mean, that's something I don't think because they have better technology that, You know, they should not be able to provide the jobs that they promised.

**[00:40:09] James Malcolm**

I think that that council and chairs narrative on that is it's clear we want to have the ability to to deal with it. But like a couple of these other ones that have appeared before us, who would tell you that? Well, it's because of covid. And we're looking at numbers from two thousand nineteen.

**[00:40:31] Faye Storms**

Right, we know we had the interview.

**[00:40:35] James Malcolm**

It gives us a lot of latitude. But again, it plays right into this group, talking as a whole about mentoring and things like that. And, you know, there's no I didn't know kind of deal so.

**[00:40:52] Diane Eynon**

Right. And I think to we have the option and it's in there that we will review it. We have options, but doesn't necessarily mean that you're automatically going to have enforcement actions taken against you. And I think that's in there that that. But I think it's good to have a bar that is high and reflects. I mean, we are giving the cost benefit analysis based on one hundred percent compliance on protecting new jobs, and 80 percent certainly seems to be too low. And so I think it's important that we change the language.

**[00:41:28] James Malcolm**

Yeah, no. OK, well, listen, can I get a motion to accept the changes presented. Can I get a motion?

**[00:41:36] Faye Storms**

I'll make the motion.

**[00:41:39] James Malcolm**

Rick, will you second that second.

**[00:41:42] Richard O. Jones**

OK, I'll second it.

**[00:41:42] James Malcolm**

Anything on the question.

**[00:41:43] Richard O. Jones**

Yeah. The other point around 80 and 90 and changes to technology is in the case of mergers where. I mean, I think that's what happened without two large hospitals, they had a merger and jobs decreased significantly from what was promised individually. So I don't have a solution for that. But constant monitoring and querying the applicants why. And in the case of some where it's significant and it was with the hospitals we may decide to face quite well. We're going to change the pilot. Now, I don't know how we accomplished that.

**[00:42:27] James Malcolm**

Well, you put (inaudible)

**[00:42:28] Richard O. Jones**

If that needs to be part of the confrontation, but just a thought.

**[00:42:32] James Malcolm**

You put it in the application. You know, it just what it says is this group, this board is willing to work with people and sometimes things come about. There's nothing you can do about it. So it shouldn't be punitive. But again, on the other side of that, there's it's very important that the you know, the applicant, whoever receives the incentive is continually up to date with us. So it's a good preventative measure. It's it's I give audit a lot of credit for being proactive on this issue. So I have a motion of a second. All those in favor. We're going to do a roll call vote.

**[00:43:12] Rose Woodworth**

James Malcolm

**[00:43:12] James Malcolm**

Yes.

**[00:43:14] Rose Woodworth**

Diane Einem.

**[00:43:15] Diane Eynon**

Yes.

**[00:43:16] Rose Woodworth**

Faye Storms.

**[00:43:17] Faye Storms**

Yes.

**[00:43:18] Rose Woodworth**

Michael Ham.

**[00:43:20] Michael J. Ham**

Yes.

**[00:43:21] Rose Woodworth**

Orlando Reece

**[00:43:22] Orlando Reece**

Yes.

**[00:43:22] Rose Woodworth**

Daniel Savona.

**[00:43:24] Daniel Savona**

Yes.

**[00:43:26] Rose Woodworth**

Richard Jones.

**[00:43:27] Richard O. Jones**

Yes.

**[00:43:29] Diane Eynon**

All right, and thank you, everyone, and Last, just for our next meeting, just to give you an update, because we've been rolling through these policies as governance has, our next review will be of the local construction labor policy. Are you UTEP, Code of Ethics and Interest in deposit policy. So that'll be on our docket moving forward. So thank you, Chair. That that concludes my report.

**[00:43:51] James Malcolm**

Thank you. Clear eyes. Good job. Good job to everybody on audit. All right. That brings us to finance. Faye.

**[00:44:00] Faye Storms**

There is no finance committee meeting this month, so no report chair.

**[00:44:04] James Malcolm**

Thank you. Brings us into governance, Mr. Ham.

**[00:44:09] Michael J. Ham**

Thank you, Chair. There was no meeting in January for governance. We will be scheduling a meeting coming up here in March. Also, we'll be reporting back to the Chair and to the entire board on the community benefits and the mentoring program. That's my report, Chair.

**[00:44:26] James Malcolm**

It's good stuff, we're expanding our horizon with that. Mike, thank you very much. OK, that brings us to all business status spending projects.

**[00:44:42] Rose Woodworth**

Joe, do you want to.

**[00:44:46] Joe Scott**

Yes, thank you, if you go to page 20, sorry, 32. And I've outlined there the status of pending projects. No change on wild Barry, Kingstonian we took action at the January meeting and we're just waiting to hear back from the company on the next steps with respect to that matter. Apherea, we've adopted the public hearing resolution again at the January meeting, and we're just waiting to schedule a public hearing once they finalize their application. And we have our file complete. And then Magruder's solar is on the agenda today for possible consideration of a public hearing resolution. And that's my report chair. Thank you.

**[00:45:35] James Malcolm**

Thank you, Counsel. Can I get a motion to accept Counsel's report is presented?

**[00:45:41] Richard O. Jones**

Motion.

**[00:45:42] James Malcolm**

I have a second.

**[00:45:43] Diane Eynon**

Second.

**[00:45:44] James Malcolm**

All those in favor.

[00:45:44] All

Aye.

[00:45:47] James Malcolm

Opposed? Carried. Thank you. That brings us, I guess, into new business, Joe.

[00:45:55] Rose Woodworth

I'll, so that's right. So Magruder's Solar is here to present their application. I don't know who. I don't know who from the group wants to speak. I know there's a few of them here. If you could give us a brief overview of the project and then we can go into the application a little bit further.

[00:46:22] Eric Millard

Yeah, so if you don't mind, I can just spend a minute talking about CS Energy and then I'll pass it on to Matt Tripoli, who will talk about the project and the specifics that worked for everybody.

[00:46:34] Rose Woodworth

Sounds great.

[00:46:35] Eric Millard

Great. OK, so my name is Eric Mullard. I'm chief commercial officer with the U.S. Energy. Nice to meet you all. I appreciate you having us here this morning. I'll give you a brief overview of CS Energy. So we are we develop and design and build community solar and utility scale solar projects across the country. We're active in about 14 different states, but we're most mostly active here in the northeast region. So we do we're headquartered here in New Jersey, but we have a big presence in New York. We actually opened an office in Albany last year. Actually, the lease started on April 1st last year, which was terrible timing. But we've established a really good presence here. We have 50 full time employees working in New York State, in addition to employing several hundred other construction laborers on our projects as well, either through direct hiring or subcontractors. It's important to note that we're not just developers. We actually design and build and provide ongoing (inaudible) and online services for projects as well. So we're working around for a long time. We're not folks that are going to be just developing and then walking away before the project started. We're in it for the long haul, which is why it's really important for us to establish really good relationships with the communities in New York. We've built about two hundred megawatts of projects so far over the last several years. We have about two hundred and fifty megawatts of projects under construction currently as we speak. And all of those projects, community relationships and stakeholder engagement, is really important. Developing strong relationships in the community is really critical for us because we're going to be around for a long time and our relations are our reputation is extremely important. And so IDA PIOLTS are a great way for us to help us contribute meaningfully to the community establishing a comprehensive community benefits package that benefits all the stakeholders involved while also giving us the certainty that we need to get our projects financed and ultimately get them get the construction people working. So with that, I wanted to pass it over to Matt Tripoli, director of Project Development, to give you an overview of this specific project, which is a five megawatt project in called Magruder Solar. So thank you.

[00:49:13] Matt Tripoli

Thank you. Can everybody hear me? Right. OK, well, yeah, yep, so this is Matt Trebly, director of product development with CS Energy. So we've been working on a project in the town of Shawangunk since since late twenty eighteen. So we initially contemplated doing a large utility scale solar project in town about about one hundred acres of property on the on a very far eastern edge of the town. There's a large central Hudson transmission line that runs through the town in that area. And we thought it was a good place to develop a project of that size. So we brought the project forward to the town and in twenty nineteen and they passed a solar law where they wanted to see smaller solar projects, some more community scale solar projects, and after some back and forth with the planning and zoning boards, decided it was best to kind of revisit our plans for the area and look at a smaller project. So we kind of took the downtime that came with everything that happened in twenty twenty and went back to the drawing board with Central Hudson and brought forward an application to the town for a community solar project similar to what you've seen most in Ulster County for the solar projects that have been built thus far. So we're looking at a 20 acre solar project or describe it as five megawatt solar projects. Again on the on the eastern edge of town. So it's on a portion of the site. We were initially planning for the largest solar project, but we think it's a good way to bring forward a project that has a smaller footprint but does match up with the town's intentions around their solar law. We found in developing products throughout the state that give the certainty associated with with great agreements is extremely important for financing. Definitely want to be upfront with this presentation that the town, there are multiple ways to approach a PILOT for renewable energy projects in New York State. The town of Shawangunk and the school district where the project is located have opted out of the real property tax law forty seven, which is one avenue we'd have to enter into PILOT agreements with the taxing jurisdictions and the other is through the board, such as yourselves, through IDA related agreements. So we as a company have been involved in several IDA derived PILOT agreements or similar projects throughout the state. I'm just within the last year or two, so I'm happy to be bringing this application forward and talking to your board about what we're intended to do in the town of Shawangunk. Thank you. And then you have my colleague, Greg Somalo, who's on the phone as well. So he's going to be prepared to chat about our application in more detail. But I don't know if before we dive into that, Rose, if you wanted to open up for questions or anything of that nature about just the kind of high level our company or the product we're looking at in the area.

[00:52:12] James Malcolm

I have a question actually to follow up from the prescreen. And I'm not really sure if it was you I was speaking with or who I was speaking with, but. Given the fact that there's no real retain of jobs in solar, I mean, you plug it in, you unplug it. I don't want to make it sound that simple. It's not my purview. But I know we did discuss using local contractors, local labor. You spoke to me about

relationships that you had with trade unions in New Jersey and things you had done there. I want to know where that stands in the process, because I actually reached out to a couple of people and have yet to hear anything back. So maybe you can give me a little bit of an update on where you stand.

**[00:53:07] Eric Millard**

This is I'll take this I'll take that question, so yes, so for this project, we're very comfortable committing to using local labor, assuming it's available and we're comfortable committing to hiring union labor force to build the project. So where I think I've mentioned to you in New Jersey, we work exclusively with union contractors that has extended up into the lower Hudson Valley, where we build where we built some projects, solar projects in New York to date. So we actually had a number of conversations with both the Electrical IBEW Union and the Laborers Union over the last couple of weeks in New York. They're obviously very interested in participating in solar projects statewide in New York. And so we've discussed this project with both of those unions. And obviously those are the two primary unions that we utilize for projects with the laborers to do the nuts and bolts of installing the metal racking system and the electricians connect all the wires so that they're aware of the project and excited to to work with us.

**[00:54:25] James Malcolm**

The guy who's been around a little while and know the way it's been described, because I know there's a million different ways to set the bases, the panels or whatever. But there's there's clearly work in there for, you know, operating engineers if you have some pile, there's work for a pile driver there. And, you know, this is kind of a rehash what we talked about. But I want to know what the status is at this point. Had you had communications with the trades in this area?

**[00:54:56] Eric Millard**

So we haven't spoken to any locals in the area recently, but we've had conversations with the statewide folks at both the IBEW and the labor unions who are all based in Albany about supporting our projects. And we are currently hiring several union contractors right now on our projects that we're building in the Albany area. So we have not yet done any outreach to union subcontractors in the area because we're still six months away from starting construction on this project. We would traditionally begin that outreach a little bit sooner to when we start construction. But I'm comfortable committing that. We we will use union labor and we want to go to local contractors first in the region that need, and once we get a little closer to construction, we'll have the designs a little bit further and we can send those out to those contractors before getting bids once (inaudible).

**[00:56:01] James Malcolm**

I understand I'm not lobbying for anyone here. It's just, you know, with potential changes on the horizon in twenty, twenty two with legislation that the governor had passed regarding public funding and prevailing wage, it's a good idea to get out in front of it, but. I, for one, is a board member would be more comfortable if I knew were being asked here to move your project along to a public meeting, a public hearing. I'd be a little bit more comfortable if I had an update and that I knew that there was I don't care what who you talk to in Albany, that's if you want to do a state wide agreement, that's fine. You deal with in New York state building trades. But in this area, you should be reaching out to people in this area and moving the process forward. And I conveyed that to people who are repping your company. So, again, I don't know where it stands, but given the fact that there's no FTE's here, I, I think it's a good thing that people will be getting paid a prevailing wage to do the work. So, you know, that falls on you to satisfy that.

**[00:57:17] Eric Millard**

I was going to say.

**[00:57:20] Faye Storms**

I'm sorry.

**[00:57:20] Eric Millard**

I just just to make sure I understand the ask. So you're looking for us to actually make contact with the contractors, local contractors in Ulster County and kind of like what we would you ...

**[00:57:31] James Malcolm**

Make contact with the trade unions, first. If you're looking to use union labor and they could give you a list of the contractors or the contractors associations, whether it's in Albany, Westchester or the Hudson Valley. But there's no movement on that yet. And I just I'm more comfortable if I see you know, to me, that's a commitment.

**[00:57:52] Eric Millard**

Got it.

**[00:57:54] Faye Storms**

Also, do you have the do you have the full support of the town that you're going to be doing this project in?

**[00:58:03] Matt Tripoli**

Yeah, so we've gone we've been working with the town since twenty eighteen, so Supervisor Volke is aware that we are presenting to the board today. He's been very frank with us that he believes that the town opted out of the forty seven pilot very deliberately. But he understands that we have the ability to go to the IDA to you know, to seek a PILOT agreement. So what we've been doing over the course of last few months in regards to working with the town is frankly, I think the town assessor is looking at everything that's going on around with solar products in the area. He's doing his due diligence, his research, looking at how products are being assessed. And he's been very transparent and open with us and we want to work with us. So he recommended a third party appraisal firm that we could hire to provide him with some additional information about how we're seeing how that appraiser is seeing projects, solar products being looked at across New York. So we're having that report done. It hasn't been issued yet. But we expect

that next week or two to be presenting that to the town and to the town assessor. Again, just to provide some more information about about how products are being looked at across the state. So I think our our intention is just to try to do stuff like that, to try to keep the town engaged. So we hope that kind of our ideal path forward is that we would work with your board on a PILOT agreement that would kind of set the PILOT rates and that we would be presenting a broader kind of host community benefit package that would hopefully address the concerns the town has a PILOT agreement with just a hand out to our company, and that we're not you know, that it's just to increase our our profitability, if you will. So we want to try to get everybody on the same path of that to make it more of a win win overall.

**[01:00:01] Faye Storms**

So I just had a follow up to that question.

**[01:00:07] Matt Tripoli**

Yeah sure.

**[01:00:07] Faye Storms**

If I may. What would be your give to us for not having full time equivalent jobs for the next, I believe, 20 years of the pilot? Or was it 30 that you're asking for?

**[01:00:27] Michael J. Ham**

Thirty.

**[01:00:29] Matt Tripoli**

Thirty is what we put in the application. Yeah. So I think we recognize that that's the variance from your approach that we would be asking for is around full time equivalent employment over the life of the facility. So something, Eric, that really gets it to get to talking about his projects or what we what we're doing currently in the state is, you know, there is a huge push to do more renewables and New York State. Currently, the state's current workforces is probably meeting what needs to be done. But there's probably, in all likelihood, with the amount of solar and wind that New York is trying to get done in the next 10 years, there's a real potential that a lot of that labor would have to come in from out of state. So we think that there's a lot of workforce development opportunities that certainly could help make sure that there's good, good jobs being created in New York State for New York State individuals to work on these projects just as civically.

**[01:01:28] Faye Storms**

This would be specifically Ulster County, since that's who we're concerned about, is Ulster County. And we'd like to see a number or something showing exactly what you're planning on doing monetarily for the absence of full time jobs going forward.

**[01:01:48] Matt Tripoli**

No, absolutely. That's a good definitely good point. So I think we now we're starting to just poke around talking to the Ulster County Tech School, the BOCES programs, to try to find where those work force, workforce development opportunities can be most efficiently applied. But we I think we'd like to bring something forward to the to the board, a future meeting with more specifics about what we'd like to do as part of that.

**[01:02:14] Rose Woodworth**

Matt, can I ask the question directly in touch with a couple folks out of the county executives office who had some, I think, some good ideas as far as workforce development and green technology.

**[01:02:28] Matt Tripoli**

That that would be wonderful. I really appreciate that. Yeah.

**[01:02:33] Richard O. Jones**

So, Matt, a couple of things. When we met, I think you were at the meeting, the prescreened meetings from speaking for myself, I made it pretty clear that unless the town supervisor was on board with us going forward, because he couldn't because they opted out sometime in the past, about five years ago, that unless he was supportive of this and let us know that in some vehicle. I couldn't see myself being supportive of obviating or for transgressing the town's decision to opt out. So that was one thing. The second thing is we had talked briefly about how much, if this did go forward with the town support, how much you would be willing to pay to the town in terms of per kilowatt hour, what portion is going to go back to the town? And you had mentioned a range of numbers and I don't see anything that documentation we that's nailed down. And then the third thing, and there are probably many other things, actually, the third and fourth thing is it's got to be local labor in accordance with what the IDA does local in this case, union labor, I would think. So you're going to have to come up with the way of Jim and I'll defer to the two (inaudible).

**[01:03:57] James Malcolm**

I made a reference to the union people and prevailing wage given what's coming down the line. So I got out of this thing. You know, you're not defined by if you're in the union or not, a union labor person.

**[01:04:14] Richard O. Jones**

OK.

**[01:04:14] James Malcolm**

As long as, you know, for our purposes, it's a prevailing wage.

**[01:04:19] Richard O. Jones**

OK? You've mentioned that before to me and I can't get it through my head, the prevailing wage so that we would need that. But most importantly, is, is the support from the community. I don't want to be in a public hearing and I think we're way too early in terms of setting a date. There's so much more that needs to be to be nailed down. But I would not want to be in a public hearing where town supervisor stands up with the assessor, stands up and says we're against it. And we already told you that it just doesn't fly for me. And the 30 year is out of the question. Again, in my mind, the state program either provides for either 10 or 15 years. So I wouldn't want to see this IDA go any further than what the state program would have provided for had the town opted in. And I think it's 10. But I know you checking that.

**[01:05:17] Rose Woodworth**

Rick, it's 15.

**[01:05:19] Richard O. Jones**

OK it's 15. So I'm not willing to go any more than that. So I think you have a lot more work to do. And I'm sure you have it's just not reflected here and so my recommendation, and I don't want to close with any discussion, but, you know, get back together again with the pre assessment team to work on the details that we need, that I would need to feel comfortable to even set a public hearing.

**[01:05:49] Matt Tripoli**

Yes. Yeah, I just want to address a few quick points, so, yeah, I think the first one is we have entered into longer we have entered into 30 year agreements with other IDA's throughout the state for solar projects. We just want to make sure that we bring that up. I understand your point about wanting to stick to what I is contemplating under under the state law specifically for renewable energy facilities. One other thing we did in our application committed to annual sales in Ulster County of seventy five percent. There wasn't, I guess, a field to specifically highlight what we were doing for Shawangunk in particular. But I think the intention would be to have the first 30 days or so of sales be specifically targeted to residents of the town. And then if we can't fill up the subscription and move on to the wider Ulster County area, and if we can fill up the subscription after that, move on to other residents that have to be Central Hudson utility customers are the only people who can who can pay for the bill credits generated by these facilities. So all the kind of sales from the facility would be within that Central Hudson territory, which is due to far afield from Ulster County. But that does go out a little bit overall. And here you are, 100 percent on. I don't want to be at a public meeting. We've worked hard to keep a good rapport going with Supervisor Valk and other folks in the town, and we're endeavoring to try to bring something for that they can support in some way or at least not be against, because that's we think that's important as well, because we are looking to bring a product for this to be part of the community for a long period of time.

**[01:07:30] James Malcolm**

For the applicant, this is a process. So,

**[01:07:32] Matt Tripoli**

Yep.

**[01:07:33] James Malcolm**

You're going to come to us with best case scenario. We're going to look at it and ask you for a little more. And I don't see there being any issues in you coming back with the information we're looking for. And then we have to make a decision based on where we're coming from. So. I appreciate your candor with it.

**[01:07:55] Matt Tripoli**

(inaudible) appreciate it.

**[01:07:58] James Malcolm**

Who else do we have here? Anyone? Rick, are you are you waiting to get are you waiting to ask another question? Rick?

**[01:08:08] Richard O. Jones**

No. I was just going to urge the company to sit with this again, to work out the excruciating details that we need in order to feel comfortable.

**[01:08:20] James Malcolm**

That's why we prescreen.

**[01:08:20] Richard O. Jones**

And happy to be part of that. I as I told you, I think the last meeting four years ago, I was involved in the town of Rochester Project and myself and one other person negotiated the deal with the company that eventually got the contract. All the details, yada, yada, yada, including many of the details that the planning board level, the specifics of encompassed by the town's solar code. So. I could dust off my old stuff, but I'm very familiar, and I know Joe Scott is very familiar with how these things get negotiated. What key to word is getting town approval? I can't tell you. How difficult it was to get everybody on board.

**[01:09:09] James Malcolm**

Ok, well, look, there's a lot hey, Mike Ham.

**[01:09:12] Michael J. Ham**

There I just have a little input for me to move ahead to a public hearing on this. There's not enough information for me at this time. I'm not saying it's a bad job, a good job, whatever. I'm just saying that I have like five or six questions that I have sitting on my sheet that I

think if touching based on what Rick says, they fall back to the screened committee. I'd like to convey my questions over to the prescreened committee to get those answered.

**[01:09:39] James Malcolm**

I'll tell you I'll tell you what I do. You know your questions better than anybody. So what I'll do is I will take myself my position and the pretty screen. I'll move away from that. And why don't you sit in for me?

**[01:09:53] Michael J. Ham**

That'll be great to hear. I appreciate it, thank you. OK.

**[01:09:57] James Malcolm**

So to the developer, thank you very much, what we'll do is we'll get with you after this call is done today and try to coordinate our schedules and give you a little time to come up with the information we're asking for and then move forward. I think it's a good project. And I think you got some vision there because they are talking about renewables and green and everything else. I believe one of the things our county executive had on is twenty, twenty one state of the county just yesterday was a lot of conversation about green and and renewable, so. Thank you for your time, this isn't a bump in the road, it's just part of the process. OK.

**[01:10:44] Matt Tripoli**

Thank you.

**[01:10:45] James Malcolm**

Thank you very much. And if we have anybody else who's not on the prescreen, typically what we'll do is we'll ask the board members for questions and then we'll convey them during the meeting. We got a pretty good group there. Ric will, he'll haunt you. I'm telling you, that guy will haunt you. Look at him up there. So that that's that. So thank you again very much. I appreciate that. And that brings us to PPE grants for board consideration.

**[01:11:29] Rose Woodworth**

We have McGillicuddy's Tap House and The Stone Pony Deli. And these, I think, should be approximate. We have these is the only two grants for the IDA because after this we're almost out of money for what was set aside for the grant program. And I wanted to bring up McGillicuddy's was one of the ones that had to revise their application with the receipts that they had sent us. But they revised the items that they were asking for reimbursement on. And we've vetted all of the receipts.

**[01:12:07] James Malcolm**

Ok, so everyone else got an opportunity to look at the applications. All right, do we need a roll call or can we just OK and make a motion to accept the applications as presented? Do I have a second?

**[01:12:23] Diane Eynon**

Second.

**[01:12:24] James Malcolm**

All those in favor.

**[01:12:26] All**

Aye.

**[01:12:27] James Malcolm**

Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much. OK, that brings us to the public comment agenda items only. I don't see anyone, anyone in the waiting room looking or raising their hand or anything.

**[01:12:45] Rose Woodworth**

No.

**[01:12:47] James Malcolm**

Ok, that being the case, I'll ask for a motion to adjourn.

**[01:12:53] Michael J. Ham**

Motion.

**[01:12:54] James Malcolm**

Do I have a second?

**[01:12:56] Faye Storms**

Second.

**[01:12:56] James Malcolm**

All those in favor.

**[01:12:57] All**

Aye.

**[01:12:58] James Malcolm**

Opposed. Carried, What we'll do is we'll take a five minute break in between the meetings in case anyone has to do anything, and we will return back here at, I believe, 11:10. Rose if you want to tell them to turn off the recording.

END OF TRANSCRIPT



Automated transcription by Sonix  
[www.sonix.ai](http://www.sonix.ai)