

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
Oneida County Industrial Development Agency**

March 26, 2021

584 Phoenix Drive, Rome, NY/Webex Video/Teleconference Due to COVID-19 Emergency

Members Present: **Webex:** David Grow, L. Michael Fitzgerald; Mary Faith Messenger; Steve Zogby; Ferris Betrus, Kirk Hinman, Gene Quadraro.

EDGE Staff Present: **Webex:** Steven DiMeo, Shawna Papale, Maureen Carney, Bill Van Shufflin, Jennifer Waters, Mark Kaucher, Tim Fitzgerald.

Other Attendees: **Webex/Teleconference:** Linda Romano, Bond, Schoeneck & King; Mark Levitt & Jenna Peppenelli, Levitt & Gordon; Rome Mayor Jackie Izzo; Gregg Evans and Michelle Lesser, Bonadio & Associates; Barry Carrigan, Nixon Peabody; Genevieve Trigg and Kevin McCauliffe, Barclay Damon, and Peter McCauliffe, Omni Navitas.

Chair Grow called the meeting to order at 8:10 AM.

Minutes

The minutes of the February 19, 2021 meeting were reviewed. **A motion to approve the minutes, was moved by F. Betrus, seconded by S. Zogby, and carried 7-0.**

Financials

- a. M. Carney reviewed the interim financial statements dated February 28, 2021, noting that there was no significant activity to report. On the balance sheet, cash was up 5% over the last twelve months mostly due to the timing of payables and increase in net assets. On the budget comparison report, we received a couple application fees and a couple closing fees (GSSP 4575 Annsville and Greg LLC Re-fi). Chair Grow explained that an item has come up in the Audit Committee meeting regarding the \$400,000 Board Designated Economic Development Fund from our net asset balance. Somehow it got lost in the translation to the current audit and he suggests that the Agency pass a resolution re-establishing it and approving it so that going forward it appears on the balance sheet as a separate designated fund. He invited input from the rest of the board. S. Papale commented that she believes Chair Grow wants to make sure that it is explicitly clear in the minutes that the special fund is restricted for special economic development projects. Chair Grow added that the board formerly restricted the fund so that it was a special fund for special projects set aside on the balance sheet. There was no specific project in mind at the time, just noting that it was there to be used for special projects. There are no projects right identified as of now but he believes we should have a designated entry on the books to reflect this fund. S. Papale said this came up while working with the auditors. The Agency had been carrying it on the books for a long time as restricted and the new auditors opined that it would be a good idea to have it clearly recognized in the minutes. M. Fitzgerald asked what the reason for restricting it is. Chair Grow responded that going forward we can demonstrate that we have specific funds set-aside for special economic development purposes that can be accessed if need be. Formally restricting the funds in a documented designated account, as opposed to just holding onto the cash in general assets with no plan to use them, would provide them with a degree of protection from access by an external source. M. Fitzgerald commented that the board would be able to remove the restriction at any time it deemed necessary. Chair Grow agreed. F. Betrus asked if this \$400,000 was from the Cree project fee. Chair Grow responded that it was not. M. Fitzgerald stated that it goes back about 20 years ago. M. Carney said her research of the accounting system showed that it goes back to around 1999, but that it was not specifically noted in the minutes at that time as a specially restricted fund. **A motion to re-affirm that the board is holding \$400,000 in a specially-designated fund balance for future economic development projects was moved by M. Fitzgerald and seconded by M. F. Messenger.** Discussion: S. Zogby stated that he believes we should aim to be more proactive in finding appropriate uses for the funds. Chair Grow agreed and wishes the staff be aggressive in finding uses for the funds. S. Papale stated that staff can do that. There being no further discussion, **Chair Grow called for a vote on the motion: Motion carried, 7-0.**

b. **Capitalization Threshold Increase**

M. Carney explained that Bonadio noted that the IDA did not have a formal capitalization threshold and advised that it might adopt one at \$2,500. The IRS recommends anywhere between \$2,500 and \$5,000. M. Fitzgerald suggested \$1,000. **A motion to adopt a capitalization threshold of \$1,000 was moved by M. Fitzgerald, seconded M. F. Messenger, and carried 7-0.**

- c. **2020 Audit:** Chair Grow gave the floor to M. F. Messenger, Audit Committee Chair, who reported that the committee met with Bonadio & Associates to review the results of their audit of the IDA's 2020 activities. S. Papale noted that Gregg Evans and Michelle Lesser, the audit team from Bonadio are in attendance. M. F. Messenger thanked them for getting the audit wrapped up in a timely fashion. She reported that Bonadio delivered a clean unqualified opinion a clean audit with no management letter comments or communication to the board that needed to be relayed. The committee has accepted the audit results and reports and now recommends its approval by the full board. Chair Grow asked if there were any questions. There being none, Chair Grow asked for a motion on the report. **A motion to accept the 2020 audit and communications presented to the audit committee and forwarding it to New York State, was moved by M. F. Messenger, seconded by M. Fitzgerald, and carried 7-0.**

S. Papale noted that IDA projects will be reviewed at the next board meeting, focusing on the December 31, 2020 job status.

SQ1 Holding LLC – (Square One) Amended Application/Supplemental Inducement Request

Chair Grow introduced a request from SQ1 Holdings, LLC for the Agency to consider an amendment to their existing application for financial assistance, and approving a supplemental inducement resolution amending the value of the agency benefits. S. Papale explained that since the time of the original application in July of 2020, the project costs have increased considerably due to a number of factors, but primarily due to the increased cost of building materials. M. Fitzgerald noted that there appears to be a mistake in the amounts listed in the "Difference-Financial Costs" column, which affects the totals column. Financial Difference costs should be \$4,000 not \$397,000. M. Fitzgerald also questioned why the value of the PILOT is less when the property value actually is going up. M. Kaucher explained that in the original PILOT calculations, the existing value of the property was not taken into consideration, when it should have been as this is an incremental PILOT. The new calculations take the existing assessment into consideration, which actually results in a lower estimated PILOT value. M. Levitt stated that the board could approve the resolution subject to verification of the budget numbers, as the stated estimate benefit values are correct. **A motion to accept an amendment to the Application for Financial Assistance relating to the SQ1 Holdings, LLC Facility and approving a supplemental resolution to amend the financial assistance for the project to (i) increase the mortgage recording tax exemption value estimated to \$6,821 not to exceed \$7,503 (an increase of \$1,196); (ii) increase the sales tax exemption to a value estimated to \$39,788 not to exceed \$43,766 (an increase of \$6,976); and (iii) amend the estimated value of the PILOT exemption to \$97,266 (a decrease of \$10,459), subject to verification of the back-up budget materials, was moved by M. Fitzgerald, seconded by K. Hinman, and carried 7-0.**

2020 Job Reporting

E. Quadraro asked if Utica National's 2 job reporting on the OCIDA 2020 Project Report was accurate. Staff will double-check. He also asked about Special Metals number. Staff has received a letter from them regarding their jobs status and will monitor and report back with its findings.

SQ1 Holding LLC – (Square One) SEQR

Chair Grow introduced a SEQR resolution relating to the SQ1 Holdings LLC Facility. The Town of Whitestown Planning Board is serving as Lead Agency for SEQR review and adopted a resolution on March 24, 2021 M. Kaucher reported that a determination of non-significance was made by the Town PB and we have received a copy of it. **A motion to accept the resolution by the Town Planning Board relating to the SQ1 Holdings LLC Facility and include it as part of our SEQR approval was moved by M.F. Messenger, seconded by S. Zogby and carried 7-0.**

Approved 4-30-2021

SQ1 Holding LLC – (Square One) Final Authorizing Resolution

Chair Grow introduced a Final Authorization Resolution relating to the SQ1 Holdings LLC Facility. The Agency conducted a public hearing on October 15, 2020, at which SQ1 principal Lloyd Ploof was the sole attendee. M. Kaucher noted he expressed his appreciation to the Agency for its continued support of his business. **A motion to approve a final authorizing resolution relating to the SQ1 Holdings, LLC Facility and approving financial assistance consistent with Agency Policy in the form of exemptions from sales tax (estimated at \$39,788 not to exceed \$43,766), exemptions from mortgage recording tax (estimated at \$6,821 not to exceed \$7,503) and reduction of real property taxes (estimated at \$97,266) and execution of related documents, subject to counsel review, was moved by E. Quadraro, seconded by M. F. Messenger, and carried 7-0.**

Griffiss Local Development Corporation – Building 302

Chair Grow introduced a request from Griffiss Local Development Corporation (Building 302) Facility for the agency to consider granting a license to Vincent Holdings to renovate the property and authorizing the release of the property from the Lease Agreement with GLDC in the event Vincent Holdings exercises its option to purchase. S. Papale explained that this is the old brown building down next to 153 Brooks Road which used to be the main telecommunications hub for Griffiss.. Vincent Holdings principal, Vinnie Ficchi, is interested in possibly renovating the facility for a multi-purpose purpose. S. J. Dimeo has done an extensive investigation of the building and GLDC is interested in granting him a license to enter the property to carry out certain building stabilization efforts including asbestos abatement and securing the shell of the building from weather damage. Upon providing evidence of completing the stabilization efforts, GLDC will allow him to exercise his option to purchase it. The result will be a shell where he can then build out to suit potential tenants. Mr. Ficchi is also the principal of Anchor Heating headquartered in Utica and has some track record with older building redevelopment. GLDC supports the proposal as they only envisioned abating the asbestos and then tearing down the building, at considerable expense. There is no longer any telecommunications infrastructure located in the building. **A motion to approve a resolution related to the Griffiss Local Development Corporation (Building 302) Facility, granting a license to Vincent Holdings LLC to renovate the property, authorizing the release of the property from the Lease Agreement with GLDC in the event Vincent Holdings LLC exercises its option to purchase, and authorizing the form and execution of related documents, subject to counsel review was moved by M. Fitzgerald and seconded by E. Quadraro.** Chair Grow noted that he did receive a letter from Saunders & Kahler explaining the need for the Agency's action on this matter. **There being no further discussion, Chair Grow called for a vote on the motion: Motion carried 7-0.**

M. F. Messenger left the meeting.

MSP Benefit Clawback & Distribution

S. Papale reported that we have received the fully-executed agreement and also the first-half of the agreed-upon repayment amount from MSP LLC. She will be paying outstanding legal fees then distribute the net amount to the affected taxing jurisdictions on a pro-rata basis using the 2020 tax rates. None of the funds will be apportioned for administrative expenses at this time.

OCIDA Solar Policy Discussion –

Chair Grow explained that it appears that from industry feedback our current per MW fee is turning out to be detrimental the development of solar facilities in Oneida County, mostly because of our current per MW fee policy. Staff has provided a report to the board on the status of other policies around the state, and has been communicating with the County Planning Department and NYSERDA, and has received feedback from them on their positions. Chair Grow believes as a result of this, the Agency needs to revise our per MW fee. S. Papale acknowledged that she originally introduced the current fee, but based upon considerable subsequent research, discovery and discussions with NYSERDA, NYSEDC, NYS, other IDAs, developers, the Tug Hill Commission, County Planning, she now has a better understanding of where our fee should be. In particular, she singled out Ian Latimer from NYSERDA as being especially instrumental in providing valuable education and clarification on all issues related to solar in NYS. She referred to a PowerPoint presentation he prepared for Oneida County IDA and which was sent to the board. She now believes the per MW fee

Approved 4-30-2021

should be something closer to \$5,000 and that the PILOT term should probably be 25 years, even though there was concern of panels degrading after 15 years. Mr. Latimer explained that the 25 useful life of the panels is factored into the NYSERDA financial model. She referred to the PowerPoint presentation which shows the power revenue comparison and the changes to the incentives. NYSERDA is capable of assisting in other areas too such as helping municipalities with how to do assessments of solar projects. She also explained that the County is going to work cooperatively with us on the decommissioning plans. Site-specific soil conditions are another consideration that may need to be addressed in the fee and the County has recommended a sliding scale fee dependent upon soil conditions, siting three soil types (prime, non-statewide significance, & non-prime/crappy) delineated on their GIS maps. The County GIS soils map could be posted on our website so that developers could determine how their proposed site fits into the per MW fee structure. In summation, she advised that based upon this most recent information the Agency needs to use this new information to revise its fee structure and support what the state is saying regarding having a clean energy policy. This is for community solar projects only, not utility scale projects. She went on to say we are anticipating a couple of the utility-scale solar projects coming up in the future. Setting aside the per MW fee structure for a moment, M. Fitzgerald stated that if we are really interested in helping out the affected jurisdictions, we need to focus on the decommissioning issue. He believes there has to be a minimum level of protection for the towns, which they could go beyond if they so choose. He suggests that the IDA spend some funds to have an engineering study to determine how much it would currently cost, per MW, to decommission a solar installation, then make sure the developer provided a bond or trust account to support any eventual decommissioning. He believes this could be the biggest problem down the road. S. Papale responded that our research found that a number of the municipalities already have engineers who can provide this function, but in cases where they do not, we need to require our application to say we will engage at the cost to the developer an engineer to determine the decommissioning cost and bonding needed. L. Romano stated that their research concluded that these cost estimates should be done by an independent engineer. The developer can provide estimates but independent party's need to provide the necessary information. M. Fitzgerald wondered if there would be much difference in costs between similarly sized facilities, like 1 MW costs vs 2 MW costs, thinking maybe we could have a study done to come up with a base per MW cost. S. Papale commented that the NYSERDA contact said there are a lot of variables that go into the decommissioning costs, as no two sites are the same. L. Romano agreed and said that maybe a basic structure could be decided upon to cover most bases but have the flexibility to take into consideration other site factors that may be applicable. M. Fitzgerald said if a developer thinks our base is too high, maybe we should have them provide us with funding to go out and have an independent appraisal done to see if they are right or wrong. Chair Grow said that of all the many solar projects around here, they must all have a base decommissioning policy and that NYSERDA might have one as well. S. Papale said yes they do and Ian said they would be glad to assist us with that. She stated we could also find a specialized engineer to give us the direction M. Fitzgerald is talking about. Chair Grow thinks we can make each project subject to an acceptable plan as part of our policy as opposed to a standard plan for every project. Then we can approve that project either with a separate engineer, NYSERDA, or with the County Planning Department's help, then approve it as part of the final project approval. First, however, Chairman Grow thinks we should agree upon an per MW fee, then the decommissioning part is part of the final agreement that ultimately is entered into that can be subject to final approval. A transitional per MW fee has been discussed with staff, depending upon the desirability of the land for alternate uses. Staff recommended a \$4,000/MW fee would be for land without much use for other purposes (non-prime); \$6,000/MW fee would be for mid-level value land, conducive for farming or other tillable purposes (non-statewide significance); and \$5,000/MW base fee for any other type of land (prime land). Chairman Grow also believes a 2% escalator in some form should be considered, as well as a 25 year term, along with a decommissioning plan for when they stop being profitable. E. Quadraro asked what the benefits are for our area. He asked if there is any guarantee that low cost power will stay in our area and benefit local customers. He is concerned we are giving up potential revenue with no guarantee of benefit. S. Papale referred to a mailing that F. Betrus received from a developer guaranteeing offering lower cost power within a certain area. She was not sure of the exact geographic area. Chair Grow stated that our existence might depend on it. E. Quadraro said he would not debate that but hopes we aren't losing our tax dollars merely to benefit some other part of the state. Chair Grow also noted the Agency fee and our ability to use those funds to assist with other projects. He noted the crunch many companies are experiencing to find workforce. Our fees could be used to assist with workforce development efforts. S.J. Dimeo noted that certain company leads we have worked with have inquired about the degree of power generation diversity we have, so this would help us show our power source diversity, especially with "green energy". S. Zogby, prefacing his comments by

Approved 4-30-2021

saying that he and his wife both drive plug-in vehicles, said he has no problem with the proposed 25-year term, and understands how our current policy is out of the market range, but that he still does not see what the consequence on the investment returns for the developers are on all this, with all the incentives in NYS taken into consideration. Based upon earlier projects reviewed, he believes the investment returns are pretty high, and with all the economic duress our local municipalities are dealing with, the proposed three-tier, \$4k through \$6k per MW numbers are too low, and though he supports these projects, believes something in the \$7,000 to \$7,500 per MW range would be appropriate. S. Papale commented that based upon what she has seen with the NYSEERDA modeling, the incentives have changed drastically since 2015. The incentives have reduced from \$.40 to \$.11 per MW. This has reduced developer returns. She believes we saw earlier economic models based upon older NYSEERDA NY Sun incentives. She outlined the NYSEERDA recommendations for the National Grid territory which show even at \$6,000, we are on the high side. M. Fitzgerald noted we would not be able to make up the loss in NY incentives with our property tax breaks. He referenced that one of the allures is not even available in National Grid territory anymore. He added that he is not in support of the 25 year plan due to concerns about technology issues, but would support it to move it along. He would also like to keep the per MW fee simple and make it \$7,000, as Rome seems to be finding success with it. He thinks we should definitely keep the 2% annual escalator, referencing the NYSEERDA PowerPoint presentation that show most of the PILOT examples feature it. He also believes we need a base decommissioning rule that the municipalities could go beyond if they are concerned about it.

S. Papale stated the following proposal: 25-year term; 2% annual escalator; solid decommissioning plan; per MW(AC) fee: She noted Chair Grow's interest in scaling it based on soils, but hears the interest for fixing it. She emphasized that the county's concern of protecting farmland and interest in having the fee be higher on the better land verified by the County GIS soils mapping. **M. Fitzgerald proposed an amendment of our current community solar policy as follows: \$7,000 fee per MW (AC) on the Oneida County GIS-verified soil map for prime soils land, \$5,500 fee per MW on the Oneida County GIS-verified soil map for non-prime, 2% annual escalator starting in year two, 25-year term, a decommissioning plan that, for now, will be on a case by case basis with the hope that we get to a standard based decommissioning policy with a bond or trust account for protection. Chair Grow seconded the motion.** Discussion: **S. Papale asked if M. Fitzgerald if he would agree to categorize soils of state-wide importance at \$5,500 fee per MW (AC) on the Oneida County GIS-verified soil map, to which he agreed.** M. Fitzgerald then asked staff to contact National Grid and NYSEERDA to find out where the interconnection points are in the county so that we know where they are. Then we can decide how big of a radius we want to take into consideration as to how they affect land value for solar developers. F. Betrus agreed with this request stating that he understands this is an extremely important decision. F. Betrus asked M. Fitzgerald if he would agree to reducing each level by \$500. He responded that he did not believe it would be necessary. S. Papale indicated she would revise the policy for distribution to all taxing jurisdictions for comment, and would schedule a WebEx session so all interested parties could provide comments. There being no further discussion, **Chair Grow called for a vote on the motion: Motion carried 5-0, with F. Betrus abstaining.** L. Romano stated that the Agency merely needs to notify and give the jurisdictions the opportunity to comment. The policy could then be ratified and approved at the next meeting. M. Fitzgerald suggested, and there was general board consensus, that S. Papale be allowed to provide the details of the revised policy to pending applicants.

Short-Line Railroad – City of Rome

Chair Grow explained that S. Papale has been in discussions with the short-line railroad servicing GBTP and other parts of Rome. The rail line is covered under a 100% real property tax exemption and there is a situation that has developed with the City of Rome. The PILOT lease comes up for renewal next year and part of the existing agreement is that the railroad could not charge the affected jurisdictions any fees for accessing the existing railroad right of way. Chair Grow gave the floor to Rome Mayor Izzo to speak to the situation. Mayor Izzo explained that the Agency has already provided an easement to the City across the railroad right of way for the purposes of the sewer line repairs along Railroad Street. In its subsequent negotiations with the railroad for the easement from them, they are attempting to charge the City an annual \$7,700 license fee for the easement. This goes against the PILOT and it is holding up the signing of the easement. Mayor Izzo is looking to the IDA for assistance in reminding the railroad of this fee prohibition. Mayor Izzo asked if the Agency would be willing to intervene. L. Romano said they already had the discussion with them and they agreed to take it out. Mayor Izzo said the last version she saw had it back in. Mayor Izzo said she will forward what she has to L.

Approved 4-30-2021

Romano. Chair Grow said this whole PILOT issue will come up next year when the current PILOT expires. S. Papale explained that at GBTP, GVT Rail's lease with GLDC for the short-line has expired and is on a month to month basis. We are working to get it renewed but they are also looking to go after some grants and to put in new rail sidings for Sovena and some other improvements. We are trying to get them to understand that GLDC is the property owner of the land and that it cannot just give land up without the specific company participating. The individual companies pay CSX directly for the rail cars come in. Companies do not pay the short lines for the cars to be brought to them. As fuel prices increase, demand for rail service increases. The Agency has served as a buffer for many of the companies who use rail, and we are trying to keep the companies from getting gouged by the rail companies, should they ever be subject to property taxes.

Single Family Housing PILOT Proposal - Woodhaven Housing

Chair Grow invited Mayor Izzo to discuss the proposed housing redevelopment project at Woodhaven and referred to the presentation/video provided. Mayor Izzo explained that the City has been talking to potential developers for about three years. The 100 acres has been designated for a mix of commercial and housing(including single family). The YMCA is planning to build a new facility on a portion of the site as well. The City put out an RFPI and has a developer who is ready to proceed. The City has been investigating the Department of Defense-installed utility situation and it appears it may be acceptable for re-use. Noting the considerable lack of new housing stock available for people employers are trying to bring into the area, the City believes the proposed project would help address that need. The City is also talking to a couple other developers regarding potential single family home developments elsewhere in Rome. The Mayor went on to describe the real property tax PILOT incentive program the City instituted several years ago for new residential construction. The abatement in assessment starts at 50% in the first year, then decreases by 5% increments thereafter. The City School District and the County do not participate in providing the abatement. The City believes that all jurisdictions need to be included in this type of program for the redevelopment of Woodhaven, stressing that the property hasn't generated any tax revenue for years, and the estimated 30% differential in Rome and Utica tax rates compared to other areas. She stated that we are growing businesses in the area, but we are not growing the residential base of the community because we lack the product employees want. S. Papale noted the red-hot residential real estate market locally and said lack of desirable options is driving people to look outside of the area. It has also driven up prices like never before. A program such as this would make homes more affordable locally she added. S. J. Dimeo described the proposed lease-leaseback structure that would be created between Rome Industrial Development Corporation, Woodhaven Ventures, LLC, and the Agency. A portion of the property would be sold off to the YMCA. The remainder would be developed by the developer and as individual parcels are sold off to homebuyers, those parcels would be covered under the PILO program. SJ Dimeo referred to a similar arrangement that was done on Deerfield Commons. Chair Grow questioned how banks would handle the mortgages on these individual parcels, particularly if a FHA or VA loan was involved. L. Romano stated that in the case of the Schuyler Commons project, it was not a problem. SJ Dimeo continued with the presentation showing what affect the PILOT would have on the real property taxes for the typical program, suggesting that possibly it would come under the City's domain along with regular tax billing. Mayor Izzo agreed with this saying they already administer the current housing tax incentive program. M. Fitzgerald suggested that he believes it might be a administrative nightmare, and that the Weaver Meadows project was administered by the Utica IDA. He also voiced concern pertaining to insurance coverage. Chair Grow said if the City were take responsibility for the administrative tasks, he feels it could work, while acknowledging M. Fitzgerald's concern about the liability while under title to the property. E. Quadraro asked what happens if a homeowner decides to lease out his property and whether a gated community or HOA scenario might be an option. Mayor Izzo responded that for a portion of the property they are investigating those options adding that the government is very interested in this project as a recruitment tool. At EADS, there are full-time guard personnel whom never leave the deployment and are spread out all over the region. EADS would like to get them closer. The AFRL has three-year rotation military personnel so they would be a natural for an HOA. S. Zogby asked if this was motivating the developer to sell houses knowing the taxes will be less and why the homeowner should also get a break if there is already a need and demand for houses. SD Dimeo explained that the homeowner bears the brunt of the real property taxes and won't move forward without the equivalent of a RPTL §485-I program. He said this concept was previously discussed and there was hope the school district would buy into it but that did not happen. Thus the concept of engaging the Agency. He added that If you try to do this project without any benefit on the tax bill, it becomes un-affordable. Chair Grow stated that if the taxes with the mortgage,

Approved 4-30-2021

taking into the construction costs, don't bring the costs down to compete with other areas, the developer is never going to build as the market will not support it. Mayor Izzo stated that they have about a \$1 million invested in the site already between demolition and acquisition so they have reached the limit of what they can do without a developer. They can absorb some of the utility cost upgrades and street improvements, but not without finding people to live there and that will require incentivization. S. Zogby agreed but still questioned the need for homebuyer incentivization if there was already such high demand. Mayor Izzo said the people are buying, but if they are not finding the homes locally so in many they are going elsewhere. She explained the real property tax imbalance that many newcomers to the area experience via a vis home value/tax bill. E. Quadraro believes the proposal would be a good plan if the City were to take the administrative responsibility. Chair Grow asked the possibility of the City adopting the current PILOT program. Mayor Izzo said they would have to get a buy-in from each taxing jurisdiction connected to the Rome City School District, which is logistically prohibitive. The School District is not averse to it, but the towns are where it gets hung up. She believes the City could manage it along with the existing tax bill administration. L. Ruberto suggested getting together with the City of Utica to see how they are handling their existing projects of a similar nature. They will report back. M. Fitzgerald wondered if a PIF might be an option. Chair Grow still has questions on the mechanics of the mortgage administration. L. Romano said we might be over complicating the situation and will do some research and report back. M. Fitzgerald questioned how we track that the developer is passing the costs saved through the Agency flow to the buyer, suggesting that costs of materials are probably 50% now. SJ Dimeo stated that is something that would need to be developed and verified. Mayor Izzo thanked the board for listening to the proposal and the comments. The Mayor wishes to present the proposal to the Common Councils economic committee next week because they really need to get going on a sale. The Mayor stated that if this is something that the Board is willing to continue looking into and not opposed to it, and that pending more information from legal counsel's standpoint, and her own investigation on administration options within the City itself, she would move forward with the steps needed to make it happen. Chair Grow said that the Agency is in support at this stage, but that it is willing to move forward specifically in the City of Rome only at this point. M. Fitzgerald noted that he would lean towards supporting a larger benefit for a shorter term, possibly five years rather than ten, but supports kick-starting the program to get it going. Chair Grow stated that he believes what the Mayor hears is essentially support from the IDA to get it going and on its way if it can be made to work it's a nice project. The Mayor thanked the board and will report back. She stated houses could be started this year.

S. Papale suggested that SJ Dimeo give the board an update on projects at the next meeting.

There being no further business, Chair Grow asked for a resolution to adjourn the meeting. At 10:15 AM a motion to adjourn the meeting was moved by M. Fitzgerald, seconded by E. Quadraro, and carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Kaucher