

MINUTES
COLUMBIA COUNTY
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
BOARD MEETING
Monday, June 28, 2016
4303 Route 9
Hudson, New York

The special meeting of Columbia County Industrial Development Agency held at their offices located at 4303 Route 9, Hudson, NY 12534 on June 28, 2016. The meeting was called to order at 10:01 AM by Jim Mackerer, Chairman.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Bob Galluscio	Treasurer	Present	
William Gerlach	Board Member	Present	
Brian Keeler	Board Member	Present	
Jim Mackerer	Chairman	Present	
Sid Richter	Vice-Chairman	Present	
Sarah Sterling	Secretary	Present	
Theodore Guterman II	Counsel	Present	
F. Michael Tucker	President/CEO	Present	
Tony Jones	CEDC Chairman	Present	
Rick Rector	City of Hudson Alderman	Present	
Tom Rossi	Redburn Development	Present	
Lisa Drahusuk	Administrative Supervisor	Present	
Erin McNary	Bookkeeper	Present	
Carol Wilber	Marketing Director	Present	

41 Cross Street Hospitality, LLC.:

Mr. Guterman noted a public hearing on the project had been held on June 24, 2016 at 8:30am at City Hall in the City of Hudson. He reviewed the project. He stated the Board had 3 proposed resolutions in front of them regarding the proposed 41 Cross Street Hospitality, LLC. He turned the board's attention to the SEQR resolution. He noted the SEQR had been prepared for the City of Hudson who had reviewed the document and had issued a negative declaration.

Mr. Guterman stated the IDA's portion of the project was financial, which has no impact on the environmental review. He stated after the environmental review had been completed, a letter outlining the deviation from the uniform tax exemption policy had been mailed to the affected taxing jurisdictions. He noted the property currently paid no property taxes. Mr. Guterman stated the City of Hudson had negotiated a PILOT with Redburn. The proposed PILOT payments began at \$20,000 and increased to \$100,000 over 10 years. He referred to Exhibit A at the back of the PILOT Deviation Approval Resolution, noting the PILOT and the other benefits were outlined in the exhibit.

Mr. Guterman asked to Board to refer to the Approving Resolution, he noted Exhibit A outlined the new regulations instituted by New York State. The exhibit lists the criteria and answers if the criteria is applicable to the project and stated the expected benefit to the community. He noted the City of Hudson would receive a significant financial benefit from the project through the PILOT as well as the \$8 million investment. He also noted the project would also be a catalyst for future development of the City's waterfront and has allowed for collaboration between the City and County IDA.

Mr. Mackerer stated he had spoken to City officials asking if any significant infrastructure would be required for the project. The City had stated that investment had already been made and no further infrastructure would be required. He also noted the benefit/cost analysis had used the more conservative job figures.

Mr. Tucker reviewed Exhibit A of the Approving Resolution line by line with the Board. He noted the project had created the opportunity for outreach and collaboration. He noted that at the CEDC Board meeting held earlier in the day, the Board had agreed to allow Mr. Tucker to continue discussions with the City of Hudson to contract with CEDC for administration of the City of Hudson IDA.

Mr. Guterman turned the Board's attention to the SEQR part 2, Impact Assessment. He noted the Board had received the negative declaration from the City of Hudson. He noted the IDA financing would not impact the environment. He asked the Board to review the document. He stated he would recommend the Board issue a negative declaration if they felt there was no impact. *Mr. Richter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gerlach to issue a negative declaration on the project regarding IDA involvement. Carried.*

Mr. Guterman stated the public hearing had generated positive feedback, he noted there had been no written comments submitted. He stated the City of Hudson fully supported the project. He noted the IDA had considered; The nature of the project; which included the reconstruction and renovation of an existing building into a boutique hotel; The economic condition of the area and the economic multiplying effect upon the area, stating the project would improve the neighborhood and promote commercial development in the City of Hudson; Job creation and retention, anticipating 45 construction jobs and 12 full time equivalent in the first year and 14 thereafter; Economic impact of the proposed project on existing and proposed businesses, the reuse of the building will serve to attract additional businesses and commercial activity in the City of Hudson; Private sector investment will be approximately \$8,438,000; Effect upon the environment, no significant impact; likelihood of completion in a timely fashion, likely.

Mr. Guterman stated if there were no additional questions, he would recommend the Board approve the PILOT Deviation Approval Resolution. *Mr. Galluscio made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sterling to approve the resolution as presented. Carried.*

Mr. Mackerer pointed out to the Board that the last page of the benefit analysis contained the breakdown of tax distribution. Mr. Tucker stated the room night projection comparing the similar hotels in the area showed The Wick (41 Cross Street Hospitality, LLC.) paying one and a half times what others would be paying at the end of the PILOT term. He requested that the "Hudson Industrial Development Agency Excerpt of Minutes of Special Meeting Regarding 41 Cross Street (Redburn) Application" be added to the official record (see attached).

Mr. Guterman stated the final resolution for the Board to consider was the Approving Resolution. He stated Exhibit A contained the description of the project evaluation and expected project benefits of the project. Mr. Guterman reviewed the criteria and benefits with the board. *Mr. Keeler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gerlach to approve the approving resolution as presented. Carried.*

Mr. Rossi thanked the IDA Board, stating he anticipated closing in late July or early August.

Mr. Mackerer stated at the public hearing a discussion point was the time the public hearing were held. He stated the hearings were typically held during the day, but a hearing was held during the evening for the Ginsberg's project. He stated Mr. Tucker would investigate and report back to the Board. Mr. Mackerer stated he felt the time would make no difference in attendance for some projects, but would for more controversial projects.

Mr. Tucker stated a change was being made in the way public meeting notices were communicated to the public. He stated the notice would be sent to the CEDC contact list at the same time it was sent to the Register Star for publication. Mr. Tucker stated it was possible for a hearing officer to hold a hearing. He stated he could step up as hearing officer if no IDA member was available, and a second public hearing could be held. Mr. Guterman stated it was important for the Board to appear at the public hearing, especially if it were a controversial project.

With no further business to discuss or public comment, a motion was made by Mr. Galluscio and seconded by Ms. Sterling. Carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:27am

Respectfully submitted by Lisa Draushuk