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MR. BRAUN: We will now open the meeting of the Industrial Development Agency. It is Wednesday, October 20th. It is 9:26 a.m. A quorum is present and Lisa, for the statement.

MS. MULLIGAN: Oh, my statement. I'm sorry. Thank you for reminding me because I would have just totally forgot about that. I was trying to figure out how to get this stuff ready to share my screen.

This meeting is being conducted electronically via Zoom in accordance with Part E of Chapter 417 of the laws of 2021 which amended the New York Open Meetings Law to allow for electronic meetings due to COVID-19.

I think I might practice and see if I can get a weather reporter job; I feel like I said that nice and fancy.

MS. SCHEIDT: You need to set it to music, Lisa.

MS. MULLIGAN: No, no, then I'm not the right person.

Where is Terri, Terri will . . . she'll
confirm I should not be singing.

    MR. GRUCCI: You probably won't get the
    job, Lisa, because you're accurate. Weather
    people don't need to be accurate.

    MR. CALLAHAN: Right.

    MS. MULLIGAN: I take that as a
    compliment, Felix, thank you.

    MR. GRUCCI: You're welcome.

    MR. BRAUN: All right, Lori, we'll go
    right into the CFO's report.

    MS. LaPONTE: Sure.

    Included in the package is your IDA,
    the profit and loss statement budget versus
    actual year to date and for the month of
    August.

    During the month of August, I just want
    to mention we did have three closings and we
    had one sales tax extension, so you see that
    over in revenue section and then as far as our
    expenses, nothing extraordinary has -- our
    monthly routine expenses. I did want to
    mention, you see some negative expenses and
    that is because once we approved the cost
    allocation to the LDC, some of those expenses
moved out in the month of August to the LDC.

So year to date, we're a little ahead of budget year to date, so for the eight months we're ahead of budget almost 1.3 and I think obviously we're going to exceed a balanced budget, which is what we forecasted for the year.

Are there any questions on that?

(No response.)

MR. BRAUN: Go right into September.

MS. LaPONTE: Okay. Go right into September. Thanks, Fred.

Included in the packages is a profit and loss budget versus actual year to date and for the month of September.

During the month of September, we had two closings and most of our expenses are a normal recurring monthly expenses. We're net positive for the month and we're net positive year to date 1.7 year to date versus budget of zero, so we're actually ahead of budget year to date.

MR. GRUCCI: What happened in those eight months that we didn't anticipate?
MS. MULLIGAN: I can speak to that a little bit.

MR. GRUCCI: Sure.

MS. MULLIGAN: So we're taking a couple of things out of order, but that's perfectly fine. We're going to discuss in a little more detail later on in the agenda the prevailing wage legislation.

Basically it's a major change and a lot of projects are under the impression, you know, whether it's right or wrong, there's a lot of unknowns with this legislation, but they're under the impression that if they close this year, they won't be subject to a prevailing wage, so there is a flurry of activity. Just about every project that's ready to close is coming forward and saying we want to close this year before January 1st, so we've had multiple closings in the past few weeks and I expect that we're going to have a bunch more coming up. I've been signing documents almost daily for closings and I think --

MR. WEIR: There will be many more
closings between now and December 31st.

The problem is a lot of the companies are closing on the IDA transaction, but they're not signing -- they may not be signing their construction contracts between now and the end of the year and that's where there may be -- it may become subject to it.

The statute's very unclear. A state commission was supposed to have been appointed a year ago to implement the rules. There's a lot of questions on how to interpret the statute. Nobody knows how the statute's actually going to work. The prior governor was preoccupied with other things other than appointing the members to the council that he was supposed to have done and the new governor hasn't -- so far has not been on her radar screen, either, so come January 1st there will be a tremendous amount of uncertainty and at the New York State EDC meeting in Cooperstown last month, this was a major topic of discussion.

Nobody knows how this statute's going to work and the impact on it, that's why there
is a flurry of activity where people are hoping they're grandfathered in so they're not subject to prevailing wages. It may impact closings in the first quarter of next year as people are trying to understand the impact of it.

MR. BRAUN: Bill, I know Lisa's got it further on the agenda, but if I understand it correctly, it is for projects of $5 million or more where the aggregate of the benefits exceeds 30 percent of the cost however defined or is that not correct?

MR. WEIR: Well, that's correct where the construction costs. Part of the trouble is no one knows what construction costs means. Is it the actual construction cost of, you know, constructing the building; does it include architectural, engineering, environmental remediation, title reports, surveys, legal costs, all the soft costs included with construction; does it even include the value of the land for the acquisition? Nobody knows that and then the other problem, as you said, Fred, if the
amount of benefits being granted equal more than one third of the total project cost, then -- construction costs, then it is subject to prevailing wage.

Now it almost becomes circular because if it becomes subject to prevailing wage and your construction costs go up 25 percent, the value of your benefits may then fall below one third.

Again, those are the issues that people are looking at and so, you know, mortgage recording tax exemption, finite number, that's easy to figure out. Sales tax exemption, finite number, easy to figure out.

Where you run into problems would be the difference between PILOT payments and real property taxes, at best that's a guesstimate. Nobody knows if it was -- if it was on the tax rolls and not in the IDA's name, what the assessed value would actually -- how the assessor would assess it and what that number would be after it's completed and nobody knows where taxes are going over the course of say a ten- or 15-year PILOT.
So trying to compare and coming up with is the PILOT amount going to be enough to trigger the prevailing wage is the very difficult determination.

MR. BRAUN: You know, a very easy way to define costs would be with the accountants using whatever can be capitalized and put on a balance sheet, would define costs, but that's probably too easy.

MR. WEIR: Well, but again, though, certain of those soft costs are capitalizable and you wouldn't want to count that. I mean I think you really want to count just the actual construction costs, you know and then does that include if you're putting in built-in cabinets, does that count, you know, things like that, so it's -- or other built-ins that really may or may not be construction, could be personal fixtures.

They did a very poor job in the statute of defining it, leaving it to this commission and as of today, the commission members have not been appointed.

MS. PAPROCKY: Bill, I have a question,
Bill.

MR. WEIR: Okay.

MS. PAPROCKY: So does -- is the IDA responsible to police this if this goes into effect the way it is because, you know, we're giving them the breaks and the incentives, but do we have to police it or is that just once it's done, it's up to them to run it, make sure --

MR. WEIR: Well, we're going to put into both the application and the lead documents the company has to certify to us whether they're subject to it or not, but here's the kicker, they gave basically a private right of enforcement to any citizen to sue the IDA and the company to get the benefits, you know, so I imagine labor will be looking at every IDA project and everyone that's not paying prevailing wages will probably get sued even if the construction costs, you know, far exceed 30 percent of the value of the benefits. I imagine there's going to be a lot of litigation.

MS. MULLIGAN: And keep in mind that
it's not just the benefits we give; if they get a grant from New York State or they get, you know, support from another entity, that counts towards it, so it's larger than just us.

MR. WEIR: Yeah and it also includes if they get tax-exempt bonds, the tax-exempt interest, so the difference between tax-exempt interest rate and taxable, which is again, almost impossible to prove over the life of the transaction. If they get low-income housing tax credits, historic tax credits, if they were to get any other benefits, if they were an enterprise zone, any other benefits that they might get, you know, some of our affordable housing projects get money from the County in home funds, that would be counted for it.

So there's a whole host of things and you remember, this is paying prevailing wage, which is higher than commercial union scale. This is the rate that the municipalities and school districts have to pay, so -- and there's no carve-out for a PLA, so you can't
even come in and negotiate with the unions for a project labor agreement.

So if you look at the current prevailing wage policies that the IDA and the LDC have in place right now, we say if five percent -- excuse me, if the construction costs are more than $5 million as being financed with tax-exempt bonds, they're subject to prevailing wages unless they enter into a PLA and then we had -- Brookhaven is the only one that on Long Island has a carve-out that it was subject to -- to be financed by a State agency that was not subject to prevailing wage or the subject of prevailing wage, so if we -- so that carve-out will go away now (inaudible). Every State agency is subject to this, so . . . we probably will not be able to give that carve-out.

So whatever the tax-exempt bond financing is now, it's almost always going to be subject to prevailing wages, but before we could do a PLA, we can't do that now.

I would not be shocked to see a lot of
not-for-profits finance things going forward
with a commercial bank loan and then when the
project is completed, take out the bank loan
with tax-exempt bonds.

MS. LaPONTE: Did that answer your
question, Felix?

I mean it's really what happened, was a
big move in closing things that we didn't have
on our radar.

MR. GRUCCI: I understand what it was
about.

My follow-up question and it shouldn't
require an answer like as long as that one
was, but --

MS. MULLIGAN: The answer is yes,
Felix.

MR. GRUCCI: That wasn't a derogatory
statement, I appreciate that information
because it did clear -- clarify why we picked
up almost a million something in -- about a
million --

MS. MULLIGAN: And slowly picking up
more.

MR. GRUCCI: But what we're picking up
would most likely have been closings in 2022,
I would assume --

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes.

MR. GRUCCI: -- because they're pushing
those 2022's into 2021?

MR. WEIR: I mean I think a lot of them
would have closed this year anyways, they're
just ready to close. I mean there's been a
lot of -- a lot of these ones we've been
working on for months, so maybe one or two of
them might have gotten pushed to next year,
you know, something like NorthPoint/Winters
Brothers, you know, they want to close, that
might have gotten pushed, I don't know, but
eye've been pretty -- you know, they've been
pretty -- they've said when they submitted
their application they want to close this
year. I don't know how many of these might
have gotten pushed, but --

MR. GRUCCI: If you look at the amended
budget line, the nine-month amended budget
line, we anticipated $810,000 worth of
closings, we actually got $2,346,000, about a
million five more than what we anticipated. I
don't think we were that far off in our estimations when we put the budget in. My assumption is that the balance of that one five was coming from 2002 closings.

The reason why I bring it up is that we need to be careful then when we prepare the 2022 budget that we're not anticipating revenue that we've already gotten.

MS. MULLIGAN: Well, honestly, Felix, it's always a guess. You know, an educated, but it's a guess.

Right now, my white board next to me has 15 projects that are ready to close. Some of them have been ready to close for quite some time. I mean I'm looking at one of them, three of them up here, I think, there's probably three of them that I'm not so sure I'm going to be able to erase because they've been up there for so long. They're ready to close. We still have contact, they tell us they're getting things set and they're planning on closing and they are actually planning on closing this year, but if we -- if I had -- each year when we do the budget for
these projects -- and some of them have been ready to close since like 2018 -- we counted them each year or maybe we didn't, just depended on the year.

It's really an imperfect estimate when we put together this budget. It's really hard to tell what's going to show up one day and close in two months and what's going to languish for years, so . . . I try to take the budget with a grain of salt and keep it in mind that we don't have -- we can't look back year to year and say, you know, traditionally this is what we see happening and expect it to be consistent.

MR. BRAUN: Felix, that said, I can assure you that Lisa and Lori spent a tremendous amount of time --

MS. MULLIGAN: Trying.

MR. BRAUN: -- putting this budget together as imperfect as the revenue line is.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah.

MR. GRUCCI: I fully understand and agree with that, but what I'm -- what Bill just explained to us was one of those hiccups
that no one expected to have happen and the
budget saw a large increase in revenue.

If we had those projects on the white
board and we thought that they were going to, 
you know, have a good chance of closing in 
2021, then we would have put -- I would assume 
we would have put that in the estimated budget 
line, but all I'm suggesting is that if indeed 
people are pushing forward their closings -- 
and to me and it sounds like they are -- then 
we just need to be cognizant of that when we 
put the budget together for the up and coming 
year.

MS. MULLIGAN: And just so you know, 
Lori just pointed out to me that last year our 
revenue was 700,000, we were behind last year, 
so it is --

MS. LaPONTE: Some of it moved.

MS. MULLIGAN: It's -- it is very hard 
to predict.

MR. BRAUN: Yeah and as I pointed out 
in the past, I've been tracking the 
bottom-line numbers for the last 30 or 40 
years and between 30 and 40 percent of those
years we've actually been in the red, so it's very difficult to project.

Before we move onto the 2022 budget, we need to approve the operating report -- the financial report for August and September.

May I have a motion for that, please?

MS. PAPROCKY: Motion.

MR. GRUCCI: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: On the vote, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

Both of those are approved and now for the 2022 budget.

MS. LaPONTE: This is the budget that we had discussed at our last meeting, actually it's input in PARIS, it's unsubmitted yet, it's due November 1st, but it's presented here for your review.
Just to add onto the discussions that we had in the past, last year we were behind our revenue numbers, so some of our projects after we did our budget closed later than forecasted and we actually last year had a net negative balance going to the point that Fred mentioned, we've had plenty of years in the red and some years not.

So again, this current year estimated budget is based on the projects that we know of that we don't expect to close by the end of this year and also our expectations for salaries, wages and the individual expense accounts and again, this is just really showing you the budget that we reviewed in detail at the last minute just showing you in the PARIS format, which is what will be officially published.

MR. BRAUN: Which is basically a break-even.

MS. LaPONTE: Yes, it's a break-even, exactly.

Are there any questions on that budget?

(No response.)
MR. BRAUN: If there are none, I need a motion to accept the budget and authorize Lori to file with PARIS.

MS. SCHEIDT: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

Second?

MR. CALLAHAN: Second.

MR. BRAUN: On the vote, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes and the budget is approved and authorized to file.

MS. LaPONTE: The last item I want to mention is we will be showing this on all of our agendas just in the CFO section about timely payments. This is to communicate to you that all payments required legally have been made timely and up to date and also, I'll explain when we start getting PILOT money in
that we've also explained that, disburse that PILOT money within the time frames required by law, than 30 days. But we had no PILOT money, I'm just explaining for the future.

As this relates to the timely legal payments relayed to any withholding, whether it's withholding for taxes, deferred compensation or retirement system, those withholdings have been made timely.

MR. BRAUN: Any questions for Lori?

(No response.)

MR. BRAUN: Okay. I think we can move on.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

MR. BRAUN: You want to come back over here?

MS. MULLIGAN: I'll stay up here.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

Thanks, Lori.

MS. MULLIGAN: Let me just make this look normal again. Hold on, give me one second everybody, I apologize.

(Pause.)
MS. MULLIGAN: Okay. Okay.

So, Joce, will you bring Steve Ripp in, please?

So the next item on our agenda, we have two applications; sorry, I have to find my notes. We have two applications on the agenda. They are FourGen H and FourGen S. I'm going to start with FourGen H.

This is a 920-kilowatt fuel cell project on 2,000 square feet of the Holtsville terminal, which is at 586 Union Avenue. It's a $5.275 million project and they're requesting a 25-year PILOT and sales tax. So let's take them individually because we're going to need you to accept applications or consider applications for both of these.

Does anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

MS. MULLIGAN: Steve, Howard, did you want to add anything?

MR. GROSS: I think, you know, unless somebody has some questions, I think, I know the board has considered and consummated a couple of projects of this similar nature in
the past, so I think you're probably familiar with these type of projects and the benefits to the community that derive from them.

MR. BRAUN: The only thing I would add is I met with Steve on Monday, he's senior vice president and chief operating officer; sound right, Steve?

MR. RIPP: That's correct.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

He showed me a list of the shareholders of each of these LLC's and I would tell you they are second, third and fourth generation, the Bernstein family, who started Northville Industries and that's basically who's behind all of this.

I also reviewed their audit and financial statements that are prepared by KPMG; they're substantial and we hope all of you would be proud to look at those numbers with a big smile on your face.

MR. RIPP: Thank you, I appreciate that.

MS. MULLIGAN: Lenore?

MS. PAPROCKY: You know, for the
benefit, Steve, for me, I'm new to this board and I don't really quite completely understand what this project or these projects that are up right now are about.

Could you just give me a little rundown of what a fuel cell energy storage plant is actually doing and just a little bit of a synopsis just in case somebody else here may not understand it, I know I don't, so I'd really appreciate that?

MR. RIPP: Sure.

These are power generation technologies. They're not fuel storage, so they are power generating units and they take fuel and convert that to hydrogen in a process called catalytic steam regeneration, reformation and then the hydrogen and the air are supplied to the fuel cells and through the hydrogen and oxygen combine electrochemically to produce direct current electricity, heat and water and then that direct current electricity is converted to alternating current, which is what we use on the grid and deliver to the grid.
MS. PAPROCKY: Okay. Well, I did look this up, so this all sounds familiar because I wanted to have my homework so I didn't look like or sound like a complete moron about this.

You know, as I was reading about it and trying to understand it a little bit better, one of the -- I'm involved in a lot of different chambers and one of the chambers had speakers and I don't know whether or not this actually pertains to you guys or not, but they were talking about something, some project over in the Holbrook/Holtsville area, which assuming is your project and there are a lot of people who are saying that that's very dangerous, so could you speak to me about the danger of these types of things being in the middle of a community because that seemed to be their biggest argument and I really didn't get much except for that they're dangerous and I know, you know, people scream and holler and go that's no good, but they don't give me a reason, so could you explain that to me; is it dangerous or what are your safeguards?
MR. RIPP: So this is a technology that originated back in the 1960's, was used in the space program to provide power to space shuttles and this dusaint's fleet (phonetic) has hundreds of installations around the world, well over ten million operating hours. It's proven to be extremely reliable, very durable, very safe. The safety is such that you can site these indoors. We're not, but you can, but that should give you an indication of the safety associated with these.

Oftentimes they're utilized for purposes where the quality and reliability of power is of paramount importance, so for data centers' back-up or for medical facilities, they use fuel cells for 24/7 reliable power.

The units, themselves, we have two at our Holtsville project, three at our Setauket project. They basically look like container units, so they're -- each unit is about 29 feet long, about ten feet tall and about eight feet wide.

We're also going to place cooling
units, which basically are a matrix of six bands, on top of the units, which add another six feet of height, so you're talking about 16 feet tall, 29 feet wide, you know, they run quietly, they're very innocuous, you can site them just right next to buildings, you know, simply because they are quite innocuous, very safe, you know and our terminals, the proximity to any homes in the locations, it's several hundred feet or a third of a mile, you know, so it's quite a distance, I don't think anybody will see or hear, you know, these units at all.

MS. PAPROCKY: Great.

One last question that I have.

So these particular ones, I said let's use Setauket because I happen to know that area very well.

Once your plant is up and running, how much electricity do you anticipate being able to I'm guessing sell to LIIPA and what does it equate to in like how many houses because that seems to be how people measure the alternative energy sources; how many houses can we supply
energy to, just use the Setauket one for an example?

MR. RIPP: Sure.

So these are base load units, meaning they run pretty much 24/7 and so at Setauket, it's 1.38 megawatts, that's three units, each unit's 460 kilowatts. They will run -- that would probably, you know, their capacity factor is about 95 percent of the hours of the year, so that would probably be about 12,000 megawatt hours per year, which would probably power approximately 1,200 homes.

MS. PAPROCKY: Very good.

Thank you for answering those questions and I appreciate it.

MR. RIPP: My pleasure.

MR. BRAUN: Any other questions from the board?

MS. MULLIGAN: Ann-Marie has her hand up.

MR. BRAUN: Go ahead, Ann-Marie.

MS. SCHEIDT: Is there an -- am I misremembering a policy this board has established or is there a specific reason that
you are requesting an abatement more than twice what has in the past been our normal period?

MS. MULLIGAN: Ann-Marie, for renewable energy projects, our UTEP allows for a longer period, so 25 years is within -- in line with what we've done for the other reliable --

MS. SCHEIDT: Okay. So it's consistent with the other projects we've already done?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes.

MS. SCHEIDT: Thank you.

MR. RIPP: And that's connected to the LIPA tariff for community net metered projects, is for 25 years.

MS. SCHEIDT: Ah. Thank you.

MR. RIPP: You're welcome.

MR. BRAUN: If there are no further questions, we need a motion to accept the application for FourGen H LLC.

MS. SCHEIDT: So moved.

MR. GRUCCI: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: On the vote, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?
MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The application is accepted.

There is another application, Lisa?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes, there is.

The next application on the agenda is for FourGen S, which like the last application, is a 1,380-kilowatt fuel cell on 3,000 square feet of property at 19 North Belle Meade Road in Setauket. This is a roughly $7 million project and again, they're requesting a 25-year PILOT and a sales tax exemption.

Any questions on this one?

MR. GRUCCI: Just a general question, if I may.

MS. MULLIGAN: Sure.

MR. GRUCCI: The power cells, the purpose of the power cells is to generate power for a specific user or to push into the
grid?

MR. RIPP: So it will be connected to the grid, but as a community net metered project, we will have subscribers who will be allocated a portion of the output produced by the units.

MR. GRUCCI: And I assume that they pay for that, correct?

MR. RIPP: They do and the value proposition for them is that it represents a discount to what they would be paying ordinarily.

MR. GRUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BRAUN: If there are no further questions, I need a motion to accept the application for FourGen S LLC.

MS. SCHEIDT: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: Second?

MR. GRUCCI: Second.

MR. BRAUN: On the call, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprotsky?
MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The application for FourGen S LLC is accepted.

Thank you, Steven.

MR. CALLAHAN: Good luck, Steven.

MR. RIPP: Thank you all, I appreciate it greatly.

MS. MULLIGAN: Thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is a request -- is a resolution from Overbay, LLC. Sorry. It's a two-part request. They have asked if we can -- they're planning on refinancing their loan and they asked if -- they're looking for our sign-off on that and they also need to release some of their property to the Village of Port Jefferson. It's approximately .28 acres, which will be dedicated to Port Jeff Village for parking.

Joce, will you bring Peter in?

Bill, did you have anything you wanted to add?
MR. WEIR: No, I think you described it pretty well for that.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

Peter is the attorney --

MR. WEIR: Peter has another . . .

yeah.

MS. MULLIGAN: So there's Peter coming in.

Peter, did you have anything you wanted to add?

MR. GRUCCI: Peter is muted.

MR. CURRY: Here I am.

No, actually I have nothing to add.

They're looking to close -- having said I have nothing to add, I will now add something.

MR. CALLAHAN: Okay.

MR. CURRY: They're looking to close early next month and the dedication of the village was part of the requirement for the approval process and the entire project and I believe that the Village had a pretty much crying need for additional parking, so they're taking that land or very close to downtown
Port Jeff Village parking.

MS. MULLIGAN: Does anyone --

MR. WEIR: Peter, how many spots can they put in, it's a little over a quarter of an acre; how many spots can they put on there?

MR. CURRY: You know, I don't know, it really depends on what the Village is going to do. I can't anticipate that it's very many spots, probably 20 or so, but at least it's --

MS. MULLIGAN: That's significant.

MR. BRAUN: If you need a parking spot.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah.

MR. BRAUN: If there are no further questions, need a motion for that resolution, to approve that resolution for Overbay, LLC.

MR. CALLAHAN: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

Second?

MS. PAPROCKY: Second.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Lenore.

On the vote, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.
MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The motion is carried. Thank you.

MR. CURRY: All right, thank you board members. I'm actually going to stay on, I'll drop off this and stay on for the Sun River Town Homes discussion.

MS. MULLIGAN: Why don't I just take it out of order?

MR. CURRY: Okay.

MR. WEIR: Yeah, that would be good.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

So taking this out of order, the next item on the agenda is a request that we received from Sun River Town Homes, LLC.

This is a project that if you recall, is an apartment complex in -- well, it's in -- I would say Manorville, but the reality is that it crosses from Manorville to Center Moriches, it's in I think three school districts: Eastport-South Manor, Center
Moriches and also William Floyd, so that kind of that area, but I always think of that as Manorville, but basically we're getting ready to close this project -- Felix, this is another one that's going to close in the next couple of days, I think next week it's scheduled to close -- but Peter told us recently that their project costs are higher than anticipated and as a request, their sales tax exemption is higher than anticipated and so, from my understanding, Bill, correct me if I'm mistaken, what we're going to do is we're going to close this project as already anticipated and then we're going to do another follow-up public hearing to consider the additional sales tax exemption and then bring that back to you, so basically I'm just letting you know and then also asking you to schedule the public hearing.

Bill, did you have anything you wanted to add?

MR. WEIR: Yeah.

Sun River is set to close, that will close this week and then at the November
meeting there will be a resolution increasing their sales tax exemption.

MR. CURRY: If I could just add, I mean this is one of the problems I think you'll be seeing in a lot of these applications that have been sitting around for a while and now as you get close to closing, everybody realizes that construction costs have gone up so dramatically that an application that was submitted a year ago actually doesn't accurately reflect current construction costs.

I believe that some of the economic studies that were done did look at a higher number than what was in the application, but certainly not the costs that we have now and most of it is based upon hard costs of construction.

So material costs have gone up and as people -- as they sign contracts with various contractors, they realize that the estimates that they had originally are, you know, totally out of whack.

MR. WEIR: Yeah. I'm seeing it from applications that were submitted in July and
August and as they're going to sign the construction contracts, costs are just skyrocketing and will continue to skyrocket. I would not be surprised on many of our -- ones we've already closed, that before they complete it, they'll be coming back and asking to increase the sales tax exempt amount.

MR. CURRY: Yeah.

(Inaudible comments.)

MR. WEIR: Yeah. The extensions as well.

Try ordering a stove or an oven right now.

MS. MULLIGAN: Try buying dinner.

MR. WEIR: Excuse me?

MS. MULLIGAN: I said try buying dinner. Everything's more expensive.

MR. WEIR: Yeah.

(Inaudible comments.)

MR. WEIR: Yeah, but try to get anything, appliances, construction, flooring, steel, everything, if you can get it, you're paying more, but even when you finally do,
it's just -- things you used to be able to get within a week or two weeks are taking months and months and months, which then adds additional costs because you got to bring electricians back or you got to bring the plumbers back and they're not doing it when they're there the first time, you got to get them back, so there's additional costs. Everything is just rippling through the economy, so . . .

MR. CURRY: Everybody concentrated on the lumber spike and the lumber spike then went down again, but the other costs continued to stay up.

And to respond to Lisa, we will not be looking for any sales tax abatement on the dinner, so it's only on these hard construction costs.

MS. MULLIGAN: Thank you.

MR. WEIR: (inaudible) we'll all go to Lisa's house for dinner.

MS. MULLIGAN: Any time.

MR. GRUCCI: This request to close and then come back to address the overruns, is
that unique to this year of uncertainty in the market?

MR. WEIR: No. I think the only thing that's unique is that it's happening as quickly between closing and like the next board meeting.

I think a lot of the projects we've already closed earlier this year I'm anticipating coming back, you know, in the next month or so saying hey, we used our sales tax exemption and we're not done yet, so --

MR. GRUCCI: We've done --

MR. WEIR: -- I anticipate --

MR. GRUCCI: My question is we've done this type of a request in the past?

MS. MULLIGAN: Many times.

MR. GRUCCI: Okay.

MR. WEIR: Many times, not usually, you know, before we closed. If they had known this three weeks ago, we would have had time to have done a new public hearing and would have been handled today for the closing tomorrow, but it's just the timing of it was we didn't have enough time to hold a new
public hearing.

MR. GRUCCI: I was wondering what -- I was wondering why we just didn't amend the original request to --

MR. WEIR: Because --

MR. GRUCCI: But you just answered that question.

MR. WEIR: Yeah, it will be more than a hundred thousand dollars in new benefits, so we have to hold a new public hearing.

MR. GRUCCI: Okay.

MR. CURRY: The other thing I will say parenthetically is that the increase in these construction costs means an increase to economic benefits, so as the costs go up and you do the calculation of the economic benefit to the area, that goes up as a consequence of the increased spending, also.

MR. BRAUN: Bill, do you need a resolution for a new public hearing?

MR. WEIR: Just the consent of the board.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

Everybody on board for that?
MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Okay, thank you.

Thank you, Peter.

MR. CURRY: Thank you. Thank you for having this hearing today. Bye-bye.

MR. GRUCCI: Take care.

MR. BRAUN: I just want to jump back to the two applications for the fuel cells.

I think that discussion and thank you, Lenore, for raising that issue, I think it was an excellent discussion. This is not going to be the last of the fuel cells we see and I think the minutes will reflect that discussion to form a great background for the future applications.

MR. WEIR: There will be more solar projects, more fuel cell projects and more battery storage projects coming out.

MS. MULLIGAN: There's going to be things that we don't even know about yet or at least I don't know about yet.

MR. BRAUN: Interesting question out of that discussion on the fuel cell.

The representative of the Northville
group mentioned there were carve-outs from the
electrical output for those fuel cells for
specific companies or areas within those fuel
cells.

Could we in the future carve out
production for the fuel cells for IDA projects
within a proximity to those fuel cells?

MS. MULLIGAN: So I did a lot of
research into this community and now I can't
even think of what it's called. Annette, what
is it, community . . . no, community power,
community --

MS. EADERESTO: Yeah. Yes.

MS. MULLIGAN: What is it, community
what?

MS. EADERESTO: I think it's just
called community based solar. It's where you
have customers that buy that power at that
rate, you know, box in a rate.

MS. MULLIGAN: So I think there's the
potential for it, but I'm not so sure that we
have the authority to do it.

I know that the Town has been pursuing
community power for residents in certain
areas, but I think it's a little bit of a heavy lift and so I think --

MS. EADERESTO: Yes. PSE&G has a whole sector and they -- they don't -- it's like one side of the company doesn't talk to the other and one will think it's a good idea and the other will say we don't have transmission in the area, so it's still a very big work in progress, we haven't been able to do one.

MS. MULLIGAN: Having said all of that, down the road it might be something that we could do, but I don't think we're there yet.

MS. EADERESTO: Yeah and just remember, fuel cells are not really alternative energy, I hate to break everybody's bubble. I mean they're run with natural --

MS. PAPROCKY: That was my question, that's why I was asking these questions. I agree, it's not really renewable energy.

MS. MULLIGAN: They're middle ground.

MS. EADERESTO: Not at all.

(Inaudible comments.)

MR. WEIR: What it's doing, it's using
natural gas to produce hydrogen and then when the hydrogen is burned, it does not produce CO2 that goes in the atmosphere, it only produces water.

MS. EADERESTO: Right.

(Inaudible comments.)

MR. WEIR: It's not polluting.

(Inaudible comments.)

MS. EADERESTO: And it produces an (inaudible) amount of water, just so you know.

MS. MULLIGAN: Annette, my understanding is there's three different technologies.

(Inaudible comments.)

MS. EADERESTO: What's that?

MS. MULLIGAN: There's three different technologies. I think one of them uses a ton of water, I don't know if the other two do.

MS. EADERESTO: Listen, is it better than an oil plant, yes. So is it better than a coal burning plant, absolutely. But is it as good as wind or solar, no.

MR. GRUCCI: I've got a question on procedure.
If they were putting this fuel cell up for the specific purpose of a specific user and not any of it going into the grid for public consumption, would they be able to qualify for our benefits?

MS. EADERESTO: Yes.

MR. WEIR: Yes because that's no different from when we've done a lot of our projects and people putting solar on their roofs in the parking lots.

MR. GRUCCI: Okay.

MR. WEIR: Yup.

Going back to Fred's earlier comment about for IDA projects, that you get into whether or not you're creating a semi-utility, it raises a lot of issues with the Public Service Commission, but in other states, not New York per se, but in other states, we have done projects where developers will put up a solar farm and where they've financed with the tax credits and then what they do is they can structure an agreement with the local utility that that energy will go into the grid, but then low-income users of the power system will
get a credit against their electric bills for that power. So you are helping low-income persons and people getting tax credits, so it's like a social, you know, it's a green facility with socially responsible and there are investors who invest in those kind of projects.

I have not seen one like that done in New York State. Doesn't mean it couldn't be, but it hasn't been done yet. Something that may be worth pursuing.

MR. BRAUN: Bill, are there wheeling or transmission charges added onto the actual cost of the electricity?

MR. WEIR: No. So you're still putting electricity into the system. The investors are getting their tax credits, so that's what they care about and low-income users are getting, you know, a discount on their electricity, so it can work.

Other utilities, particularly in the DC area, have made it work and it's very responsible way of investing it for people who are socially conscious and green investors.
They market the tax credits of those people.

Will LIPA/PSE&G ever be able to figure that out or Con Ed or any other ones in New York State, I don't know. I don't even know if New York State Public Service Commission would allow it, but it's something we could pursue.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay. So I'm going to go back to the order that we have on the agenda.

Under resolutions, we have a resolution for Coast 2 Coast Real Estate, LLC.

Marty, I think you need to recuse on this one.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yup, I'll leave the room, you'll send me a text; what do you want me to do?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah, we'll shoot you a text. It should only take like two minutes I would expect.

MR. CALLAHAN: Send me a text.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay. Thank you, Marty.

(Mr. Callahan left the room.)

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.
So Marty has a conflict on this project.

So just to explain to everybody, Coast 2 Coast is a project that we closed a week or two ago. It's an existing building. They purchased the former Grucci facility and everything is closed, we're all done, but we had a realization that we held this public hearing electronically and Bill realized that although we're allowed to have these meetings virtually, Hochul didn't change our public hearings and so we had to have -- we had to hold this public hearing and the next two a second time as a supplement just to make sure that they were legal, we held them in person. So this was -- I think the attorneys call this belt and suspenders, but we did them again just to be sure that everything was above board.

MR. BRAUN: So, Bill, this is a ratification of the public hearing that's already been held?

MR. WEIR: Well, it's a ratification of the prior resolution that's -- because we held
a new public hearing.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

MR. GRUCCI: Lisa, I'd just like to put a statement on the record.

The Grucci building that was referred to in the presentation is not in any way connected to me, Felix Grucci; it's my nephew's building. I have nothing to do with the business operations, I retired from the company over five years ago and have no interest in the building, no interest in the company and in fact, I didn't even know this took place until Lisa just brought my family's name into the conversation.

So for the record, I just wanted to put that on the record so that there was no confusion that I as a sitting board member was involved in any kind of a deal where the IDA was involved.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Felix.

All right, I need a motion. (Ms. Scheidt waving.)

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

Is there a second?
(Ms. Paprocky waving.)

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Lenore.

On the vote, Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

And we always trust you, Felix.

MR. GRUCCI: Thank you, Ann-Marie.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The motion is carried.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

The next item on the agenda is for AE Manorville 2 and I just asked Marty to come back in.

Just like the last public hearing, this was another of the public hearings that we did virtually.

So this AE Manorville 2, just to remind everybody, is a solar installation, a BESS system, a battery energy storage system, that's planned to go on the Town's Manorville compost site. We already have a solar
installation there, but there's going to now be an additional solar installation and a BESS system located there and again, this is a supplement -- we did a supplementary public hearing and I apologize, I don't know if I said this, for Coast 2 Coast as well, there were no comments, but we held that public hearing yesterday, also.

MR. BRAUN: Can I have a motion, please?

MR. GRUCCI: So moved.

(Mr. Callahan returned.)

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

Second?

MS. SCHEIDT: Defer to Felix.

MR. BRAUN: Is that a second, Ann-Marie?

MS. SCHEIDT: I'm a second, yes.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

On the vote, Mr. Callahan, if you're back?

MR. CALLAHAN: I'm back.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.
MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The motion's carried.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

Then basically the exact same thing for the C2NY/EDPR public hearing. Again, there was no comment and just to remind everybody, this is the solar carport project that is located at the Town's amphitheater, so exact same situation as the last two, there was no comment and it's a supplementary -- supplemental public hearing.

MR. BRAUN: Motion, please.

(Ms. Paprocky waving.)

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Lenore.

Second?

MR. GRUCCI: Go ahead, Ann-Marie.

MS. SCHEIDT: Okay, Felix.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?
MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

The motion is carried.

Bill, the current legislation runs till January 15th; is that correct?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes.

MR. WEIR: That is correct, yes.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

MS. MULLIGAN: So the next item on the agenda is the Long Island Avenue Holding, LLC.

Just to remind everybody, this was a plan, we closed this 2019, I think.

MR. GROSS: December, yeah.

MS. MULLIGAN: When was it, Howard, September?


MS. MULLIGAN: Okay, yup.

And the plan was for them to build a 15,000 square foot facility and then lease it to subtenants and their plan was they thought
it would probably be a bunch of smaller end users, but, of course, if somebody came in who wanted the whole thing, I think they'd be amenable to that, but their plan was to market it as smaller units and then as Howard said, it was December of 2019 and we all know what happened shortly after that.

What they -- and they never started construction and they've come back to us and they've said they do want to start construction, they have asked if we would be agreeable to giving them a 30-month extension for their completion date and their sales tax exemption to May 30th of 2024 and that also means that we would have to push their PILOT start date to the 2024-2025 year. They would still be paying what their normal taxes until the PILOT starts, so it's not that they would get a longer PILOT, it will just start at a different time and they also asked if we would consider pushing their job creation numbers to 30 months after completion and the request right now is to basically extend -- I'm asking if you accept this "application" and then set
a public hearing.

So does anyone have any questions?

MR. BRAUN: It's under your report, do we need a motion for that?

MS. MULLIGAN: You need a motion just to tell me to set the public hearing, but basically if you --

MR. BRAUN: Who's the principal on this?

MS. MULLIGAN: What's --

MR. GROSS: Silveri.

MS. MULLIGAN: Oh, that's true, that's true. Silveri is the developer. I was thinking of our contact, but -- and Howard, is there anything I should add to that?

MR. GROSS: No, I think you explained it.

MS. MULLIGAN: And the letter was in the package, too.

MR. BRAUN: All right. We need a motion for Lisa to set the public hearing.

MR. CALLAHAN: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Marty.
Second?

MS. PAPROCKY: Second.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Lenore.

On the vote, Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

That motion is carried.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

Prevailing wage legislation, I think we covered this pretty thoroughly earlier, but just keep in mind that the letter that we received from the Department of Labor, which hits the high points of this, was included in your packets, so as a point of reference and like we indicated before, there's a lot of unknowns with this and we are doing our best to try to figure out how -- what we need to do and how this is going to impact us.
So does anyone have any follow-up questions from our earlier discussion?

MR. BRAUN: Bill, is there any chance we get this, as bad as the legislation is, but to try and get it right; is there any chance they postpone it for another six months or 12 months rather than try and jam it down and have to change it later on?

MR. WEIR: You know, nobody knows, Fred. I mean again, I'm not -- I've not heard anything to say that Governor Hochul's even looking at it, so I don't know if we're going to have the commission in place by then. So it's one of these things where nobody at the state government is at least publicly focusing on it, so she probably could grant another extension, although I imagine the construction trade unions would not be pleased and she's in an election year, so I'm not hopeful that there will be another extension.

MR. BRAUN: Okay.

MR. GRUCCI: For my knowledge, what is the prevailing wage; I mean I know what it is, but what's the dollar amount?
MR. WEIR: It's set by the Department of Labor for every county and it's my understanding about 20 to 30 percent higher than the commercial union scale. So if union scale is 50 bucks an hour, they set prevailing wage at like $65 an hour and they call it prevailing wage, you know and it's not subject to review by anybody, it's just New York State Department of Labor is controlled by the labor unions and again, this is something that as a taxpayer, every taxpayer in New York State forever has been paying extraordinarily high construction costs, this is why it costs so much to build a school, build any kind of public infrastructure in New York State, you know, at twice the cost of anywhere else including, cities, you know, like London and Paris, all the cities in Europe, Japan, all construction costs in the U.S., particularly New York, are so much higher, you know.

MR. GRUCCI: So if I understood you correctly, Bill, if the union scale is 50, they're saying that a private contractor not using union labor has to pay $65 an hour?
MR. WEIR: Whatever -- yeah.

So it doesn't have -- the statute doesn't say you have to use union labor.

Prevailing wage is the euphemism for union scale, union employees. You have to pay whatever -- so if the Town of Brookhaven was building a building, whatever rates they're paying at that Town level or the Suffolk County or school district, those "prevailing rates," prevailing wage rates, set by New York State Department of Labor is what a private contractor who's getting benefits from an IDA or a private company, that's what their contractor will have to pay their employees.

But it also goes beyond that, it also includes once the building's built, everybody who does maintenance at the building, the janitors, the guys mowing the lawn, landscapers, painters, anybody going forward doing that kind of maintenance work has to pay prevailing wages, so it's not just construction, doesn't end when the construction's over, it goes forever.

MR. CALLAHAN: Projects will move out of state, they'll go somewhere else.
MS. PAPROCKY: I was going to say, that's ridiculous, that's crazy.

MR. CALLAHAN: Texas, Florida.

MR. WEIR: So --

MS. PAPROCKY: Who's going to build here?

MR. CALLAHAN: Nobody.

MS. PAPROCKY: Why would you?

(Inaudible comments.)

MR. WEIR: A number of the developers who have done a lot of projects in the Town of Brookhaven and Suffolk County have all said that, you know, it's already hard enough to get a reasonable rate of return on your investment here, that they will now consider, you know, if they've got two projects, one in New York and one in North Carolina or somewhere else, the ones out of New York State will get priority.

MS. PAPROCKY: Of course.

MS. SCHEIDT: Did I understand correctly, Bill, that prevailing wage is based on, but higher than the union's labor agreements --
MR. WEIR: For commercial.

MS. SCHEIDT: -- so you have to pay this bounty --

MR. WEIR: So even if you're using union -- all hundred percent union job and they have their commercial rate -- they have a residential rate, a small commercial rate, a large commercial -- you know, for large projects, then they have their governmental for prevailing wage, so everybody will now pay the highest governmental prevailing wage rate, not the union commercial scale.

MS. MULLIGAN: I just looked it up, there's a 51-page document, the prevailing wage schedule and you put in the county that you're in and it brings it up and it's specific dollar amounts for each job title.

So, for instance, floor coverer is $54.75 an hour as of 7/1 of '21 and that's true in Bronx, Kings, Nassau, New York, Queens, Richmond, Rockland, Suffolk and Westchester and it gives a little description of what they actually do and then there's the per hour supplemental benefits of about $47
and overtime pay.

I mean this is a huge . . . this is an accounting . . .

MR. BRAUN: Nightmare.

MS. MULLIGAN: I don't know, Lori, maybe your folks would be excited by this. This is a significant spreadsheet to get this stuff straight. So it's per job.

MR. WEIR: Again, yeah, so this is (inaudible).

MR. GRUCCI: It's a poison pill for job creation in New York as I see it.

MR. WEIR: Yeah. I mean it's -- I mean the way -- you can manipulate it. We may have to give five-year PILOT's and then down the road give them another five-year extension, you know. Until you start crunching the numbers, it's going to be hard to figure out what -- how it works, you know, the people -- you know, developers will say I want a shorter PILOT, you know. If a seven-year PILOT gets them less than 30 percent, they'll do that, that's their incentive, but it's not . . . you know, again, had they allowed for a carve-out,
unless you enter into a project labor agreement, you know, I think that would have been a reasonable compromise and that's what all the Long Island IDA's have in their own prevailing wage policies where you pay prevailing wage or through a PLA. Westchester has something similar. You have the PLA agreements, you can negotiate the rates and sometimes depending on the project, the unions, I've seen them come below even their commercial rate, you know, because they want the project.

This to me, you know, making a commercial project pay the same rate as a school district or a municipality, a lot of developers are going to say it's not worth coming here to New York.

MS. PAPROCKY: Bill, I have a question and maybe this is too political for this group, but we had on November 2nd the election for it's mostly local.

If we change the seats in Albany, can the -- can the new legislature -- legislation that comes in fight this or is this already in
the works, it's on the books and --

MR. WEIR: Any law that's been enacted can be amended or repealed. It would require a change, I think a change in the membership of both houses or a recognition by leadership in both houses that people get a hundred percent of zero on this bill.

It was not always -- from what I could understand of it, to the extent you can understand the prevailing wage statute, it was not a very well thought out bill. It created more problems than it solved and ultimately I don't think the people who thought they were going to benefit from it will benefit from it.

MR. GRUCCI: Bill, if you're an all union project, are you still subject to the prevailing wage?

MR. WEIR: Yeah.

So that's why I said, you know, if you had a project, you know, something like Tritec, Ronk Hub, hundred percent union, they have project labor agreements in place. Going forward, if they have to pay prevailing wage as opposed to -- and Annette, correct me if
I'm wrong, I think they have -- am I right that they're paying prevailing wage or did you require prevailing wage or PLA's in the --

MS. EADERESTO: No. Any project on the Town, any project on Town land has to pay prevailing wage.

MS. MULLIGAN: What about Tritec, Ronk Hub?

MS. EADERESTO: What's that?

MR. WEIR: That's --

MS. EADERESTO: No, Ronk Hub is not on Town land, so no.

MR. WEIR: But for Ronk Hub, under their master development agreement, I believe they had to have a PLA in place.

MS. EADERESTO: Yes, but that, as Bill has eloquently explained, is not the same as prevailing wage.

MR. GRUCCI: I was always under the impression that prevailing wage was union scale, but it's really not.

MR. WEIR: Well, prevailing wage is again, it's a euphemism for union.

It's the amount that are paid --
prevailing wage as set by New York State
Department of Labor is the amount that
basically municipalities and school districts
pay. It is not commercial union scale. It's
higher.

MR. GRUCCI: That's wild.

MR. WEIR: And you can also -- also, if
you have a PLA -- so as taxpayers, I mean I
don't think New York State taxpayers are aware
of why you build a school in New York, you
build the identical school in North Carolina,
it's twice as expensive in New York. You
know, it's a combination of the prevailing
wages and then, you know, we also have, unless
there's a special legislation, you can't have
a general contractor on a, you know, on a
municipal project, you have to have separate
contracts for construction, electrical,
plumbing and HVAC and again, you also can't do
design build contracts with guaranteed maximum
prices for municipal projects unless it's
specially -- so everything that -- every
project that Governor Cuomo spearheaded, he
would make sure there was, either by executive
order or in the statute, allowing for design
build with a GMP, guaranteed maximum price
contract.

When it comes to the schools, the
towns, the counties, villages, they can't do
that, so it costs so much more. Whatever a
municipality builds in New York, almost twice
anywhere else in the country.

MR. GRUCCI: When you say design and
build, what does that mean?

MR. WEIR: So design build, you put out
an RFP, I want a new town highway department
building and you put out what you want and
people send you, they say this is what we'll
build, we will design it, we'll build it, it's
basically a turnkey and they design it with
architects, engineers, they build it,
guaranteed maximum price. When it's
completed, the municipality gets the building
for, you know, whatever they paid for it.

So typically that's when -- that's how
it's done everywhere else in the country, it's
all design build. It's coming in one
contract, to design it, build it, pay for it.
MR. GRUCCI: Under that scenario, they're exempt from the prevailing wage?

MR. WEIR: No, New York doesn't exempt them from prevailing wage, but they're basically exempting themselves from the Wicks Law. It's the Wicks Law that also adds dramatically to the costs.

So New York has a double whammy of prevailing wage, which is higher than normal construction scale and the Wicks Law, which requires multiple contracts, unless it's a special project of the governor's and then he -- our former governor was very good at getting design builds in for his own projects, you know, like the Kosciuszko Bridge, the Mario Cuomo Bridge. Anything the governor wanted, he made sure it was done.

MR. CALLAHAN: Tappan Zee Bridge.

MR. WEIR: Tappan Zee, formerly known as the Tappan Zee Bridge.

MS. EADERESTO: Listen, I just have to say that if I was governor, I would have named it the Americo Eaderesto Bridge, so I have no problem with it.
MR. GROSS: Annette, if you were running for governor, I'd vote for you.

(Inaudible comments.)

MS. MULLIGAN: Yup. Don't run for governor, though, Annette.

MS. EADERESTO: Oh, no, don't worry about that. I'm running for the hills, that's about it.

MS. MULLIGAN: Okay.

Does anybody have any other questions about prevailing wage?

MR. BRAUN: Obviously (inaudible).

MR. GRUCCI: Yeah, that was enough of bad news for one day.

MS. MULLIGAN: Well, so then on that note, let's move to the next thing, which is some good news I would say.

The IDA impact study is included in your packets. The New York State EDC contracted with Camoin Associates to do a -- they did a whole bunch of group meetings to talk about what IDA's do, how we handle things, what we see in the horizon and this study is the result of all of that work and I
think if you take a little bit of time to read it and honestly I haven't finished reading it, but what I have read so far is really a great piece about all the hard work that all the IDA's do across the state, so it's -- we went from bad news to some good news and so when you have a little bit of time, I think you will enjoy that study.

MR. BRAUN: I will just add that a copy of that report was sent to James Madore of Newsday, who's one of the few reporters that really understands what we do and why we do it and I would not be surprised, assuming it gets by his editorial board, that you see a very favorable article in Newsday somewhere down the road.

MS. MULLIGAN: And to tie in with actually both prevailing wage and New York State EDC, Joce is going to be sending around an email for -- New York State EDC is doing another one of their, what is it, academy do they call it the academy?

MR. BRAUN: Yeah.

MS. MULLIGAN: Academy courses and
prevailing wage is one of the top subjects on it. Joce is going to send that around today or tomorrow; if anybody's interested, just let us know, happy to sign you up for it. I've gone to the past few that they've done and there's -- always leave with a lot of good information.

Is this one virtual?

MR. BRAUN: I think it's virtual. I think it's November 9th.

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes. Joce sent the announcement out already.

MS. MULLIGAN: Oh, excellent; thank you, Joce.

It's actually I think November 16th.

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes.

So that reminds me, that is the day that we have sort of earmarked for our Ronk Hub public hearing.

This conference goes until 4:30, so I think we can just step out a little bit early, pop over into the next meeting, but that's still -- that's just a placeholder, that
November 16th, we're still working through the details to see if, in fact, we're going to hold the public hearing that day or not. I think it might end up getting adjourned to another date.

MR. BRAUN: And that's the eminent domain public hearing.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes.

And then if no one has any questions, I just wanted to transition over now to keeping with the New York State EDC, I just wanted to show everybody this award, I don't know how this is going to work so well. Hold on.

Does that work; I don't know?

MS. EADERESTO: Yeah.

MS. SCHEIDT: Very cool.

MS. MULLIGAN: We got a very nice award.

New York State EDC did something, I think it was very smart what they did, was they gave all of the IDA's the 2021 -- was it just the IDA's or it was everybody?

MR. BRAUN: As far as I know, the IDA's.
MS. MULLIGAN: The IDA's, okay.

They gave all the IDA's the 2021 economic developer of the year award. So just I thought that was very smart and thoughtful and so we collectively all across the state got this award and I know that Amy was in touch with Todd Shapiro's office to try and put out some press that we and everybody else got this award, so I just wanted to show you that.

MR. BRAUN: That award is actually a big deal. It's announced every year in Cooperstown as it was this year. The fact that all IDA's received it was kept a secret, it was extremely for obvious reasons very well received and I think everybody gave everybody else a standing ovation; Bill was there and I was there at the time.

MS. MULLIGAN: So congratulations.

The next item on the agenda is Governance Committee to discussion our UTEP. I just wanted to mention it again. It's in your packet. Also, I hadn't gotten any feedback from anyone, but take some time, read
through it, let me know what you think and
we're going to try to put together a
Governance Committee meeting coming up; we
tried, but we had some issues getting
everybody together, so we're going to try
again to consider if we should make some edits
to our UTEP and it's included in your packets.

Also included in your packets is your
board assessment. It's that time of year
again, so fill out your board assessments and
get them in to Joce; you can drop them off,
you can put them in snail mail, you can snap a
picture and text them to us, whatever works
best for you.

Oh, you know what and I apologize, that
should have been on the LDC agenda, also. You
have to do one for the IDA and one for the
LDC, so sorry, I should have included that in
the other packet and agenda.

Next Tuesday, the 26th, is our bus
tour. So Amy's going to follow up with an
email, but I'll just tell you all right now
we're going to meet at the Top Golf facility,
we should probably park off, you know, a
little off to the side, but we'll meet there at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, the 26th, we'll hop on the bus and we have I think 70 projects that we're going to do, we're going to drive around and do drive-bys of, so everybody who can attend, we -- I think everybody's RSVP'd to Amy. If you said no and now you think you can go, great, we have plenty of room, so we'd love to have you there and if you can't go, just let us know and we're going to end up at Top Golf at the end and anyone who wants to take a couple of swings, can take some swings.

MR. CALLAHAN: Anybody other than from the IDA coming with us that were invited?

MS. MULLIGAN: I'm sorry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Any of the board members from the Town or anybody coming with us?

MS. MULLIGAN: I invited the Town board and I got -- everybody was very interested and asked that we keep them in the loop. We have to confirm a couple of things, so right now, I don't know, maybe Kevin, Kevin was the only one who seemed like he might actually get on the bus with us, Kevin LaValle.
MR. CALLAHAN: Perfect.

MS. MULLIGAN: But that was a while ago, sometimes things sound good in concept and when you get closer they're a little bit daunting, so we have to reach out to him and just see if that still works for him --

MR. CALLAHAN: Gotcha.

MS. MULLIGAN: -- but he's on our list, but I think he's the only one who might join, but that might change, too.

Workforce Development, I just wanted to let you guys know that Jim and I met with Pat Doyle -- Boyle of Ignite, he's from Ignite of Long Island and he has an apprenticeship program, so we are waiting for some more information from him, but what we're going to do is once he sends us the flyer about this, we're going to blast that out to all of our projects in the hopes that some of our projects will be interested in sending some of their employees to this program to get trained in and there's a whole host of things. The one that they mentioned to us that we felt was sort of an interesting take on courses was
they have Spanish for managers, so instead of trying to teach the line workers English, they figured let's just teach the managers Spanish and so it's focused on their industry so they can work together. There's still the opportunity to teach English to the employees, also, but as a stopgap in between, they're like let's just make sure that our people can communicate, but it's pretty much you name it, whatever training you might need, they have an apprenticeship program for it. He was rattling off things like beer brewing, just everything, so --

MR. BRAUN: Can I sign up?

MR. TULLO: Hospitality.

MS. MULLIGAN: So we met with him about that program and then we also met with Andrea Bonilla from WDI, from Workforce Development Institute and she has funding available so that if an employer wants to send their employees to one of the Ignite Long Island apprenticeship programs, then she can help with any costs that are associated with it and the cool thing, one of the cool things about
the apprenticeship program is that you have to remain employed at the sponsor for two years, so you guys send me for the apprenticeship program, I have to remain employed with you for two years, otherwise I lose my ability to complete the program. So it really helps with retention and so there's a whole bunch of little things like that that were very intriguing and I think smart about the way they put the program together, so hopefully we are going to get more information about it and then we'll be able to get it out to all of our projects soon and go from there; just trying to, you know, keep our Workforce Development focused, alive, especially since we haven't been able to do job fairs, which is what we historically had always done.

Ann-Marie, did you want to add something?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yeah.

There are two other programs, entities, that we may also be interested in highlighting to our projects. One is the advanced manufacturing program that John Lombardo runs
at Suffolk Community College.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yes, we are well hooked up into that one.

MS. SCHEIDT: The other one -- pardon?

MS. MULLIGAN: We are well hooked up into that one, so we have a bunch of --

MS. SCHEIDT: And the other is a new entity called the Institute for Workforce Advancement. It's the phoenix that grows from the ashes of the composite prototyping center and it, too, is focused on training for manufacturing, so it might be prudent to get -- to ask those two groups as well and when there's a blast out to our projects, let them know about diversity of workforce training resources that we have.

MS. MULLIGAN: Ann-Marie, would you send an introduction email to me for the workforce?

MS. SCHEIDT: Absolutely.

MS. MULLIGAN: We know John very well, we've worked with him over the years and we've highlighted their programs to our projects, but if you would, send us the Institute for
Workforce Advance --

MS. SCHEIDT: I absolutely will. Glad to do it.

MS. MULLIGAN: Thank you.

Lenore?

MS. PAPROCKY: Lisa, can any of these tools be used for people who are looking to hire and say listen, we'll train you and -- because my -- you know, being from the chambers, you know, these people can't find any workers, so this is a great way to promote getting a job without having any training, but will put you through training; is that something that's available to utilize in this or do they have to already be working there to be on the apprentice program, does that make sense?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah. You know, I'm not sure about that, but so if you said I want to hire you and listen, if you come in, I will put you straight into this program, I think that that would work just fine.

I think you have to have a sponsor, so, you know, company X has to say I'm bringing
these people forward, so I don't think that
they're just training the general public, but
what they will do is if you find someone who
you're interested in hiring, you hire that
person and then you sponsor them through the
program and there's -- whatever fees are
associated with sponsoring, there's grants out
there to offset that.

MS. PAPROCKY: Right.

That could be a good way to promote,
you know, to the companies, you know, Jim just
mentioned hospitality, you know, the hotels
are struggling to find anybody to work and I
don't, you know, as easy as something like --
well, it's not that it's easy, it's the worst
job, the hardest job in the whole hotel, but
housekeeping, but they can't even find
salespeople, so a lot of these people didn't
have no sales experience per se or hotel
experience, they could say listen, we'll hire
you, we'll give you that training that you'll
need to even be better in your job and that
then at least gives them two years with the
person. I see that as being something that
should be married together as far as I'm concerned.

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah and we're trying to help them get the word out, so . . . we were very interested in the program, also. We still haven't gotten the flyer yet I don't think, but we reached out --

MR. TULLO: We have not.

MS. MULLIGAN: We haven't, have we?

MR. TULLO: No, we have not. In fact, I sent a follow-up email reminding them about our meeting, thanking them and asking them to forward us the information so we can get it out to our companies.

MS. MULLIGAN: So, you know, as soon as we get something, we will share it with our companies and Andrea also offered that if we -- when we share the information, we can cc her and then any company that has any workforce needs, she'll be able to go in and meet with them and them help figure out how her organization can assist, so we're just -- you know, we used to do a couple of events every year and we would highlight these
programs and have people come and sit down and have a breakfast and have people talk and then people ask questions and then afterwards, hey, let me sign up, come see my facility and it's just that it doesn't -- it's not happening right now, so we're muddling through how to keep things moving in a different world, but we are working on it.

Any questions?
(No response.)

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah.

So I know that we had Michael was on before, he was going to give a presentation, but I don't see that he's on right now.

Amy, have you heard from Michael; is he coming back on?

MR. CALLAHAN: Amy's muted.

MS. MULLIGAN: Amy, you're muted.

We can hear her.

MS. ILLARDO: Sorry.

Yeah, he was with us for a while and now I don't see him in the attendees. I don't know where he went, my apologies, but he was on for a bit, so let me just email him quick
and see if I can get him back.

MR. BRAUN: Then --

MR. TULLO: If not, we get him on for next month?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah. All right.

MS. ILLARDO: He's scheduled to be on every month, so . . .

MR. TULLO: All right.

MS. MULLIGAN: Don't even worry about it. We'll --

MR. GRUCCI: I have a question before we adjourn.

MS. MULLIGAN: We actually -- we're going to ask you to stay on for a little bit, Felix, but go ahead.

MR. GRUCCI: Before we go into executive session, just two quick questions for you.

A while back we did a pretty in-depth look at the airport with an eye on perhaps the IDA purchasing, purchasing the airport.

Is that still on the horizon or has that been scraped?

MS. MULLIGAN: I don't think --
Annette, chime in, but I don't think the Town is interested in having us purchase it, the airport, anymore.

MS. EADERESTO: No. We have -- a lot of things changed and the revenue streams changed over there, so I think the Town is just going to keep it.

MR. GRUCCI: That's fine. I just wanted to get it off of my list of things to ask.

And the last question that I had is many years ago when I was there, we had this industrial zone that offered benefits to people who wanted to bring their businesses. Is that still in existence or a successor to that in existence still today?

MS. EADERESTO: Felix, you mean the Empire Zone?

MS. MULLIGAN: Yeah.

MR. GRUCCI: Yeah.

MS. MULLIGAN: So the Empire Zone program ended, I want to say in 2007, so that ended a while ago. It was replaced with the Excelsior program, I think it's called now.
MS. EADERESTO: Yeah, I think you're right.

(Inaudible comments.)

MS. MULLIGAN: And that instead of being a zone is the entire state. There's programs available.

It's a little bit narrowly defined now. We find that fewer projects qualify for it, but there still is a program and any time we meet with anybody about growing their business, we always make sure that they have a contact at Empire State Development so that they can reach out to them and learn specifically about their programs.

We always -- we let everybody know about the programs through PSE&G, National Grid, New York State, so we just make sure and depending on what their needs are, we try to tailor them a little bit, but --

MR. GRUCCI: The program that we had that actually carved out a geographical chunk of land and said this land is entitled to these specific benefits, that doesn't exist any longer.
MS. MULLIGAN: No, now the program covers the entire state.

MR. GRUCCI: Got it. Okay, thank you.

MS. MULLIGAN: You're welcome.

Anything else?

MR. BRAUN: If not, we need a motion to go into executive session and Joce --

MS. MULLIGAN: To discuss --

MR. BRAUN: To discuss items of --

MS. MULLIGAN: Lawsuits and personnel issues.

MR. BRAUN: Correct.

MR. GRUCCI: So moved.

MR. CALLAHAN: Second.

MS. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Marty.

Okay. Joce just sent the link and guys just bear with me because I'm the one getting us into this and I'm not as adept at this as everybody else. I will be there, though, just bear with me.

MR. TULLO: Bye everybody.

MS. MULLIGAN: Thank you.

(Short recess taken.)

MR. BRAUN: I need a motion to come out
of executive session.

MR. CALLAHAN: So moved.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you, Marty.

MS. SCHEIDT: Second.

MR. BRAUN: On the vote, we'll go in reverse order, Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. Grucci: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

We are out of executive session.

MS. MULLIGAN: And there was no action taken while we were in executive session.

MR. BRAUN: Unless there's something else to be discussed, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting of the IDA; it is now 11:21.

MR. GRUCCI: So moved.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yup.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Callahan --
MR. CALLAHAN: Second.

MR. BRAUN: -- on the vote?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Grucci?

MR. GRUCCI: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Paprocky?

MS. PAPROCKY: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Ms. Scheidt?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Mr. Braun votes yes.

Thank you very much for your time and your comments and we will see you again in November, hopefully in person starting in January.

MS. MULLIGAN: November 17th is our next meeting, but we'll see a bunch of you next week at the bus tour.

MS. PAPROCKY: Can't wait.

MR. GRUCCI: Sorry I can't make the tour, but you guys enjoy.

MS. SCHEIDT: Sorry I can't, also.

MS. MULLIGAN: We understand.

Thank you.
(Time noted: 11:21 a.m.)
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