

BROOME COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

IDA Special Meeting Transcript

Held telephonically, November 6, 2020, commencing at
12:02 p.m. Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

[See attendees at end of Transcript.]

REPORTED BY:

Carrie Hornbeck, Executive Assistant

Broome County Industrial Development Agency

Chairman Bernardo: I would like to call to order this Special Meeting of the Broome County Industrial Development Agency of November 6th, 2020.

For housekeeping purposes, I'm going to have Stacey run through the methodology of this meeting, and then from there, she'll throw it back to me, and we'll begin to hear from the public officials first, and then from the general public, thereafter. Go ahead, Stace.

Ms. Duncan: Sure. Thank you, John. Good afternoon, everyone. The purpose of today's meeting is to host a dialogue between the IDA Board of Directors, the Supervisors of the Towns of Sanford and Windsor, and any other taxing jurisdiction related to the Board's action on October 21st, related to the Bluestone Wind Project. All other attendees wishing to speak will be provided time during a Public Comment period. If you do wish to speak, please add your name to the chat, beginning now, as I see several are doing that already. You will need to provide, on the record, your name and address, and if you are speaking on behalf of an organization or business, please also provide that information when you speak to the Board. You will be provided up to five minutes. In addition,

due to the availability and time constraints of some of our Board members, we have revised our agenda and will begin our discussion with the taxing jurisdictions. The meet -- this meeting was properly noticed for the requirements of Public Authorities' Laws -- a Special Meeting, and attendance information has been posted to our website. In addition, the meeting is being recorded and will be posted to our website within a few hours after the meeting ends. All correspondence that myself or staff have received since our October 21 meeting via email or regular mail, has been provided to the Board of Directors prior to today's discussion. The purpose of today's meeting is not to take any actions regarding the PILOT benefit that was previously requested. The purpose of today's meeting is to provide, at the request of the Towns of Sanford and Windsor, an opportunity for dialogue and communication and understanding on the impact of the Board's decision. Any subsequent actions will be a decision of the Board.

At this time, I'm going to turn the meeting back over to our Chairman, John Bernardo.

Chairman Bernardo: Stacey, thank you. I guess first order of business is to allow Carolyn

Price, the Supervisor of the Town of Windsor, to speak with us. Carolyn.

Ms. Price: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for giving this opportunity to speak. Because of rural eastern topography, and the lack of infrastructure, economic development for us focuses on natural resources: stone, lumber, natural gas, oil, wind and sun. New York City -- New York State has banned hydraulic fracturing for natural gas and oil. The rest of the natural resources can be developed in Eastern Broome. And New York State has approved the Bluestone Wind Project. The Agency helped with economic development in the Towns of Windsor and Sanford through the Millennium Natural Gas Pipeline, and that was a PILOT. Now you have before you, another PILOT, Bluestone Wind. We appreciate The Agency allowing the Town of Windsor and the Town of Sanford to help negotiate the Host Community Agreement, known as the HCA, and the PILOT for this project. We learned from working with the Millennium Natural Gas Pipeline PILOT, what to avoid and what we should have in a PILOT agreement. I'm going to give you a couple examples. In the Millennium Pipeline PILOT, there was no payments [sic]

made in the first year. So, when we worked on the PILOT for Bluestone, those payments will start with tree clearing. Another example, there was a formula developed for paying, and in that formula, they added the equalization rate, which can cause a decrease in payment from one year to the next and can cause errors in calculations. So, the Town of Windsor has experienced a decrease in payment four times year-to-year because of this formula. And one year, we had payments miscalculated because of it. So, as we worked in the Bluestone PILOT, we said we need to do better than this. So, we developed charts that clearly show annual payments and a 2% increase each year. The Town of Windsor compared the Millennium payments and the Bluestone payments over the same number of years, and the payments through Bluestone will be over double what they have been with Millennium. We heard The Agency Board members express concern over a 30-year PILOT and the Town of Windsor is open to a 20-year PILOT. What are the economic benefits from the Bluestone Wind Project for the Town of Windsor? Our HCA and PILOT payments will be \$1,298,179.00, and you might ask, what are we going to do with that money? Our tentative plans are to use it

for capital improvements, and vehicles, and other purchases in our Highway Department, and these are all things -- if we didn't have this money, we would have to go to the taxpayers for that money. So, that's a huge help. The Windsor Fire Department will receive \$350,995.00. The road-use escrow accounts will be started at \$125,000.00, and will be replenished should we need more money. There is \$48,000.00 for a skid-steer to be purchased for the Highway Department. There is \$14,500.00 for our Cultural Mitigation, which will be used in our history program, and legal costs that were not covered by the State Intervener Funds paid at \$13,505.00. The total of that economic benefit to the Town of Windsor is \$1,850,179.00. Significant.

The company has already made charitable contributions to community groups and we expect that to continue. The Village of Windsor for Cultural Mitigation, will receive \$32,500.00, and the Windsor Central School District will receive \$3,905,691.00. There are also payments to landowners -- Good Neighbor Agreements -- and we have the landowner of Sky Lake, where there will be four wind turbines. Sky Lake is a tax-exempt property. Now, we will have revenue

because of those four turbines there. And again, as I said, it's about 1.8 million dollars. You have a Letter of Support from Sky Lake, and I'd like to quote Matthew Williams, who is the Director of Sky Lake, "It is a way for the natural resources of Sky Lake to contribute to the financial well-being of the Town of Windsor." So well-stated.

I know that jobs have been brought up in these discussions. We know we have residents of the Town of Windsor, who belong to unions who are going to do this work, and they will have temporary jobs during construction. The permanent job number of two, is in-line with what we've seen in other PILOTs. The Millennium Pipeline listed six permanent jobs and the Leatherstocking PILOT, which is still an open PILOT with you, lists two jobs -- the same as Bluestone. Remember, my opening comments -- our opportunities for economic development in Eastern Broome are with natural resources, which do not have the number of jobs manufacturing would have. We do not have the topography or infrastructure for manufacturing. We have to capitalize on what we have. After over two years of challenging negotiations, the Host Community Agreement was approved by the Town of Windsor, the

Town of Sanford, Broome County, the Windsor Central School District and the Deposit Central School District. Now you, The Agency Board, have the opportunity to approve the PILOT to further much needed economic development in Eastern Broome County. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Carolyn, thank you very much. We're gonna [sic] ask Dewey Decker, the Supervisor of the Town of Sanford, if he'd like to offer additional comments. Are you there, Dewey?

Ms. Abbadessa: He is here, John. Let me just make sure he's unmuted.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you.

Attorney Begeal: Okay, are we unmuted Natalie?

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you. Yes.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes, you're good to go. Yep.

Mr. Decker: Thank you, Carolyn for explaining things very good in reference to both towns. I would like to thank the IDA for allowing the municipalities to participate in a PILOT -- a program

I have never seen this approach, in this manner. It has been both challenging and educational. I also would like to thank the IDA and Board members to allow the town to present the positive side, as to the effects it will have on the Town of Sanford.

I would like to show the financial effect it will have on the Town of Sanford the first year. The first-year PILOT would be \$108,000.00. The first-year HCA would be 432,000. Special district tax would be approximately \$25,819.20. A new grader would be 250,000, for a total of \$815,819.20. The town has just passed our budget for 2021 of 2.4 million. You can see the tremendous effect it would have on our town. I would like to explain some of the immediate needs of our town. The town is in need of a new town garage. The present garage is located in the middle of the Village of Deposit, which creates a huge problem to move our equipment in and out of the village. We would be able to update equipment, such as a 1997 Heavy Duty 10-Wheel truck, which has just been taken off the road due to cracked frames, and other wear on this vehicle. We also have a 2000 truck with similar problems, which we will soon be losing. The Road Use Agreement would help purchase a new

grader. We have one that is old and another one that is a back up -- we purchased from the army surplus. The PILOT and HCA would make this possible.

I'd like to continue with saying that I really appreciate the opportunity to present -- the good part of this is in representing the Town of Stanford. Just moving a highway garage, which is desperately needed, out of the village, which is a real problem moving this equipment -- that it's getting bigger and bigger. I was behind a truck the other day that -- they have to go forward and back up in order to get around these turns, and it is very unsafe. Just building a new town garage out of the village, would be a big plus. Thank you.

Attorney Begeal: Do you want me to comment on this?

Mr. Decker: Yes, I would.

Attorney Begeal: Dewey also asked me -- I'm the attorney for the Town of Sanford. Our office also represents the Town of Windsor -- asked me just to comment just for a moment on what . . .

Ms. Duncan: Brady, could you just state your name, so we have it on the record?

Attorney Begeal: Yeah, sure. Brady Begeal. I just wanted to comment for a moment on -- from the town's perspective, as to what the outcome of a no vote on the PILOT might be if they submit a modified application for reconsideration. So, if there's a no vote, I think there's some perception that it's -- that would automatically result in basically the end of the project, as we know it. And while that is a possibility, there's also other possibilities, here. The other possibility is that they -- after investing many millions of dollars to get to this point, and having the project approved by the state -- that they decide that they're going to take their chances with having this fully assessed at the town's level -- so, that's a potential outcome here, and you can see right from their application -- Exhibit C in their application -- exactly how they would interpret the assessment of this project. So, I know there's been a lot of public comment and a lot of statements saying, well, this should be fully assessed, and they should pay the same tax as everybody else, and the towns would agree with that 100 percent. And so, from a

negotiating standpoint, we looked at their arguments as to what they would believe that this is fully taxable at, and what we believe it would be fully taxable at, and it's, hard to understate the gap between those. I mean, right in their application, they say, estimated approximately, like 38,000, versus what the town would say, it's --maybe should be assessed at something over 200 million dollars -- because they view a lot of the components as personal property. They also have an argument to be made about economic obsolescence and physical depreciation. These are not just blowing smoke on these things, there's legitimate arguments here to be made. So, the reality is, if they choose to go back and ask us to assess this, there's nowhere else to go other than full-blown litigation over this assessment. And this was fully vetted by both towns, before we got into this negotiation -- it was determined that really, this outcome, ultimately looks a whole lot like what we would probably end up in a settlement, if we had to settle a lawsuit over what this would be assessed that. So really, what you can consider this -- this Host Community Agreement/PILOT combo as, is a preemptive, pre-settlement agreement. That's really

what this is. It's more -- we'd be getting far more than what they would argue we would get if it was fully assessed, and we're getting less than what we would get if we fully assessed it, and got what we thought we would get. And there's [sic] cases out there right now -- there's no direct case that I'm aware of right, on wind turbines, but there's a case out of Cornell, about solar panels where they ruled that basically solar panels are personal property. And there's other guidance out there that suggests that could be the case here, too. So, there's legitimate arguments on both sides here, and that risk was factored in, as part of this. So that's a potential outcome here. Another potential outcome is that they come back to the towns and say, well, let's try to negotiate a 15-year PILOT under Real Property Tax Law 487, which isn't good for either side, because then they don't get the sales tax exemptions, or the mortgage tax exemptions, and then what's going to result is they're going to say that, well, they can't pay as much to us. And then, it also adds uncertainty because it's only 15 years. So, that's a -- that would be a terrible outcome for the towns -- neither one of them would like that option, because it would

just kick it right back to us, in the town's lap to have to renegotiate again after they've already done the work. So, I just wanted to merely comment on potential outcomes here of no vote -- it certainly could possibly kill the project. It also could result in us having to have a battle over assessment and also possibly kick it back to us for a less desirable type of PILOT. Thank you.

Mr. Decker: I would like to make a comment too, there, that it seems like there's a problem with the 30-year. The Town of Sanford would also be open to a 20-year PILOT, the way that Carolyn mentioned.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciate your comments. I'm going to ask if our County Executive, Jason Garner, would like to weigh in, because I know he's on and I believe he requested an opportunity. Hi, Jason.

Mr. Garner: Hi, John. John, thank you and Stacy for putting together this meeting. The way that the county sees this, is this is a project that has been approved, and it's all ready to go. And what we're looking at here is whether or not we should give a payment in lieu of taxes -- a PILOT -- to put on

this project. And, from the county point of view, the county has worked with the school districts and with the towns to come up with a very equitable and fair PILOT and HCA payment program. I mean, the total payments for PILOTs in the HCA are 46 million dollars. I mean, just a shade under 47 million dollars. Broome County would net 9 million dollars. And to be clear, without this -- I think this has been pitched in certain areas as, well, you're gonna [sic] get this big PILOT for, like, two permanent jobs. And, that's not what we're looking at, here. This is a project that's going to bring in tens and millions of dollars of revenue to communities that absolutely need it -- whether it's the county, whether it's the towns, whether it's the school districts. I can tell you that the county -- because of COVID -- in our revenues being hit, is down right now about 30 million dollars in revenue, just this year, alone. And, I'm sure the towns in -- are suffering revenue issues, as well, with a decline in sales tax revenue. And, I know that because of COVID, school districts have had to do many new things, and they've never had to do before. And, I'm sure one of the things that school districts are looking at is -- there's broadband issues, right?

There's [sic] issues with remote learning and having the access for students to be able to do that. COVID is not going away anytime soon. So, whether it's the revenue issue, or some of the things that school districts -- especially the school districts, like Windsor and Deposit -- are going to have to take a look at is, getting extra revenue to be able to accommodate students that are in a virtual or hybrid learning environment. So, I -- my hope would be that, if there's a compromise that can be reached on this specific PILOT program -- I know that the Supervisor Decker and Price talked about going to a 20-year agreement -- the county would certainly be amenable to doing something like that. But I guess the broad picture that we're looking at is, this is money -- 46 million dollars -- 40, almost 47 million dollars, that would not be coming -- won't be coming to any of these communities, if this doesn't happen. So, a PILOT gets approved, this project moves forward -- and that's 47 million dollars into these communities. And I hope that it would not be looked at as well, we're giving a PILOT to create two jobs. You're giving a PILOT to create a revenue stream that's sorely needed of almost 47 million dollars. And I think it's also important

to mention a couple other things, as well. Lease payments to landowners over 30 years -- 52 million dollars' worth of lease payments -- that money typically goes right back into the economy, and that's helpful for the overall Broome economy. And, also for the sales tax that we expect -- people will be doing things like making home improvements and things like that and purchasing goods -- and, those all go to all of our sales tax numbers, as well. That's a good thing. And, while this is only going to create a small amount of full-time jobs, we're in a period of high unemployment here, because of COVID, and there are a lot of temporary jobs that would be created with us, at a time that we sorely, sorely need jobs. And, my understanding is, that the company has Local Labor Agreements to hire people locally, and I don't care if they're only hiring them for six months or whatever, we need to get people employed -- like, today. And so, for all those reasons -- for the local jobs, for the payments, the landowners -- but in my view, especially the revenue that would be gained by -- from the municipalities in the school districts by approving this PILOT, we really hope that some type of compromise, some type of understanding could be

reached. And, we'd be amenable to -- if it means going from a 30-year PILOT to a 20-year PILOT, we would we would be amenable to doing that. So, I just -- I do want to respectfully thank the Board members for their time and, and us being able to talk about the project, and in particular, John and Stacy for holding this meeting. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Jason, thank you. I'd like to offer an opportunity to the school districts. I see Jason is on with us, from Windsor. Jason, would you like to offer any comments?

Mr. Andrews: Sure. I'll be very brief. So, school districts are not typically part of any PILOT negotiations -- don't take positions in PILOT agreements. So, pretty long-standing history of that -- and I would continue with that. PILOT payments are really revenue-neutral to school districts from the standpoint that an additional PILOT payment is then subtracted from the tax levy that we collect. So, although good for residents to pay less in taxes, they do not result in a boon for school districts. For us, we were involved this -- in the negotiation of the Host Community Agreement, which of course, we did in

good faith for the Windsor district. That is resulting -- the first-year payment would be about \$77,000.00. Of course, we are in a time of potential large cuts in state aid. For us, if a 20 percent cut in state aid were to come through, that would represent about 4.9 million dollars. So, \$77,000.00 would help, for sure. Having said that, this is not something the Host Community Agreement, or the payment in lieu of taxes -- that is going to have a significant impact on the Windsor Central School District one way or the other. So, unlike the towns and county, where the chief elected official is part of the PILOT process and giving their support, we -- the Windsor district has not taken a position one way or another on the PILOT -- do see benefit, of course -- that \$77,000.00 in the Host Community Agreement, which represents for us a little less than half a percent on our tax levy. So, that's all I would have to offer. Thank you for the opportunity.

Chairman Bernardo: Jason, Thank you. Appreciate your participation. Denise Cook is with us from Deposit, I believe. Denise, would you like to offer any comments?

Ms. Cook: Sure. Thank you for the opportunity. I think my colleague, Jason, did a great job explaining some of the issues related to the PILOTs. Like he said, it is neutral for the school district, but it is beneficial to the taxpayer, for sure. It would be helping people in an uncertain time -- it would be offsetting the tax levy that is spread out amongst our residents for schools. Having said that, it's a little bit more significant impact, so I'm sticking to the financial pieces, because as Jason explained, we've been -- we were part of the HCA process, so that we could represent our districts. It is a little bit more significant in Deposit, and are -- out of the HCA payments alone, it looks like Deposit would -- Central Schools, would be the beneficiary of about \$231,000.00 for the first year and over the lifetime of the HCA, over 9 million dollars. So, for us, just to give you an idea of what that means -- as County Executive Garner stated, this is significant in a couple of ways; specifically, in a school district. The years -- it really doesn't matter to the district about the years -- but 30 years specifically, is significant to the lifecycle, usually, of a teacher. And, at \$231,000.00 a year, we're looking also -- with

the possibility of a 1.2 million dollar hole in state aid -- and, as Executive Garner mentioned, the COVID crisis hitting and spending a lot of money on technology, infrastructure, and things for students that we never had to provide before -- it does fill a bit of a hole in Deposit Central School District, including potentially not cutting two full-time teaching jobs, and their benefits, which may seem small, but actually those two jobs in Deposit, trickle out into Broome County. As you know, it affects many other things -- has a big ripple effect. So, I would just state that -- that's what that money looks like for the district. I would just echo how significant it is to Mr. Decker and the rest of the town and village, in Deposit.

Chairman Bernardo: Denise, thank you.

Thank you, very much. Appreciate your comments.

Okay, I believe we've heard from each of the elected officials that wanted to participate. Stacey, is that correct?

Ms. Duncan: I believe so. I think, yep.

That's -- at this stage, if there's no other comments or questions from the Board, directly, to any of our

elected officials or school representatives, you can go to Public Comment.

Chairman Bernardo: Wait a minute. I'm led to believe maybe Dan Reynolds would like to speak. I see he's on. Dan, would you care to join us, please?

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah, I would. I mean, we've -- I don't know if my camera's working there. So, if it's not . . .

Chairman Bernardo: You're very dark right now. There you are.

Mr. Reynolds: There we go.

Chairman Bernardo: There you go.

Mr. Reynolds: Sorry about that.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Dan.

Mr. Reynolds: Yep. I understand the municipalities' positions, and I think the concern here that we have to keep in mind is that we don't necessarily commingle or relitigate what's happened in the past. And I think that sometimes those issues wind up getting commingled about whether or not the project itself should move forward; that decision was

made by the state. And, I don't want that -- the thought process behind that to detract or weigh into what the discussion should be right now. I think 30 years, to me, when you hear it from a project standpoint, and just the longevity of the equipment, and some of the other stuff -- it seems - it seemed long -- and, I tend to agree with what the current position of the of the Board was, on that agreement. But there's always openings for compromise and discussions on things. And I mean, I think that's what -- at least, in part, this discussion is supposed to help facilitate on. On some level, I do think that there's probably common ground to move forward on it. I'm not a fan of the way that the state jammed this process through. And, in the first place, I don't think that's how government should work. And -- but I, again -- I don't want to relitigate that aspect, as well. This is really more about the financial component of this contract, and whether or not the financial support the municipalities are giving, is warranted. And, I think the easiest thing to focus on right now is the terms [sic] of that contract. The jobs are important. I think the longevity of the equipment is something that you have to factor in,

too. The only other thing, I guess that I would say, is that I'd hate to make the decision or the financial decision based solely on where we are today, versus a year from now or two years from now. And, I do think you have to factor that in. Right now, we're definitely feeling it because of the pandemic -- we're certainly feeling desperate in some ways, because of the financial influx -- that we need to. But that doesn't relieve our obligation to make sure that we look at the long-term on these projects, because so many years down the road, we come back and we look at these projects, and we start to wonder whether or not they were good deals or whether they made sense. And, in hindsight, it's real easy to go back and say they were, or they weren't, but that's what I would caution the Board -- and anybody else that's involved in it -- is to make sure that you just wade through all the factors that are there, and whether the terms are fair for everybody that's involved, and that the deal looks good. Not only just today, because we're desperate for jobs -- we're desperate for the influx of finances for each of the municipalities. But does it make sense, assuming we had a more robust economy, assuming that we had a better financial picture -- which I do

think we're eventually going to get back to. So, that's the only other thing that I would add, John. Thanks.

Chairman Bernardo: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your comments, we appreciate them. With that said, I am going to turn it to, I believe Natalie, probably, because she has the screen in front of her, and she's going to begin to go down the list of names and permit each [person] -- we're going to allow for a five-minute or less comment period for each person. We are going to stay on that five minutes. So, you'll probably be warned, if you have a lot more to say, that your time is running short. But I think I'm going to let Natalie or Stacey run with that part. We're all going to stay on as long as we can. I know we have a Board member, or two, that have conflicts, once we hit the one o'clock mark. Okay?

Ms. Abbadessa: Alrighty. Scott Kurkowski.

Attorney Kurkowski: Okay, good afternoon, everyone. How are you?

Chairman Bernardo: Hello.

Mr. Kurkowski: I'm Scott Kurkowski, and thanks for letting me speak today. I did want to give you the perspective of the clients that I've been representing, and many of the landowners and community leaders that I've been interacting with over the past few years on this project. I've represented over 40 landowners in the project, and we've entered into agreements of all kinds, including wind turbines, roads, Collection Line Agreements, Good Neighbor Substation Agreements. I also represent numerous businesses that just can't wait for the construction of this project to begin. They're out there now; the promise has been to provide local jobs. That promise is being followed through with bidding processes that are going on right now, with local businesses that hope to participate in this project. So, it really is going to be a huge boost to our local businesses, and to the landowners in the community. I provided a number of letters of support to the Board, from both participating people -- and, by that I mean people who are signed up with agreements on the project, and also non-participating members of the communities. What I wanted to highlight was Dr. Lawrence Snyder -- he's a Professor Emeritus of Chemistry from Albany University

-- and I thought his letter really summed up a lot of the issues, well. He said, I took the time to make sure that the infrastructure would be located in a manner compatible with existing land use in the area, most of which is dedicated towards agricultural and recreational use. Ultimately, I decided that this project is a win for our family and for the community. I work [sic] closely with the Bluestone team over several years to locate the project infrastructure on my property, in places that would minimize impact to our family farm and to our neighbors, as well as to the local ecosystem. I feel confident that this wind energy project is compatible with the landscape of our family farm. I believe that largely speaking, we're in the midst of an energy transition, and that renewable energy plays a key part in this transition today, and will be even more important in the future. This project will have a meaningful impact on our regional emissions, and the income from this project will allow our family farm to remain an agricultural lot, through the next generation. We don't get the opportunities like this every day in the Southern Tier; I think it's important to benefit from this opportunity, while also be being on the right side of

change in progress. So, I just thought, from someone -- from Dr. Snyder, that was just a great way to put it, and working with other farmers who find that this is a way for them to be able to maintain their family farms into the next generations. I have one group that did works with youth. I've heard from someone that, perhaps -- that this is going to hurt their camp business. I will tell you that the views that I've heard are that this project demonstrates to our children, our commitment to creating a sustainable world.

I think, as you know, this is -- the Sanford area -- was targeted as one of the first areas for oil and gas development. Many of the people that I hear speaking out against the project are people that also spoke out about oil and gas development. So, they didn't like that -- they didn't like pipelines here. I understand, and I believe, it's the policies of the state to be moving forward with more renewable energy. Well, this is it, right? We have exactly what it is that we're looking for. We can't reject every single opportunity that comes along the way. Now, others I've heard say -- prior public meetings -- I'm in support of renewable energy. I'm just not in support

of it here. So where should it go, right? If that's a view, as the Board you've looked at, ask yourself that -- if it's not here in Sanford and Windsor, where should it go? Look around the state at where some of these other projects have been developed, like Wolf Island, on the St. Lawrence River, the shores of Lake Erie or Lake Ontario, the Town of Howard, the Town of Lowville at the foothills of the Adirondacks. These are all beautiful areas, just like Deposit, and Sanford and Windsor. But these are the types of areas that you have to have in order to have this kind of development, right? You have to have large areas where there are hills, and where you're ready to go and produce this sort of wind. And we know for sure that Windsor, Deposit, Sanford -- they desperately need this economic development. So, during all of the public comments, I was a little bit amazed to not hear more about climate change, right? It is the policy of this day to achieve a carbon-free electricity system by 2040. The state's Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act codifies New York's goal to achieve 70 percent renewable energy by 2030, while cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 85 percent by 2050. These are the projects we need in order to satisfy these

state goals. I've heard some people say that the process lacks transparency. I hope that you've looked at the Article 10 process and everything that has happened in that in that proceeding. There are over 964 documents -- members of the State Health Department, ESC, Environmental Conservation and others, and community leaders, have all participated in that process -- and it's been going on since 2016. It is a comprehensive top-to-bottom review of this project to determine whether it was appropriate for our community, and the end, the process established by our state resulted in a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need. So, to the extent that there are those arguing that this hasn't been reviewed extensively, and there's no transparency -- maybe there's a question or two that haven't been answered - - there always will be. But the review on this was really incredible by the state at all levels and now, further being reviewed by our courts.

Ms. Abbadessa: I'm sorry, that's five minutes.

Attorney Kurkowski: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Scott, thank you.

Ms. Abbadessa: Next to speak would be Michael Dundon.

Mr. Dundon: Hello, good afternoon, everybody. So, I'd like to begin this by introducing myself. My name is Michael Dundon and I am a lifelong resident of Broome County, New York, and President and Field Representative and Apprentice Coordinator of Labor's Local 785. I'm speaking today in support of the Bluestone Wind Farm. This project will consist of building 27 wind turbines in the Towns of Windsor [and] Sanford, which will be 124-megawatt wind and energy. And this wind farm -- it'll require close to 100 construction jobs, which will include surveying, site grading, drilling foundations, pouring concrete, building temporary access roads to the collection system, and structure erection, to name a few. Now, speaking on the construction jobs, as Apprentice President and Apprentice Coordinator of Laborer's Local 785, we have approximately 175 members that currently reside in Broome County. Projects like the Bluestone Wind Farm enable the members of Laborer's Local 785 to provide for their families, not only in the form of a paycheck, but also in the form of health, dental, vision and retirement benefits. Local

people spend their money locally -- whether it's on big ticket items, like a house or a vehicle or something as small as eating in local restaurants and shopping in local stores. The Laborer's Local 785 JATC Apprenticeship Program has young members that are also Broome County residents. These apprentices are part of an Earn-While-You-Learn Program -- where on top of classroom instruction -- these young members receive on-the-job training as part of becoming Journey Worker Construction Craft Laborers. The Local 785 Apprentices are learning a trade and hoping -- in hopes of having a career, building a family in the county that they grew up in. It's projects like the Bluestone Wind Farm that will help retain young people to Broome County, while offering them good paying middle-class jobs. This project will boost jobs in the overall economy of the Southern Tier. The approval of the Bluestone Wind Farm project in the end, will not only be good for mobile construction workers, but it is the only construction project of this size, where developers come into the area wanting to build with local labor. The only other projects, comparable in size the last few years in Broome County, were the Binghamton, Johnson City Sewage

Treatment Plant and Prospect Mountain. Neither of those developers or general contractors were willing to make the commitment that first Calpine, and now, Northland has made to the local trade's workers. And something else I wanted to touch on is -- you always hear temporary construction workers. Well, yes, construction is temporary. But I've been a member of my local for 13 years, and I had temporary jobs at SUNY Binghamton, and temporary jobs at Binghamton City Schools, and I've had temporary jobs all across Broome County and the Southern Tier. But in those temporary jobs, I've built a pension, I've built retirement, I've had medical, I've had dental, and I have had vision provided for my family. So, if construction is such temporary jobs [sic], why are there so many construction workers that use that as a career? So, when I hear temporary jobs, that really bothers me, when this is my field and my profession. And I just think that this project is a huge win for the Southern Tier all the way around -- and let us -- and we would like to have the rare opportunity to be able to build a large-scale renewable project in our backyard and be able to benefit -- let Broome County benefit from

having workers be able to stay and work locally.
Thank you for your time.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Michael.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you. All right, next to speak, Adam Flint.

Mr. Flint: Good afternoon, everybody. And thanks very much to the IDA and the Board for the opportunity to speak. I'm going to add some things to this discussion. I don't think I have anything to add to what's already been said about the immediate benefit to taxing authorities, local businesses and labor. I think those are extremely strong agreements -- or arguments -- and I'm hoping that the Board will find them persuasive. The first thing I want to mention is that all of us who pay utility bills to NYSEG, pay into the system benefit charge. As somebody who spent the last decade providing education information and support to people in the Eastern Southern Tier that want to take advantage of state and federal energy incentives and programs, we're not really taking advantage of those programs to the degree that we should. We're paying into that fund, but we're not getting our fair share and it's not

because the state and federal governments don't want to give us that money -- it's, we just haven't been taking advantage of it. My organization, The Network for Sustainable Tomorrow -- realize I didn't provide that information the beginning -- I'm a resident in Vestal. We aren't as busy as we ought to be. We have programs every week that have now moved online, we have unfilled seats, and we really look to community leaders, such as the ones that are present today, to use your bully pulpit to get the word out that this is a very important and growing area, and one in which virtually everyone can benefit in one form or another, certainly building owners. My second point is with workforce development. I'm really happy to hear of the Local 785 Apprentice Program. I think we can go beyond that. I haven't obviously spoken with Jason about this, but I know by reputation that the district in Windsor and Jason, himself, are very forward-thinking. I also know that the wind, construction and maintenance profession is one of the fastest growing in the United States. And I wouldn't be surprised if the Bluestone folks would be amenable to some sort of program that would allow children at Regional High Schools is to learn about wind as the means of

generating clean electricity, but also as a profession. Third point, I just want to dispel any lingering thought that oil and gas development is going to happen in New York. It's not. The state and utilities are preparing -- over the next three to four decades -- to draw down the existing gas system, and you can see that in the NYSEG Rate Case Proposal, where all of the significant projects for gas, infrastructure development were withdrawn, as well as the Public Service Commission's Gas Matters Proceeding. A part of this very complex situation is to make sure that we have other forms of energy that are going to work for the people who need them before this happens, and also to make sure that ratepayers are not soaked with rates going out the next eight decades through accelerated depreciation, when we're talking about a system that really won't exist in seven or eight decades. The final thing which I want to stress even more, is how important a project like this is for regional branding and economic development. If we have a reputation for being friendly to clean energy development, we're going to get more of it. In addition, we have many businesses located within the region that can expand and we need

more. In the HVAC field alone, we're going to need to make it possible for our existing HVAC businesses to move from conventional to heat-pump installations. That's what we're going to be heating and cooling our spaces with now, and in the future. It's already been said -- I think, more eloquently than I can -- by the person whose letter Scott Kurkowski read, what this means to young people. In terms of branding, a place that is friendly to clean energy is creating an image that attracts and retains young talent, in terms of its orientation towards the future, as opposed to the past. And I think also, doing our fair share as a community that really hasn't experienced much of the downside of traditional energy development, to really hosting some of energy production that is necessary for our lives to continue. I want to again, thank everyone concerned with this effort for all their hard work, and we stand ready to support in any way we can. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Adam.

Appreciate your comments.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you, Adam. Next, we're going to have Rob Aikens, and then we'll have Anne Lawrence.

Chairman Bernardo: Rob?

Ms. Abbadessa: I believe Rob's on the phone.

Chairman Bernardo: Rob, are you there to join us? Okay, let's come back to Rob, please. You want to go to Anne Lawrence?

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes. That's fine.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you. I don't want to redirect here, but. . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Nope. That's fine.

Chairman Bernardo: Go ahead. Anne Lawrence, would you like to speak?

Ms. Lawrence: Yes. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Anne.

Ms. Lawrence: Thank you for the opportunity. And, indeed, this is a very highly-attended meeting. There had been some misunderstanding this past week about what the exact

cause was and emails have been flying, that there will be a revolt and I'm glad to hear that is not going to be the case and that we each have an opportunity to bring an alternative and additional arguments [sic] about this project. First of all, I want to say that it is a very sad thing how much this project has divided our community and it is split across families, across neighbors and it has caused a lot of grief along -- among a lot of people and a lot of people that this project was pushed upon. One of those families, for example, is the Snyder family. Scott wrote [sic] from a letter from Lawrence Snyder about his family farm and this and that -- his own two children are strongly opposed against this project. They live up the road from us, and they are part of our group, and that just illustrates how deeply this divide is. One of the main problems we found with the process so far, is that the public has not sufficiently been able to input. The applicant keeps referring to the Article 10 process that was designed -- by design -- to favor the applicant. The burden of proof was put at the public [sic] that this project has negative impacts. All the effort needed to do, was prove that they had mitigate [sic] the negative

impact to the maximum extent possible or feasible, which in reality, often meant, is it too expensive, or does it hit your bottom line -- and then they were easily granted a bye. Also, there's a lot of documents there -- a lot of them are cookie-cutter documents that the wind energy uses in all of their application [sic] across the country. And there are just standard facts that they pull, and this includes the Social Economic Study that they did. And it's really is [sic] important that we look at this and that we drill down, and if there's going to be a reopening, and a renewed discussion about whether or not this project deserves a PILOT, I really hope that the IDA will set really great standards for how you're looking at these facts, and that it's not going to be a similar sham procedure, like the Article 10. I think Dan Reynolds said it very well -- we need to look -- the long-term impacts of this. Of course, we can all say what we would do with the money -- building a new garage and all of that, and the town does need money, the schools need money. The schools are fairly neutral in this discussion, because they will get money through property taxes, and we don't even know exactly how much these property taxes would

be. Now that the PILOT has been rejected, and we are hoping that the IDA pending department will calculate those true property taxation values, and that it will be clear and transparent. And I know that [inaudible] that they may contest those payments, but we can't act out of fear for not getting something, for them to walk away -- we still have to wait, all the impacts -- and that goes for environmental impacts, as well as social economic impacts. Also, I do want to point again, to the fact that this project does not comply with our local law. And just for that reason, we should not grant them a PILOT agreement. The local law was changed within the year, and it came up during our last discussion, and I wasn't allowed to say something then, but the Siting Board needs to make their findings within the one year that they have the project under review, and the law was changed. We announced in March that we were going to work on revising the law, because it wasn't sufficiently protective of people living close to 670 feet [sic] turbines, and they have ignored all of these things, because again, it is all about the bottom line. They could install eagle detection systems to cut back on eagle kill, but they don't want to do it -- that's too

expensive. They could have flights -- how do you call it -- things that indicate that there's a plane coming and then lights come on -- but they don't want to do it, because it's cheaper to install red blinking lights, and we can just have no more night sky. And this is the kind of deliberations that maybe we can have going forward and that we have not been able to have in the Article 10. Again, they really have ignored the public voices. The wind developers use a table. They like to spread these projects over jurisdictions, over different towns, several counties, and before we knew what was really going on, they had been talking to all these individual leaders, but not to the public. We have not been heard -- our health effects and our jobs, that we are going to lose from tourism. Carolyn Price said that we have natural resources, and that includes beautiful pristine mountains, where people want to come to hike, to fish, to camp. Those are also natural resources, and those will be destroyed by this project. And that is one of the benefits, or losses we need to take into account. There will be job losses there. And I do want to point out that one of the studies that everybody seems to be quoting, about how many jobs this will bring.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you, Anne. That was your five minutes.

Ms. Lawrence: Okay. Socio-economic Impact Report. That's what I want to say. Check it out. Thank you.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Anne.

Ms. Abbadessa: Rob Aikens is back.

Chairman Bernardo: Natalie, do us a favor - - maybe like 15 seconds before you've hit the five minutes, let them know, just so that they know you're gonna. . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay. I just don't want to be rude and interrupt.

Chairman Bernardo: Understood.

Mr. Aikens: Just sorry. One other suggestion. If you could say who's on deck. When you say the person that's coming up, then that person can be prepared to unmute.

Ms. Abbadessa: Sure.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you.

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay, so we'll have Rob Aikens, and then I believe, Cassie Woodford would be next. Rob, are you there?

Mr. Aikens: Can you hear me now?

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes, we can.

Chairman Bernardo: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Aikens: Okay. Sorry about that -- before I thought I was unmuted.

Ms. Abbadessa: It's okay.

Mr. Aikens: So, I'm Robert Aikens. I represent the Operating Engineers in the Southern Tier. I'm the Assistant Business Manager of Local 158. I'm also the Building Trades President in Binghamton/Oneonta Building Trades. Our members missed out on a great opportunity with the gas industry in the pipeline. We haven't had a ton of work in Broome County. We missed out on and we didn't get the wastewater treatment plant, which is a pretty sizable project, so our members have been having to travel to go to work. So, I think with this opportunity with Bluestone, it's a good opportunity for them to be able to work home and be home every

night. So, we've got a great relationship with Northland. They've committed to working with our contractors -- we currently have six actively bidding the project. They're big contractors -- they are committed with us to use our local labor and get that -- get the labor through us. So, we also have about 30,000-man hours on this job for operators, which is huge and bigger than the wastewater treatment plant would have been for us. So that being said, I just want to say that the Operating Engineers and the trades involved in this project support this project, and we would hope that The Agency would move forward with a PILOT [and] approve it, so we can get our members to work, as scheduled. That's all I got and I appreciate your time. Thanks.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Rob.

Appreciate your comments. Cassie Woodford?

Ms. Woodford: Can you hear me? Hi.

Chairman Bernardo: Hello.

Ms. Woodford: My name is Cassie Woodford and my husband and I reside on a farm on [sic] Sanford New York. I'm commenting today as a citizen directly affected by the Bluestone Wind Project. About 18

months ago, my husband and I first heard about the proposed wind project, and I started answering questions I had by researching this complex and highly technical project. This led to an objective and comprehensive assessment of all potential economic impacts to the entire community. The estimates presented in our Net Economic Impact Report are supported by over 100 sample studies and reports and they are typically from independent experts, rather than the materials cited by the wind industry. We estimate that the Town of Sanford, alone, will lose approximately 3.9 million dollars per year. That's net loss of 3.9 million. I emailed our study to you for your review, along with the article from the journal *Science*, entitled, "Economic Importance of Bats in Agriculture." I don't believe that information was a surprise to any of you. I believe there must be another reason for revisiting this PILOT conversation, then silent [sic] science or economics. Surely, The Agency is aware of the destruction, noise, large net economic loss and problems with loss of tourism, damage of clean water supply and adverse human health effects. Surely, The Agency is aware of other communities in New York State that are fighting

for their right to health, safety and welfare. So why would anyone want to go back and reconsider the PILOT? There are political reasons that someone would want to force this PILOT through. The Agency knows that taxpayer money is already 40 percent of the budget for the project. Why should our towns be forced to accept a project that we don't want, that we are already supporting with taxpayer money, that gives a huge tax break to the company? We don't want the project. We feel like we have to accept it while, appearing to stay neutral. We pay the town lawyer for their time, and the PILOT isn't fair. If this particularly destructive project has to be in our towns, why wouldn't it make sense that there should be some benefit for the residents, instead of only political benefit to people who live far away from here? Yes, there will be a few temporary union jobs during construction, but does that make up for the massive permanent destruction of 27 green hilltops? When you look objectively at the pros and cons of this project, the scales aren't even close to being balanced. By the way, blighted areas would be a great place for green energy projects in Broome County. It would get rid of the blight and turn land that isn't usable for

farming or homes, into land that can be used for something. An example is the solar installation where the old Amphenol building used to be in Sidney. Rooftop projects are also good ideas. Many of the decisions about this project and [sic] were made in the past from appointed judges, who pass things along for political reasons. The Agency recently was brave enough to stand up to political bullying and vote no on a PILOT that doesn't benefit the local area enough. Please, we beg you -- please, don't cave into political pressure, and stand firm to oppose a PILOT that isn't good enough for us. If you do cave in to political bullying, can I ask you, what's next? What will be forced upon us next, after politicians realize that we can be bullied? Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Cassie.

Ms. Abbadessa: All right. Next, we're going to have Carol Miller, and then Valdi Weiderpass.

Chairman Bernardo: Carol, are you with us?

Ms. Duncan: Natalie, I think the note said she was on a call -- phone number only -- think, in the chat.

Chairman Bernardo: Carol Miller, are you with us? Okay, let's skip Carol for a moment. And what's the next person on the list, Natalie?

Ms. Duncan: Natalie, you're muted.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yep. Sorry. I think it was Carol Hill. I'm sorry.

Chairman Bernardo: Okay, Carol Hill.

Ms. Abbadessa: I apologize.

Chairman Bernardo: It's okay. Is Carol Hill with us? Last four digits 2040. That's what her note says.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes.

Chairman Bernardo: Okay, next name for now, Natalie.

Ms. Abbadessa: Is Valdi Weiderpass.

Mr. Weiderpass: Okay, hi. My name is Valdi Weiderpass. I have lived in Broome County, since since 1985. I'm going to repeat what I said -- I don't know if you heard that. My name is Valdi Weiderpass. I've lived in Broome County, since 1985. I'm a retired engineer, and I have spent a lot of my

time reading about climate change -- the problems that we've already experienced in the triple cities. The place where I used to work is now demolished. It was Air Force Plant 59. It was built in World War II, and it was flooded with this last flood, and has now been demolished along with dozens of other homes that were flooded. And, many businesses went out of existence. As a result of this flood that we had in 2011, which has been studied and has been found to be more than likely exacerbated by climate change. So, this is a problem that we all have to face, and what I want to point out here is that this project is the single most effective, quickest way for Broome County to do its part to help implement the goals of the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act, which was signed into law. And, it would provide enough electricity to satisfy the current residential demand of the entire city limits of the triple cities. The amount that I came up with was about 84,000 people, that this would provide the current demand of -- and this -- the demand is going to increase, as we have to transition the economy to be totally, as much as possible, from electricity. So, the demand is only going to keep going up. Heat pumps are going to have

to be used. Those use electricity. Transportation is going to have to go to a renewable electricity. That's going to increase the demand. Businesses, industries -- they're going to have to switch from natural gas for heating processes, to electricity. So, the demand is only going to go up. So, we have to do a project such of -- such as this scale. Construction is supposed to start this month with tree clearing. It's supposed to go online by 2022. So, that means by -- in two years, we could have this project online, doing a huge lift in terms of providing renewable energy for our area. The other thing I don't understand here is -- it's my understanding from reading the mission statement and the vision statement of the Broome County, The Agency, as well as the IDA -- that this organization works for us, and they're supposed to be encouraging and assisting with economic development. So I don't -- it's astonishing to me that at this late stage, after two years of this -- actually close to four years, this project has been in the works through the approval process and in negotiation stages -- that now they're going to pull the rug out from underneath this project by denying this PILOT agreement, which all of

these communities have worked in good faith to try to sign and agree to. So, please, reconsider and vote to approve the PILOT. And, the other thing is that the fossil fuel industry right now is jeopardizing people's health and safety, with these pipelines that have had the PILOT agreements signed for less jobs, then what this project is going to probably inspire and affect the economy through stimulating the economy -- stimulate the economy through payments injected into the land owners, as well as the Host Community Agreements, as well as the PILOT tax agreement. So, people are dying of cancer, they've got asthma, they're exposed to fires, explosions, there are risked by transport of natural gas from our neighbors in Pennsylvania that are suffering the effects from fracking and pollution, and this is something that can help slow that down. The bulk of people are in favor of a transition to renewables and the bulk of people believe that climate change needs to be addressed. This has been done by a polling survey that came out in *EcoWatch*. It was published by universities just a couple of weeks ago. So, the politics is shifting in favor of this, as well, and then that includes both Democrats and Republicans. So, I don't really see the

reasoning here. I would love to know what the reason was that . . .

Ms. Abbadessa: 15 seconds.

Mr. Weiderpass: . . .PILOT was rejected, and I am begging people to reconsider their vote and to support this project. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Valdi.
Appreciate your comments.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you. We have Carol Hill.

Ms. Hill: Hello.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes.

Ms. Hill: Can you hear me?

Ms. Abbadessa: We can, Carol.

Chairman Bernardo: Yes. Go ahead, Carol.

Ms. Hill: Yes. Hi, thank you. My name's Carol Hill. We -- me and my husband have a dairy farm up here in the Town of Sanford, and it's been in our family for six generations. We milk about 75 head -- it's a totally working farm, and we adore it. If we

ever thought that these turbines would affect the value, our livestock, the wildlife, and the value of our crops being ruined in any way, we would fight this till the end. We have seen these turbines on other farms with wildlife -- livestock grazing right underneath them, and I know many fellow farmers -- because I work in the livestock industry -- with turbines on their property every day, and everybody is happy and surviving. Of course, there'll be construction. That's expected. They always say to plant the seed, you have to turn the ground to get the crops in. Please go forward with this project. Also, a neighbor of Mr. Snyder, and Miss Anne Lawrence, and our farm will be right in the middle of this project. Please go forward with this project. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Carol, thank you for your comments. Go ahead, Natalie.

Ms. Abbadessa: Next, we have Sean Martin.

Chairman Bernardo: Sean, are you with us?

Sean, are you with us?

Unknown: Did you go on? Did you get a chance to talk?

Ms. Hill: I just got off.

Unknown: You did?

Chairman Bernardo: Is Sean Martin with us?

Ms. Hill: They had Anne Lawrence on.

Chairman Bernardo: Okay, Natalie, who would
be next?

Ms. Abbadessa: Julie Swift?

Ms. Duncan: On mute, Natalie, I'm. . .

Ms. Swift: Hi. Can you hear me?

Chairman Bernardo: Julie?

Ms. Byer: Yes, this is Julie Byer,
actually.

Ms. Duncan: Natalie, you may need to mute
the previous speaker -- it might be the cause of the
feedback -- I'm not sure. She may not be aware that
she's still on.

Ms. Byer: Okay.

Ms. Duncan: Give us just one second . . .

Ms. Byer: Is this better?

Ms. Duncan: We'll start your time over, yep. Is that better? Okay.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yep. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Go ahead, Julie.

Ms. Byer: Julie Byer, and I'm a concerned resident of Sanford, and I am very concerned about this Bluestone project. First, thank you for realizing the economic impact the PILOT program like this would have on our rural community. It would be financially devastating. And, as Cassie stated, it takes courage to stand up and do the right thing, when there's a lot of political pressure. I am sure you've heard or will hear from individuals, union members, Green Party, lease holders, etc., that want this project -- program to be passed by you. Please do not let these outside parties, who will not be directly impacted by this project, and are not aware of all the facts of this proposed project or PILOT program, sway your decision that this PILOT program does not make financial sense for our communities, which will be forever impacted. Obviously, lease holders want this project -- this PILOT program, because they will gain financially and can elect to move out of the area with

the money they receive and some lease holders just own land in these communities and do not even live in our communities. Thus, they are not concerned with the net economic effect on our communities should a PILOT program be approved. Unions want work for their members. I understand their need for jobs, but I do not understand or agree with some temporary jobs of maybe a year, but at the cost of financial detriment to Sanford and Windsor. Rural communities that are already struggling financially, would be forever financially damaged. Any PILOT program would be devastating financially to our communities. Our communities depend upon our tourism, seasonal camps, fishing, hunting, camping, to support our businesses, and way of life. All of this is dependent upon maintaining and safeguarding our environment. It is important to note that I'm in support of green energy. If the energy is efficient, cost-effective, environmentally-safe and safe for residents within the project area. I believe the Green Party is well-intentioned, wanting to preserve our environment and provide energy alternatives. However, our rural communities are very unique. Our area has some of the most pristine water sources. Projected turbine sites

are close to aquifers supplying our homes with our only water source. The proposed industrial turbines are not efficient, not effective, and not green. The devastation of thousands of acres of clear-cutting of trees, blasting mountains and making holes 30 feet deep and 60 feet wide and filling these holes with cement, requiring thousands of gallons of water to make cement drawing from our aquifers, which will be affected by blasting in the ground, which will cause storm runoff on our mountains down to our streams carrying cement particles damaging our environment, natural habitats, pollution to our waterways, and potential damage to our homes, health and drinking water and wells. The electric generated will not benefit the residents by either electric supplied or lower bills. In fact, electric bills generally increase. Our environment is unique. We are a migrant path for Bald and Golden Eagles. These turbines will kill our eagles and bat population, which are necessary to our farmers. In addition, and most important, is the health risks to our residents that live in Sanford and Windsor. It is now proven in international studies that industrial turbines are a health risk to your heart, causing heart disease and

other concerns, especially among the elderly or those who already have a heart condition. Medevac helicopters will be banned from our area, another risk for us, should we ever need help. These turbines are not cost-effective; our wind is not strong enough continuously. These turbines are purchased with taxpayer-funded subsidies. Without these subsidies, they would not be financially feasible to put up and the PILOT program is just another subsidy they are looking to get, at the cost of our already-struggling communities. All of these give-a-ways for what? After the project is done, we will have a forever destroyed economy -- our health, at risk -- dead eagles and bats, ruined waterways and water sources, trees destroyed, tourism gone. And for those of us who own homes, our home values destroyed, and homes unsellable -- all for two people to have jobs. This project should never have been proposed for an area such as ours, and no PILOT should be given.

I also just want to mention that Carolyn Price said we need to capitalize on what we have. Well, what we have is our tourism, which is what our local businesses depend on. Should this project happen and a PILOT program be given. . . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Ten seconds

Ms. Byer: . . .our tourism will be gone. Carolyn and Dewey Decker said they would consider a 20-year PILOT. Research shows average life of turbines is only 10 years. Two jobs and money from [a] PILOT is not sufficient for what our communities will lose at the cost of all who live here.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you, Julie.

Chairman Bernardo: Julie, thank you.

Ms. Byer: I just want to add one more thing -- Article 10 process. Our two ad hoc representatives both stated that they were against this.

Ms. Duncan: Okay, we should . . .

Ms. Byer: . . .and we weren't listened to. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Julie. Go ahead, Natalie.

Ms. Abbadessa: Next, we'll have Joanne McKiernan. Sorry, if I mispronounced that.

Ms. McKiernan: No, hi, yes. I'm Joan McKiernan -- and sorry, I come up as me on this

program and my camera isn't picking up. So, thank you for giving us the opportunity. First of all, having the meeting, giving us the opportunity to speak. I am -- I want to add in here -- I want to focus on climate change. I am a member of the Broome-Tioga Green Party, and contrary to what people have stated in this discussion, we voted last year to support the campaigners against these turbines. People felt they are too large; they will be the height of the Empire State Building, if they are built. They are too dangerous on our steep hills, and they are dependent, folks, on fossil fuels. So, let's talk about climate change. I have been fighting on environmental issues. I want to focus on climate change. We do need renewable energy, but this is not it. These turbines are going to be dependent upon the use of fossil fuels. So, all those people who want to use more natural gas from Pennsylvania, that's what they will be used for -- is to make the things -- first of all, you need them in the manufacture, in the processing and in the actual operation of them. I live in Deer Lake; I live right below Sky Lake. Where, as Carolyn Price pointed out, they intend to have four turbines. So, I am right below where all the cement is going to

fall down. I am right below where our streams, feeding into our lake are going to be destroyed -- because if you see any pictures of turbines, you will see them leaking oil, leaking all sorts of chemicals into our waters. That is what is going to destroy our fishing industry. And I want to support a number of people who referred back to Carolyn Price. And, I really want to go and address this to Carolyn Price. We depend upon our natural resources. Absolutely, right. These turbines are going to destroy our natural resources -- the rainbow, the natural rainbow trout that spawn at the top of those mountains, right? The rivers are going to be destroyed. And, climate change. Let's face it. Climate change -- we need our forests. We need our forests to go and keep our oxygen -- they are going to destroy those forests. Everywhere else in the world, they're building reforestation projects. Want to put people to work? Let's get people out there planting trees to keep -- prevent soil erosion, prevent the floods that we have had -- 2006, 2011, 2012 -- we've had all those floods. Deposit knows about them, because they're threatened. When our lakes and rivers up here, break dams and overflow and everything, they hit down to the town.

You ought to really be doing a full Cost Benefit Analysis. How much is it going to cost to stop the erosion? How much is it going to cost to replace all the recreational fishing industries? Not just here around our area, but up and down the Delaware and the Susquehanna Rivers, where people are dependent upon using the natural resources. Where people come in every Friday night for the weekend and fill all the local cafes and restaurants, when they were open. Okay? When they come to the ends -- and rent out all the places -- that's all going to be over, folks. So, Dewey and Carolyn, think again about these prices [sic], and, in terms of preventing -- presenting clean energy for this area, this energy that will possibly be produced by these things -- it's not going to be here, it's going to be wherever the best price is. Maybe the best price is New England; maybe it's downstate. We don't need it. Upstate New York is already based on renewable energy, so what we produce here -- what we're using here -- is already renewable. We need to get renewable out to the rest of the world, yes. And when research, when science improves turbines -- not what we have now, we need better. We need better stuff that's not going to go and push more

fossil fuel out of the ground. I'll leave it at that. Thank you very -- and the cost of everything -- the cost of electricity throughout the world, and particularly, in Europe. Germany is a very good example. Look it up. We've got it on our web -- Facebook page. Germany's been trying it, [do] you know [what] Germany uses -- to go and make the turbines work -- they're using coal, right? Here, they're going to use natural gas. And what they have found in Germany is that the cost of electricity goes up. . . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Fifteen seconds.

Ms. McKiernan: Okay, if you move from one to the other, from the wind, to the gas, to the coal, it makes it all more expensive. So, everybody's cost -- not everybody -- yours and mine -- cost of electricity are [sic] going up. Thank you all, everybody.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Joan.

Ms. Abbadessa: Next, we're going to have Demo Stefanou, and then, I believe there's [sic] people from Local 785 that wanted to speak. So, you can go next.

Chairman Bernardo: So, this is Demo Stefanou?

Ms. Abbadessa: I believe so. Sorry. I said that correctly. Demo, are you there?

Chairman Bernardo: Demo, from the 516 area code.

Ms. Duncan: Is he muted? Are you muted?

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes, he is, and I can't unmute him. He's got to do it.

Ms. Duncan: He needs to -- you'll need to unmute. Do you want to come back to him?

Chairman Bernardo: I think we should.

Ms. Duncan: Yeah.

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay. Is there anybody from Local 785 that wanted to speak?

Ms. Duncan: Yeah, just a reminder -- if you're on a phone call, you may need to unmute, if you dialed in that way. Just with the call-in.

Chairman Bernardo: Anybody from Local 785? Who would that be? All right. I'm causing static for some reason. I don't know why.

Ms. Duncan: All right. Natalie, why don't we -- why don't we go to Jim Donahue.

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay.

Ms. Duncan: Jim, are you on the phone? I think he was maybe just a phone number, as well. Jim?

Unknown: Who did you ask for?

Ms. Duncan: Jim Donohue? Trying to get through the list. All right. No, Jim. We'll come back. Demo. Are you with us? Okay, Local 85? Local Laborers?

Chairman Bernardo: 785.

Ms. Duncan: 785, thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Yep.

Ms. Duncan: Okay. How about . . . Nat, do you have your -- I know you've been. . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Yep.

Ms. Duncan: [Inaudible]. . . better tabs on the chat here.

Ms. Abbadessa: Jim DeRose.

Ms. Duncan: Jim, you still with us? Okay.

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay, let's see. Miriam Bloom?

Mr. Morrison: Can you hear it?

Ms. Bloom: Can you hear?

Unknown: Yeah, yes. We can hear you.

Chairman Bernardo: Miriam?

Ms. Bloom: You, go ahead.

Mr. Moore: Okay -- Miriam Bloom and Ron Morrison. We live in Deposit. I'm going to be speaking. And first -- the first thing I wanted to thank you for having this -- this is very important. And I also want to commend the people who have rejected this PILOT deal, which is the equivalent of getting a tax break for degrading an environment in advance -- that's quite a good deal there. But the other thing I want to point out is that this is really not economic development. This is use of an environment for the placement of an installation that will generate power to benefit some unknown source -- it could be anywhere, but it's using this environment. And I think of people who have been convinced that this is good, are basically buying into the idea that

some quick cash that will be gained in the initial building, and also workers who will get jobs temporarily, but don't forget, those are going to end and they're also up for bid to other companies.

That's the other thing. Now, the overall thing about this project, that I think has not been carefully considered, is that these are the wrong kind of wind turbines. These are 670 feet tall, an actual turbine that you see around the world on land is 280 feet. Now, that is more than twice the size. Now, the engineering components of that large a turbine are designed for being out in oceans where there's no people around, no one is there. But to put one of those in an environment where you have people living nearby -- the sound issue, the vibration issue is absolutely increased by [inaudible] -- who knows how many -- I haven't calculated it, but we're talking about the wrong way to do renewables. This is the issue that is primarily -- of primary importance here. I'm not really 100 percent -- wind farms that are contained in -- in areas where you have the actual turbine design for land -- that are contained in one area away from populations -- you have these in Europe -- they have them in many parts of the world -- this

is the wrong way to do it. You don't string them out through two towns, on mountain tops where it's going to be basically -- and what -- who takes them down, the other issue? What about -- you're mortgaging the future of your children and grandchildren. There is no obligation for these companies to pay for taking those things down, when they wear out, in 20 or so years? They actually are known to wear out in about 15 years. So, what -- the benefit of the money you get now, which can be spent in the next few years, you're going to have to pay in the future to clean up the huge disaster that will be there. I mean, so, I'm convinced that this is absolutely the wrong kind of equipment in the wrong place, and I think this is overwhelmingly clear, and, that's all I have to say.

Chairman Bernardo: Miriam, thank you very much for your comments.

Ms. Abbadessa: Is Demo on? Nope. Okay. Kelly. Is there a Kelly?

Ms. Duncan: I think it says -- is it Gen? G e n? Gen Kelly?

Ms. Bloom: Ron, I don't know how to put it off. . .

Ms. Kelly: I'm here.

Ms. Duncan: Yes, is this Gen?

Ms. Abbadessa: Apologies.

Ms. Kelly: I'm Gen Kelly.

Chairman Bernardo: Hi, Gen.

Ms. Kelly: How are ya?

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you for
joining us.

Ms. Kelly: Well, let me put -- start it very easily and I don't have any figures -- that is still in my mind for a year and a half. They change back and forth. I've been involved in this from January of 2019, when we found out that this project had been in the works for like, two years. But getting back to it -- what we got here is a lot of figures, a lot of money, and a lot of natural resources -- a way of where people from all over the Atlantic states, and north of us, come here to escape exactly what Bluestone wants to put here. I have to tell you that those four turbines in Windsor are not really in Windsor. Half our lake -- Deer Lake, is in

Windsor, and two thirds is in Sanford. And those four turbines are going to be looking down our throats within a mile. Six hundred and seventy-foot turbines, of which they are going to clear-cut five to ten thousand trees, to put in 30-foot cement footings. They're going to have antifreeze to make sure they don't freeze, and all that is gonna [sic] erode and wash down into a creek from Sky Lake, that had been charged with violations of pollution for over 10 years. And now, we finally got a source -- that's the IDA, that looked at it from the standpoint of the individuals, not one agency, including respectfully, the IDA, have been in our area to actually see where these turbines are gonna [sic] to be. And, frankly, I'm in my 90th year, and I have to tell you, my kids are not going to get the benefit of this, because they're already in their 60s, and I can tell you, we don't have a young population -- the families grow up, they raised them in a perfectly economical and environmental area, and then they leave to go elsewhere. We're not talking about economics for young people here, nor jobs [inaudible] gone, but most of them work in Binghamton. And what they do is they can't wait to get back home, here to enjoy the

lifestyle that this area projects. There is tourism. There is -- I used to drive 158 miles one way to escape from New Jersey, since 1976. Every weekend -- winter and summer. It's money, it's the money. How much money does the school need? We have one school in Deposit, we have three schools in Windsor. Millions of dollars. They don't even have the students to fill that kind of expense. That's it. God bless you all. Thank you for your time, and please don't change your vote.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Gen. Thank you very much.

Ms. Abbadessa: Next, we have Chris Stanton.

Mr. Stanton: Hey, guys. Can you hear me okay?

Chairman Bernardo: Yes. Go ahead, Chris. Hey, thanks so much for hosting this meeting today. Just wanted to just touch on a couple points that were brought up that I think were factually inaccurate. One point was made that the turbines on this project would be as tall as the Empire State Building. We are, under our Article 10 Certificate, can go up to 673-foot tip-height. The Empire State Building is

1,454 feet, so way more than double what the tip height of these turbines would be. A comment was made that the fossil fuels embedded and the concrete and steel that go into these structures would somehow cancel out the climate change benefit. Just want to be very clear on that point, because that's a favorite talking point of folks who are opposed to wind energy. The American Wind Energy Association has looked into this extensively, and they found that the amount of carbon embedded in those project components is wiped out within six months of operation of the facility. And as discussed earlier, we plan on operating this facility for 30 years. There's been a number of comments made to date on stormwater runoff from the facility, and I just want to be clear about this point, as well. We are under strict regulation from the DEC, as well as other state agencies, to implement a Stormwater Pollution Protection Program. That -- a version of that was submitted with our tree clearing plan on October 27th, and that will be scrutinized closely by the state to ensure that any ground disturbance from this project will not lead to run-off from the project into adjacent properties or water bodies or any other areas of concern. If we were to

do as Miss Kelly suggested and pollute a water body such as Deer Lake, we would be liable to the state for failing to meet the conditions of our permit, as well as meet the conditions of any major construction project in the State of New York. A comment was made that we would not be able to -- we won't -- there won't be any ability to stand by the decommissioning obligation. Clearly, we understand this point, well. Taking a facility down this size is a major endeavor, and for that reason, New York State requires us to put money aside in a Letter of Credit that is available to the towns in the event that the owner of the project were to be insolvent or unable to perform its obligation to decommission the facility at the end of its life. So, according our latest calculation, including the contingency required by New York State, that's a 4.88-million-dollar Letter of Credit commitment that we will be held to. We'll have to keep that Letter of Credit enforced throughout the asset life, and we're required every five years to meet with town officials to ensure that the existing estimate for that decommissioning is tracking with inflation and other considerations. So, as far as the IDA is concerned, these issues that were mentioned by

some folks, were litigated in the Article 10 permitting process and limits were imposed on us, as the project entity, that we have to abide by, under Article 10 Certificate conditions. I really appreciate some of the comments that were made today, from -- some landowners we're trying to dial in, such as Demo Stefanou -- unfortunately, just weren't able to get in. But I know that Carol Hill echoed what I think a lot of landowners have put in writing, in what I hope members of the IDA Board have seen over the last couple weeks, and that is, we certainly -- certainly they were not super aware of the public hearing for this, this project for the IDA application that was held a couple months ago, and that's really my fault, for not making folks aware. But with the prospect that the PILOT would actually not be entered into by the IDA and the actual prospect of losing out on real tangible revenues in calendar year 2021, it certainly got their attention, and I hope you guys have gotten to see some of the notes and writing that -- where landowners have tried to express how important these revenues could be to maintaining their property and their families over -- in allowing to pass it down in the next generation. So, thanks for

that. I did want to underscore that payments under our leases, just as, as our obligations to town go up over time -- so there's an adjustment for the cost of living and inflation, that allows somebody with a family farm to be able to count on that revenue for a really long period.

Finally, I just wanted to address -- I included this in written remarks to the IDA last night. I appreciate -- I wrote quite a bit, and it -- probably didn't -- you guys didn't have a chance to digest all of it yet, but, heard some comments from Board members that a PILOT term of less than 30 years -- they have concerns with the length of PILOT term.

So, I just want to underscore that our Host Community Agreement with the towns, the school districts, and the county has a mechanism in it, that kind of foresaw the possibility that there would be a shorter PILOT term. So, under that. . .

Ms. Abbadessa: [Inaudible] seconds, Chris.

Mr. Stanton: All right, under that Host Community Agreement, we make our payments as scheduled for 30 years to towns, and that's sort of the minimum. If we were exposed to higher taxes in years 20 to 30,

under shorter PILOT term, the towns would just benefit from the uplift from that, but they would not be subject any risk under a shorter-term PILOT. Thank you very much.

Ms. Abbadessa: Thank you, Chris.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Chris.

Ms. Abbadessa: Is anyone on from Local 785? They were having trouble getting through, I think. Tim. There's a Tim on, and I see his hand is raised. Did you want to speak?

Tim: Yes, I would like to speak.

Unknown: There, Mike. Can you hear me?

Chairman Bernardo: Yes.

Ms. Abbadessa: If you could just state your full name, please.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Tim Lewis. Deposit, New York. I understand that a Green Movement, email and letter writing campaign may be in progress to inundate the Board with emotional appeals to reverse your decision in order to save the environment and the planet. While I also support clean energy and saving

our environment, we cannot let emotions override the facts in this application. The facts remain that the proposed PILOT is a sham and injurious to our communities and residents who pay their fair share of taxes on the fair value of their property with the expectation that they will be able to safely live and enjoy a healthy life on the property they own. The Town of Sanford is not one large industrial park, nor is it comprised of large flat wheat fields with no residents in close proximity to the proposed wind turbine facilities. It is residential and agricultural. In my observations at numerous town meetings over the last three years, the Town Boards of Windsor and Sanford have been grossly under-resourced, under-educated and ill-equipped to deal with corporate profiteers like Calpine, Bluestone Wind and Northland Power, on top of the political pressure of the New York State Governor. In addition, these Town Boards lack the will and the adequate legal counsel to exact a fair Host Community Agreement that would collect significantly more tax revenue. They should be getting more than twice as much as they're asking to get, and they should also require stricter zoning laws to protect their residents. Failure to properly zone

and enforce adequate turbine placement, zoning distances from neighbors will result in future lawsuits and property value destruction. I, and many of the residents of these project-impacted areas, commend the Broome County IDA Board for taking a strong position to prevent the people of our area from being taken advantage of and to ensure that Broome County's unique and valuable environmental resources are not cluttered and devalued by corporate and political pirates without commensurate jobs, compensation or benefits that will outweigh the health and property destruction that will result from this project. I also might like to add that the 52 million dollars that was previously quoted -- cited as going to the 40 land lessors, I guess you'd call them -- more than half of those live out of the area. They're in Brooklyn, they're in New Jersey. That 52 million dollars will not find its way back into the community or the Broome County economy. Thank you, in advance, for your thoughtful consideration of all the facts. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Tim.

Ms. Abbadessa: All right. Was there anybody else that wanted to . . . okay, Tony Wagner.

Mr. Wagner: Yes, please. Am I muted, or can you hear me?

Chairman Bernardo: No, we can hear you, Tony. Go ahead.

Mr. Wagner: Okay. I'm Tony Wagner, landowner of Sanford, and Windsor, both. And we've had the property for 65 years. I have a basic question. We have not seen the comparison that typically, a planner does -- a town planner or an IDA planner, in this case. Someone does a calculation that shows the total cost of the PILOT program over 30 years, or 20 years, or whatever number you want to put it at. Those are the total estimated tax payments based on some level of assessment. I believe that number exists in this process. We've never seen that number. I know it's confidential during the negotiating process, but it should become public knowledge on -- after a decision is made. In this case, it was a no decision. It should also be public knowledge if it was a yes decision. So, I question

where that information is and why has that not been provided? Number one.

Number two, there is energy involved with producing on the equipment that's presented. Mr. Stanton just mentioned that the carbon captured or embedded in the materials of the plant, give a six to 12-month payback, I guess, depending on the types of materials. But what they -- what the wind energy organizations don't talk about is the additional energy beyond what's captured in the materials, required to make the materials, such as the production of steel, the transportation of turbine blades, the removal of trees, all the grading, the amount of rock that has to be moved, etc., etc. That all has a fossil fuel energy impact, and that's separate from what is embedded in the materials. And I point this out because we just heard a partial story on this call from Mr. Stanton -- we don't hear the whole picture. And also, throw in that the back up energy required to back up this energy require [sic] a fossil plant somewhere. It's [inaudible] than one -- somewhere [a] 124-megawatt plant needs to be available to produce the back up power when the winds not blowing. That plant also consumes a lot of energy to produce,

okay. If you didn't have the wind, you'd have to produce that -- you'd have to make that plant anyway. But it's not a free ride. And then the carbon model in my mind, as an engineer, just does not work. You need to include the total picture, and there are people that have done studies to say, a 20-year lifespan of a wind turbine plant -- in those 20 years, they don't produce as much energy as the fossil energy cost to make and -- to make the material and build that plant. Thank you for having this open session. Thank you for your no vote. We have lots of information to say why it should happen, why it shouldn't happen. I hope you stick with your decision and decline any future revisit of this [inaudible] use of [inaudible] or whatever the process would be. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Tony.

Ms. Abbadessa: We're gonna go to a Richard Rogler and then we'll go to Kermit Mott.

Mr. Rogler: Yes. I'm Richard Rogler. This is my wife Deborah. Can you hear me?

Chairman Bernardo: Yes. Go ahead, Richard.

Mr. Rogler: Okay, thank you. We live in the Town of Colesville, just outside the Towns of Windsor and Sanford, thank God, but these turbines are so huge that even in surrounding townships, we're impacted. But first of all, this PILOT should have been negotiated at the beginning of this -- of the project, not at the end. Calpine/Northland took the risk of spending millions of dollars on this project, without the knowledge of how much they would have to pay in taxes. Now, they say they can't pay you fair market value in taxes, but here's millions of dollars to sway your opinion. Sure, it's a lot of money, but they'll be making a lot of money, especially since this is heavily subsidized already by the state and the federal government. Let the project pay for itself. It doesn't need any more of our help.

Secondly, I'm also a member of the Delaware-Otsego Audubon Society, which is an advocate for wind power. The society was actually awarded funding over two years to study the eagle migration that's in the middle of this project. Their results were stunning. They not only found that this was a major eagle migratory route, but it was also a wintering area for the endangered Golden Eagles. They tried to introduce

the Bayesian Model Study of estimated eagle kill, but those results were redacted. Their conclusion was that this is actually the worst possible location for a turbine project. You actually should have received a letter in the mail from that Audubon Society, confirming what the results were, and also telling you that they were against the project. Thank you, and that's all I have to say.

Chairman Bernardo: Richard, thank you very much.

Ms. Abbadessa: Kermit Mott, and then looks like we'll end with Michelle Benash.

Chairman Bernardo: Kermit Mott. Are you there?

Mr. Mott: Hello.

Chairman Bernardo: Hello.

Mr. Mott: Oh, great. You can hear me, now. Yeah, I've been following the -- this project for a little while. And I really have some concerns. And I'm going to make my comments very short, concerning the timeframe. I went back, I looked at the application -- that was dated from -- for September

16th, 2020, and I believe it's incomplete. I would ask you to review the document list. And under that list, there were two items that were not submitted. One was item number two, which is EAF, which is the Environmental Impact Statements, and the other one is the item number three of Financial Arrangements. I believe without these documents, the Board cannot determine the environmental impact of this project, nor can the Board determine if the project is financially viable. I'm also respectfully requesting that the Board members review the October 21st, 2020 meeting. At that meeting, there were several questions and issues were raised, and my question to the Board is what additional information have you received, which addresses those questions and issues which were raised at the prior meeting? To me, the bottom line is 40 percent of the project is financed by taxes, and that was a statement that was made at that October meeting, I believe. If the company cannot provide the remaining money, then my question is are we to provide further assistance to a project, whose cost is not known at this time? Because there has not been a final -- as to the best of my knowledge, there has not -- a final plan has not been

submitted for design purposes -- will only provide two permanent jobs -- and that's according to the application. And the question about who will benefit from the electric that is generated from this project, is also kind of, up in the air, I believe -- and that the standard answer seems to be, it goes back into the grid. But I believe it was Mr. Mirabito, if I remember correctly, who asked more questions concerning that particular point, and I believe at the end of the discussion, it was determined that most of this electricity will not benefit a majority of Broome County, because of the way in which things are zoned, and I believe it was indicated that the zone that would apply would include part of Eastern Broome County, and it would go towards the New York City area. I thought that was a very good issue that was raised by Mr. Mirabito, and I would ask you to further pursue that issue, because at the end of the day, I think you have to balance the amount of money that you're willing to offer, and tax rebates, etc. against the benefits for the county. And it would appear, at least from that discussion, that a majority of the residents of Broome County will not benefit from this wind-generating project. It will only be -- maybe a

slim part of Broome County, at best. So again, I would respectfully ask that you review the meeting from the 21st. I thought there was some very good questions asked -- some very good issues were raised. And I would just ask you to keep in mind that if you do not have answers to those questions and/or issues that were raised, then I can't see a possible reason to change your position on the decision that was made at that meeting. Thank you for your time, gentlemen, and ladies, and hopefully you can arrive at a decision that will benefit everyone.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you, Mr. Mott.
Natalie, go ahead.

Ms. Abbadessa: I think there was Michelle wanted to speak, to just -- Michelle Benash -- is she on? And then, Kelvin Herrala.

Mr. Herrala: Kelvin is here.

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay, Kelvin, we'll go ahead with you. Thank you.

Mr. Herrala: I'm Kelvin Herrala, Business Manager IBEW Local 325, in Binghamton, New York. I just wanted to speak again, on the jobs that it's

going to mean for the area building this. I have been a temporary worker since January 6, 1985, in the electrical industry. . .

Unknown: [Inaudible.]

Mr. Herrala: And, that's what we live on -- is projects in the area, doing work in the area. This project -- we've been approached by contractors, workers -- are going to be done by local workers. There's going to be ramp-up time at the peak time. There's going to be up to 60 electricians working on this project. That's on top of the hundred and some that the laborers are going to have in Operating Engineers. If you times that by their hourly wages, incomes to their family -- I mean, we're talking millions of dollars, that's going to be spent into the county that -- they're paying taxes or they're living, they're working in the area. So, this is more than the two permanent jobs that are on a piece of paper, which will also be good, long-term jobs for somebody, but this is going to bring work to the area. Thank you.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments, Kelvin. I think we have time for one more right, Natalie?

Ms. Abbadessa: I don't think we have any more.

Chairman Bernardo: Okay.

Ms. Abbadessa: Oh, wait. Is, Debra Kernons?

Chairman Bernardo: Is Debra, on the line with us? Okay.

Ms. Abbadessa: How about David Lawrence?

Mr. Lawrence: Yeah, yes, I'm here. Yeah, I wanted to speak about the impacts to the local community that this project is proposed in, from a financial standpoint. And that is basically, this project's asking for subsidies from the local population to an unknown extent, and the impacts -- so, we're expected to subsidize this project, here in this county, for what's actually -- what [this] company [has] listed as 70 temporary jobs. And as a result of those subsidies that we're going to be

providing, we're also going to see a significant reduction in our property values, and long-term, that will far outweigh any benefits -- perceived or otherwise, from this project. That's going to be a significant hit, in the Towns of Windsor and Sanford long-term. There's study after study that indicates that this will bring down property values anywhere from 30 to 80 percent, and that's up to miles away, basically -- specifically, based upon the economics of the area we live in, this is an area that's popular with people who go there to get away from 80 decibels -- and, then also, there's the fact that these things are being situated adjacent to properties, as part of this plan, and there's no compensation -- no anything given to people who will actually have up to 80 decibels on their land. And this isn't just homes, affected homes -- this is all over the community. And everything was only modeled on homes. This is gonna [sic] cause a significant reduction in property values.

Chairman Bernardo: David, are you still there?

Ms. Duncan: I think we're . . .

Mr. Lawrence: I am. That's all I have to say.

Chairman Bernardo: Thank you very much for your comments. We appreciate that. I think . . .

Ms. Abbadessa: Okay, John. We're all set.

Chairman Bernardo: I think we're all set to wrap up. I want to thank all the Board members, and of course, all the participants, including the municipal leaders for arranging on their end, this meeting. The Board appreciates all the comments we've heard. As Stacey indicated earlier, she has shared with us voluminous documents, if you will, relative to the different positions that have been taken, or that are being taken on this -- and, as Stacey also stated, there's no -- there's not going to be any vote today, nor will be -- will there be any further discussion on this matter. We will go from there. Okay. Thank you all very much.

Ms. Duncan: Thank you.

Ms. Abbadessa: John, I think you have to just adjourn.

Mr. Stevens: I move to adjourn.

Ms. Abbadessa: Yes.

Mr. Howard: Second.

Unknown: Thank you. Keep us posted.

[The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Stevens, seconded by Mr. Howard at 2:00 p.m.]

[Attendees: John Bernardo, Wayne Howard, John Stevens, Rich Bucci, Dan Crocker, Jim Peduto, Brian Rose, Joe Mirabito, Stacey Duncan, Natalie Abbadessa, Carrie Hornbeck, Theresa Ryan, Brendan O'Bryan, Amy Williamson, Joe Meagher, Carolyn Price, Dewey Decker, Jason Andrews, Denise Cook, Jason Garner, Daniel Reynolds, Robin Alpaugh, Greg Deemie, Omar Sanders, Carly Norton, Kermit Mott, Alice Ray, Scott Kurkoski, Brady Begeal, Dan Spitzer, Jeff Platsky, Anne Lawrence, Jim DeRose, Kenney (IBEW), Michael Dundon, Rob Aikens, Cassie Woodford, Carl Andresen, Valdi Weiderpass, Michelle Benash, Miriam Bloom, Ron Morrison, Kelvin Herrala, Amy Hogan, Joan McKiernan, Chris Stanton, Robert O'Donnell, Arthur Wagner, Adam Flint, Scott Lauffer, Ian Williams, Tony Wagner, Jim

Ehmke, Joanne McGibney, Richard Rogler, Colleen Lewis,
Joyce Rice, Richard Blythe, Sean Martin, Sarah Evans,
Julie Byer, David Lawrence, Genevieve Kelly, Tim
Lewis, Tony Wagner, Daniel M.]

STATE OF NEW YORK :

COUNTY OF BROOME :

I, CARRIE HORNBECK, Executive Assistant,
do certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
transcript of the Broome County Industrial Development
Agency Special Meeting, held telephonically, on November
6, 2020.

Carrie Hornbeck / signed electronically

CARRIE HORNBECK

Executive Assistant

The Agency Broome County

Industrial Development Agency

FIVE South College Drive

Binghamton, NY 13905