1	STATE OF NEW YORK
2	BROOME COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
3	
4	In the Matter of an Application
5	of
6	100 SAVEAROUND PARKWAY, LLC
7	for financial assistance
8	
9	A Public Hearing held at 185 Court Street,
10	Binghamton, New York, on the 6th day of November, 2017,
11	commencing at 6:00 PM.
12	
13	BEFORE: JOSEPH B. MEAGHER
14	Counsel for Broome County
15	Industrial Development Agency
16	
17	REPORTED BY: CZERENDA COURT REPORTING, INC.
18	71 State Street
19	Binghamton, New York 13901-3318
20	KEVIN CALLAHAN
21	Shorthand Reporter
22	Notary Public
23	Binghamton - (607) 723-5820
24	(800) 633-9149

HEARING OFFICER: Good evening.

My name is Joseph Meagher, and I am counsel
to the Broome County Industrial Development
Agency.

The agency is conducting a hearing pursuant to General Municipal Law 859A to seek public comment on an application for financial assistance submitted by 100 SaveAround Parkway, LLC, in connection with a proposed corporate office and warehouse center with adjacent parking lots and associated utilities to be located at 100 Emerson Parkway in the City of Binghamton, County of Broome and State of New York.

The acceptance of the filing by the agency does not infer any position on the approval or disapproval of the financial assistance requested. No position will be taken by the agency until the public hearing is concluded.

A copy of the application along

with the cost/benefit analysis prepared by the agency is available for review at the agency's offices.

Notice of this hearing was published in the PRESS & SUN BULLETIN on October 25, 2017.

I request that each person wishing to speak state his or her name, and if you're speaking on behalf of any entity or organization, please, identify that entity or organization. The hearing will remain open until all public comment is concluded.

First I'm going to request that
Tom Gray of the agency explain the
application that has been filed by 100
SaveAround Parkway, LLC.

MR. GRAY: Good evening. My name is Thomas Gray, and I'm the deputy director of operations for the agency Broome County IDA, LDC.

This current project involves

SaveAround Parkway, LLC. The entity is

purchasing the existing 38,000-square-foot

building located at 100 Emerson Parkway,

Binghamton, New York 13905. 1 2 In order to accommodate the 3 existing and future growth of SaveAround, Inc., SaveAround will utilize the facility 5 to combine both their corporate office and 6 warehouse. SaveAround Parkway, LLC, is 7 requesting a 20-year deviated pilot. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Tom. 9 Does anyone wish to speak either 10 for or against the project? 11 I recognize John Solak. 12 Okay. John Solak. MR. SOLAK: Ι 13 live in the City of Binghamton. I'm going to talk about the 14 15 Stantons tonight, but I don't know them. 16 They seem like fine people, but my beef is 17 not with them. My beef is with the agency. So, you may end up, what do they call that, 18 collateral damage. 19 2.0 MR. WHALEN: Cross-fire? 21 MR. SOLAK: Yeah. 22 MR. STANTON: You still get a 23 coupon book, by the way. 24 MR. WHALEN: Not with that group.

MR. SOLAK: I used to be with the Fuller Brush Company. I can do the hard sell. They don't call it the Fuller Brush Company anyway.

So, here we are again, and I think we've got to go into the ugly history of this thing. This, of course, was GAF,
Anitec. In 1995 the City of Binghamton lost Anitec after overcharging it on the assessments for decades. They won a million dollar case and then they shoved off. The City of Binghamton in 1995 lost its biggest payroll, its most employees, biggest customer for water and highest property evaluation all in one swoop.

In 1995 I was expecting the Mayor of Binghamton, he was a young Mayor, to take action to take the city's costs down so that the damage could be mitigated. Instead we went to another plan. A wrecking company was called called Brandenberg International out of Chicago, I believe. It was their job -- they were touted as a developer when they were just a wrecking company and they

held the title of that building for about

10 years until let's see if anybody came out

of the woodwork for any sort of toxic claim

or whatever.

So, then a miracle occurred. A miracle occurred that made me happy.

Emerson came to the site, a Fortune 120 company, and built a brand new building.

Now, the failure was -- is that for some strange reason there was not the effort that I would have undertaken because once you lure the first Fortune 120 company the other ones should be easier.

And I don't know what we were preoccupied with. I know that the state senator had legal problems. I know that the community was obsessed with the student housing downtown, but why that didn't lead to more development is beyond me, and we are here tonight not for success but for failure. Now -- because of failure.

Now, the Stantons are picking up a nice bargain, and they have done that well.

I believe they picked up Metro Center.

They're good buyers, and I don't blame them and I don't have anything against them or their operation, but I don't think, I don't think we can say that this is of the caliber of what was there or what was envisioned.

This is a downshift, nothing -- just like

IBM Glendale when it went from IBM to collection agencies and telemarketing was a downshift. So, that's troubling to me.

2.0

Now, as in the -- if the news releases are correct of what I'm reading, there was going to be somebody else that is going to share that space. Now, maybe that was wrong. I don't know. All I know is what I read in the papers. Now, if that's the case, I think we're entitled to know who it is because right now, for example, in the case of 50 Front Street I found out by talking to Mark Newman on the radio and by reading the Buffalo papers that there's a partner in 50 Front Street that nobody ever discusses, and that partner is under federal investigation in Rochester. So, I think the public if there is going to be a tenant, I

think we should know who it is and I don't think that's asking too much.

Now, tonight the city council is right at this precise time working on the payment in lieu of tax schedule. Now, this is too close for comfort to me because I don't know -- first of all, I can't be in two places at once, but I -- it's amazing that there's this long of a wait with no activity, and the synchronization with these things happened very, very quickly. It's unbelievable. You wait 10 years and then all of a sudden things have got to be done.

What troubles me in looking at the schedule that the city has, it seems to be a -- really a stealth assessment challenge, is what it is, because you're going from, what is it now, is it 2.8, is it 3, is it 4, I don't know, but it's listed there at 1.4 million.

So, I think you've got to be dreaming to think that people are not going to challenge their taxes and cite this as an example. I mean, if I had similar space in

the City of Binghamton, and there is similar space -- and I'm not -- I don't have a payment in lieu of taxes. I'll say, here's the square footage, this is what they're doing, and I'm not going to apply for a payment in lieu of taxes, but I'm going to question the valuation of this property because it's going to take -- you're saying it's going to take 20 years to get to where you are now. So, it's, you know, really very troubling.

So, it's a failure of this agency.

It's a failure of this agency under, I

think, from our turn. So, it's a failure.

It's not a success, and I think explanations

are owed and I think that this is just a

tremendous blow to the City of Binghamton,

and it looks like another crooked he deal.

Now, Bob Nielson made this big thing when he was on here, we've got to have uniform -- uniform pilots. That's where the problem was, and, yeah, rah, rah, rah, uniform pilots. Well, you know, I don't know when there's been a uniform pilot.

They're all deviated pilots now. So, this policy that the IDA has of trying to make things uniform so that things are equalized even among people that come in aren't so.

So, I mean, I wish the Stantons

luck. I think they've got a hell of a

bargain, you know, and I think they'll make

money. I think they'll make money. I think

the losers are the taxpayers, and quite

frankly the IDA has contributed to this

situation by not moving forward with a

better plan.

But I would rather see, as I said in the Babcock matter on the Singer Link building, and you ended up doing exactly what I wanted to do, I am reluctant to go into deals where there is a business entity that comes in and the real estate values don't tend to jive with the business, and that was the case in the Singer Link facility. I said, why don't you just sell it at auction, and that's what I would have preferred. I think if you sold -- even if you put a reserve bid on it, that would be

more palatable to me and look like less than 1 2 a crooked deal than this does. So, I don't 3 understand why you can't do it, why you can't -- and then shut a guy up. 5 after it only brings \$500,000 at absolute auction, maybe I'll have egg on my face for 6 7 once. Thanks. 9 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, John. 10 Does anyone else wish to speak? 11 MR. WHALEN: I do. Do I need to 12 stand up or can I speak from here? 13 HEARING OFFICER: Whatever you're 14 comfortable doing but --15 MR. WHALEN: My name is 16 Brian Whalen, and I'm not representing --17 I'm president of the board of education in 18 the City of Binghamton. I'm not 19 representing them, per se. I'm representing 2.0 myself as a taxpayer and I certainly have no 21 gripes against the Stantons, either. 22 matter of fact, I coached Ray. 23 But once again --24 MR. STANTON: A few years ago.

MR. WHALEN: A few years back.

Once again my issue is also with the agency in the way they go about conducting their business. What we have here is a pay in lieu of tax agreement that represents a 20 percent tax on the 1.45 million assessment of whatever the tax rate would end up, but it generates -- basically, if I read this right, it generates about \$26,000 the first year and it ends up, basically, costing \$16 million over the course of a 20-year pilot to the taxpayers.

My biggest objection is that the school districts, any school districts in this area do not have any say in these pilots and how they're awarded, and as a matter of fact they're generally the largest taxing entity when it comes to pilots. So, they're the ones that lose out the most.

Now, there's a lot of -- in general pilots there's a lot of things that are built into pilots. Like the county made sure they got their sales tax written into

the agreement when the legislature failed to own up to their responsibility and turn the agency over to a board, which, basically, reports to nobody and has -- and all I can say is that the -- there's -- this is no more than -- there are no construction jobs being generated, according to the application, and according to the application it doesn't appear that there's a partner in here, and I could be wrong, but according to the application I don't see there's a partner in here.

So, this is alight to, basically, me going out and getting a mortgage on my house and then asking somebody else to pay the taxes for me, okay.

The number of jobs that's projected to be added is 10 over three years.

Certainly that's not a significant number and certainly not one that, in my mind, would justify giving a pilot of this nature, especially a deviated pilot for 20 years.

And what it really does is it shifts the tax -- the school district along with the

other taxing entities who sign the tax liens or the tax warrants every year, they're not getting -- they're, basically, going to collect the same amount of money, okay, from the taxpayers. Unfortunately, they're going to be -- they're going to be collecting it from those who are less able to pay than the ones that are actually getting the pay in lieu of tax agreement.

So, I've heard so many comments about how high our taxes are in this city, both school taxes and property taxes, and one of the reasons is that we continue to give pilots when they're not really necessary to justify the business growth that's being projected.

The other thing that I see here is it looks to me like there's two other properties that will either be sold or abandoned, which will mean they'll come off, if they're abandoned, they'll come off the tax rolls because who would want to pay taxes on them, and that's generally what's happened with pilots all along. It's a

2.0

21

22

23

24

failed process. It's ended up costing taxpayers in this community millions of dollars with actually no gain to the employment and the betterment of life in this community.

So, I'm speaking out against this pilot and I'd like at a minimum for the agency to consider a lesser term of the pilot. Twenty years is just not -- it's just not -- it doesn't fit the needs. not Dick's Sporting Goods that's creating 400 jobs and putting a new building up and generating all kinds of construction employment in the area. This is an existing building, which, I agree with John, will probably draw -- it has a better use, and that's what the agency ought to be looking for. If you locate businesses to their highest use, that's when you're going to get your biggest bang for the buck as a taxpayer and as a resident.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
Mr. Whalen.

Does anyone else wish to be heard? 1 2 Do you want me to MR. STANTON: 3 answer some of the questions that --HEARING OFFICER: It's up to you. 5 MR. STANTON: Sure. So, 6 Ray Stanton, partner in SaveAround. 7 So, just for clarification I think it's important a couple things. As it 9 pertains to another tenant or partner on the 10 project, I think what's in the application 11 is factual. We don't have a partner. 12 There's no third party. My brother and I, 13 essentially, own the company that is leasing 14 to SaveAround. So, it's a family-owned 15 business and it's exactly as the application 16 has. 17 The buildings that we currently 18 maintain we have continued to juggle efforts 19 in parking and space. We currently are on 2.0 three levels with our operations. The new 21 facility and, you know, working with the 22 agency and looking at a number of different 23 options, frankly, both in New York State and

out of state, we had a choice to make, and

that building and that location happens to be a location that fits well.

The operation is going to be on one level versus the three levels. The parking is going to be ample, and our goal is to have a multiple of what we've committed to as it pertains to hiring and continuing our growth and our expansion across the country.

The existing buildings, you know, I get asked and I've been asked a few times in the past couple days, are you guys staying or are you moving? The building is being remodeled over on Front Street and we're doing some painting and doing some renovations. We just put new pavement in the parking lot.

We're from Binghamton. We're from the east side. We're from where Dick's Sporting Goods was founded and lived and grew up on Fairview Avenue, our family did, and have built what we're awful proud and what we think is a great, reputable national company headquartered here in Binghamton, New York. And we're honored to be able to

2.0

work with the different parties involved to figure out a way to continue to do business in, frankly, what is a tough state to do business in in New York State.

Our families are planted here.

We're committed to this area. We're

committed to the location that we're

purchasing and we're committed to, you know,

our continued growth and going to do

everything we can to not only make the

community proud but to make the country

proud in looking at what we do as an

organization.

So, we are, and just finishing up on the two buildings, we are consolidating. Our goal is to put both buildings, the warehouse over on Chenango Street, as well as the offices that we currently operate in on Front Street, into one facility. Those two additional facilities we own and will continue to review our options on and what's the best use and best opportunities to continue to hopefully keep them occupied and continue to invest in those properties, as

well. 1 2 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. 3 Does anyone else wish to be heard? 5 (Whereupon there was no response) 6 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. At this time I'm going to ask that the notice of 7 publication, the affidavit of publication, my letter to the taxing authorities, the 9 10 affidavit of mailing and the affidavit of 11 posting be spread upon the record of these 12 proceedings. 13 The stenographer will prepare a 14 transcript, which will be presented to the 15 members of the agency for their review 16 incorporating all the comments that have 17 been made tonight. Thank you all very much. 18 We appreciate your participation. 19 (Whereupon Exhibit 6 was marked for 2.0 identification) 21 (Whereupon the hearing was 22 concluded) 23

1		I N D E X	
2			
3	EXHIB	BIT:	PAGE:
4	1	Notice of public hearing	19
5	2	Affidavit of publication	19
6	3	Letter of J. Meagher to taxing authority	19
7	4	Affidavit of mailing	19
8	5	Affidavit of posting	19
9	6	Hearing sign-in sheet	19
LO			
11			
L2			
L3			
L4			
L5			
L6			
L7			
L8			
L9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
	i e		

1	STATE OF NEW YORK :
2	COUNTY OF BROOME :
3	
4	I, KEVIN CALLAHAN, Shorthand Reporter, do
5	certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
6	transcript of the proceedings in the matter of an
7	application of 100 SaveAround Parkway, LLC, for
8	financial assistance, held in Binghamton, New York, on
9	November 6, 2017.
10	
11	
12	Ken Culh
13	KEVIN CALLAHAN
14	Shorthand Reporter
15	Notary Public
16	CZERENDA COURT REPORTING, INC
17	71 State Street
18	Binghamton, New York 13901-3318
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	