

BROOME COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

IDA Board Meeting Transcript

Held via Zoom, January 19, 2022, commencing at
12:00PM. Adjourned at 12:35PM.

[See attendees at end of transcript.]

Digitally recorded proceeding
Transcribed by: Elana Hulsey
Reporters Transcription Center
P.O. Box 903
Binghamton, NY 13902

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Broome County Industrial Development Agency of January 19, 2022, and I will turn the first part of the meeting over to our attorney, Joe Meagher.

MR. MEAGHER: Thank you, John. Good morning to all, or good afternoon. I'll ask you all to repeat after me... Are we all set? Everybody's in?

MR. PEDUTO: Yeah.

MR. MEAGHER: Okay. I-

ALL: I [crosstalk].

MR. MEAGHER: Okay. I guess they know their names. Do solemnly swear.

ALL: Do solemnly swear.

MR. MEAGHER: That I will support the Constitution of the United States.

ALL: That I will support the Constitution of the United States.

MR. MEAGHER: And the Constitution of the State of New York.

ALL: And the Constitution of the State of New York.

MR. MEAGHER: And that I will faithfully discharge the duties.

ALL: And that I will faithfully discharge the duties.

MR. MEAGHER: Of the office of Member of the Broome County Industrial Development Agency.

ALL: Of the office of Member of the Broome County Industrial Development Agency.

MR. MEAGHER: According to the best of my ability.

ALL: According to the best of my ability.

MR. MEAGHER: And those who are not present are going to have to get us signed copies of this. We'll provide it out to you.

MS. DUNCAN: Yes. We also did send electronically... Annually we do an Acknowledgement of Fiduciary Duties and some that are present may have those in their folders. If you could sign and leave with us, and those that are not present, we'll get them to you electronically.

MS. HORNBECK: Yeah. They should go out today.

MS. DUNCAN: Perfect. Thank you, Carrie.

MS. HORNBECK: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Joe, I'm going to let you continue, correct?

MR. MEAGHER: Oh, I'm still on. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Joe, we're not paying you extra for this, but go ahead, proceed.

MR. MEAGHER: I'm just trying to drag it out. All right, do we have a motion with respect to the nomination of the officers of the Agency? [inaudible].

MS. DUNCAN: So, we'll start with Chairman.

MR. PEDUTO: This is Jim Peduto. For Chairman, I'd like to nominate John Bernardo.

MR. MEAGHER: I think we could do these all as one motion.

MR. PEDUTO: Even better.

MR. BUCCI: So, a motion for the slate, is that what you need?

MR. MEAGHER: Yes.

MS. DUNCAN: For Vice Chairman next.

MR. MEAGHER: Vice Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: I'd like to nominate Jim Peduto to the position of Vice Chairman.

MR. MEAGHER: Secretary?

MR. PEDUTO: I'd like to nominate Richard Bucci.

MR. MEAGHER: Treasurer?

MR. BUCCI: I'd like to nominate Dan Crocker.

MR. MEAGHER: Do we have a second to the slate that has been proposed?

MR. GATES: I'll second it. Dan Gates.

MS. DUNCAN: Okay, Dan.

MR. MEAGHER: Any discussion?

MR. BUCCI: Is there a salary increase? Is there a cost-of-living adjustment?

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Significant, Mayor. Significant.

MR. MEAGHER: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

MR. MEAGHER: Any votes opposed? The slate as presented is hereby elected for the upcoming year. John, I'm going to throw it back to you.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Thank you. Looking at the transcript for our December 15, 2021, meeting, looking for a motion to approve the transcript.

MR. CROCKER: I have a comment on those.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Go ahead, Dan.

MR. CROCKER: I notice that Carrie is no longer assigned the arduous task of doing the transcripts. Are they done by audio?

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. The time involved with the changes to this, we're looking at just a service to do that. It takes a lot of the time off of the-

MR. CROCKER: Oh, sure. I agree with that wholeheartedly. That was a huge [crosstalk]. I noticed in the December transcripts, as I was reading through them I'm thinking, "I don't speak like that." I mean, most of the general audio is correct, but I was looking at the end of it and there was some talk, some of the chairman's talk and I thought, "That doesn't sound right." No, just the what the transcript said. So, at the end of it, it said that I said I have a motion. I just don't speak like that, and there's some stuff that the Chairman said. I went back and looked at the video and listened to it. I mean, I got tinnitus bad, but that's not what was said.

MS. DUNCAN: Okay. We will cross-reference that and double-check that and make corrections where needed.

MR. CROCKER: I think that's a good idea. That was a lot of work for Carrie.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: With that said, we're going to hold off on moving forward with approving the transcript until the staff has a chance to take careful note of it.

MR. CROCKER: I mean, it wasn't anything that was pertinent information. It was just idle chitchat, but it wasn't accurate.

MS. DUNCAN: Okay. We will go back and double-check that, okay?

MR. CROCKER: I mean, I read them all and would approve them, but it was just not...

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Let's hold those until the next meeting. We come to the part of our agenda where we have a chance for the public to comment on anything concerning the IDA. If you wish to speak, feel free to introduce yourself, give us a residence, and limit your comments if you would please to five minutes. Would anybody like to speak? Moving onward. Executive Director's Report. Stacey, updates please.

MS. DUNCAN: Yes. Happy New Year to you all. We have a busy year ahead, a busy month ahead. So just a few updates for you. One note with just a reminder for the record with the appointment of committees which is done by our Chairman, Chairman Bernardo. We did send that out electronically, the committee assignments. There have been no changes, but just for the record I want to note that committee assignments have been sent to you all electronically and no changes currently for that.

So, a few updates. Just to note something that I think goes a little bit unnoticed but is a useful tool that I think we'd like to make you aware of. On an annual basis, the IDA gets an allocation of private activity bond from New York State's Office of Economic Development. That is based on the Chapter 58, prescribed on Chapter 58, Law of 2020, utilizing the most recent population estimates from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. So on an annual basis - it's typically a two-year allocation - we'll get an allotment of private activity bond that we can use for eligible projects. We did get our notice for 2022 that our allocation is \$7,285,706, so this can be a useful tool as we vet and work with project developers. So, I

just wanted to put that to your attention that our annual allocation has been set for 2022.

A couple of things coming up on the radar for next week that I want to put to the Board's attention as it relates to projects or initiatives that this Board has approved, two great county partnerships that's being shepherded through County, I think County Planning, the Office of Planning is an announcement on a grant award related to the expansion of the Southern Tier Network. If you recall back in 2021, we provided funds to support the extension of the Southern Tier Network in the urban core. So what this will be is in a gap analysis study to identify what parcels, what sites, what buildings, where the gaps are in broadband service. And as we know, this has been a continuing challenge for both business growth and for individuals, especially during COVID. We're looking forward to participating in that next week. I believe that's on Tuesday.

And then the following Thursday, the 27th, we're also working with the County on an announcement related to the COVID Recovery Grant Fund. If you recall, we did participate with the County on an application for Community Development Block Grant funds. The County was awarded \$1 million in funds to provide grants to small businesses. We're maxing those out at \$50,000. The County will be the recipient of the funds through Planning. We will be a subrecipient, and we have established criteria and an application to start getting out to businesses. So, we can send that out. We'll distribute the guidelines and the application to the Board following today's meeting, so if you know of businesses that you think we may want to be talking with after next week, we're ready to go. We're excited about that.

At the end of February to get rescheduled, myself, Natalie, and Brendan will be attending EDC's Annual Winter

Conference. One of the things we're going to be spending close attention on and hope to get more clarification on is changes with regard to prevailing wage mandates. Joe and I, we've talked to numerous counsel at various levels, and there's still not I'd say any strong clarification on how we should be moving forward with projects. But certainly, as that guidance comes in, we will modify and update our procedures accordingly, but we'll keep you posted on that.

And then lastly, I just wanted to bring to your attention the Governor did make her budget address yesterday, and I wanted to just highlight a few things related to economic development that we think were wise ideas. They are continuing a tax credit for small business for COVID-related expenses which we do think many of our small businesses are continuing to deal with COVID-related issues. For those in the affordable housing world, they did increase the State Low Income Housing Tax Credit aggregate cap growth. Which if you're working with LIHTC, I think you probably know better how that will impact, but we know that's an important program.

And in addition to ones that we advocated for was the continuation and expansion of the Brownfield Cleanup Program, which we know has been effective, especially in a lot of our legacy sites here in upstate. Lastly, the Restore New York Program, which we also thought has been an effective program to deal with vacant and underutilized properties.

So, we were pleased to see from an economic development perspective that those programs have remained. It's also our understanding that the Regional Economic Development Council process will continue for a 12th round. The Downtown Revitalization project will also continue, and I believe potentially expand. They've also added basically a small city DRI, so one of the things actually it was this region that

advocated for our more rural village centers. That they don't have access to potentially the capacity or the ability to allocate as much funds, but that there would be a need for a like program. They have initiated I think what they're calling New York Forward, a small city DRI. We do think that could help, and we'd love to work with our village centers and our rural populations on that.

I think those were the items that I wanted to bring to your attention today, so I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Thank you, Stacey. Are there any questions for Stacey on our updates? Okay, you all I hope have had a chance to look at our unaudited financials through December 31, '21. Theresa, thank you, well done. I don't know if she's on or she's in the room.

MS. RYAN: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Needless to say, a very good year, the bulk of which as a result of the 265 closing. Any questions for Stacey relative to the financial statements?

MR. MIRABITO: I have a question. Are we classified as a not-for-profit?

MS. DUNCAN: No, it's a public benefit corporation. We're not a not-for-profit.

MR. MIRABITO: I just wonder what happens, if we have to do anything with all the what I'd call profits or income.

MS. DUNCAN: No, so it's a public benefit corporation.

MR. MIRABITO: Okay. So, we don't get that money?

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. We're just limited in how we can spend it, how we use it.

MALE VOICE: There's limits on how you can spend it and disperse it.

MR. MIRABITO: So, you just kind of put it aside, and you use it for later?

MS. DUNCAN: Okay.

MR. MIRABITO: Okay. Correct.

MS. DUNCAN: And just a note on the financials, on the summary of bank deposits and investments, you'll see the NBT Transition Account with about roughly \$308,000. That has been swept into... We did purchase a new Treasury with those funds. That always happens at the end of the month, so they're always reflected on the financials. However, we did re-allocate those funds to purchasing a new Treasury, and we have begun the audit process with Inero and expect to present that in March. As well, we'll have NBT come for an annual investment report.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Thank you, Stacey. Any other questions? Moving on, loan activity reports. Anybody have any questions for Natalie? Okay. New business, the 2022 meeting schedule is out and has been shared I believe, and I'm quite confident an invitation for every one of those meetings was attached. Any questions or comments regarding the proposed schedule?

Okay, item number eight, resolution accepting an application from 322 Main Street, LLC, authorizing a Sales and

Use Tax exemption in an amount not to exceed \$2,400 consistent with the policies of the Agency in connection with the renovation and equipping of the property and building located at 322 Main Street in the City of Binghamton, Broome County, New York. Stacey?

MS. DUNCAN: Yes. Is there an issue with it?

MALE VOICE: Yes.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, it's been revised for \$4,800.

MS. DUNCAN: Oh, did John not get that?

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: [inaudible].

MS. DUNCAN: Okay. I have that, but for some reason-

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: You know what? I'm going off the original agenda. My apologies.

MS. DUNCAN: Okay. I just want to make sure you have the correct one, John. So, you have one that says \$4,800?

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Yes. I stand corrected. Insert \$4,800, delete \$2,400. Sorry about that.

MS. DUNCAN: Got it. Yeah, thank you. Yes, so you have in front of you an application for our Small Business Incentive Program or our Sales Tax Exemption Program from Yosef Birnboim. He is on the call should any members of the Board have questions. The project includes renovations of existing building and site at 322 Main Street Binghamton, New York, including in-unit interior renovations, repairs, improvements

to bathrooms/kitchens, new refinished floors, lighting fixtures, painting, etc. Common space interior renovations include improved electrical and plumbing and new laundry room and storage facilities accessible for tenants.

Exterior renovations include removal and replacement of siding and roof, driveway and parking site repair, and the addition of bike racks. The result will provide an updated 12-unit market-rate apartment complex, improved living facilities, and amenities for the tenants. A total project cost on this is roughly \$484,000. The eligible exemption on this for sales tax is \$4,800. He's happy to answer any questions the Board may have.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Any questions for Stacey or the developer? This would otherwise have gone through Governance. I guess I'm looking, unless there's objections, I'm looking for a motion to move forward with this resolution.

MR. BUCCI: Motion.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Is there a second?

MR. MIRABITO: Second.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: I did not hear the second. Was that Dan?

MR. MIRABITO: No, Joe seconded.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: I'm sorry, Joe. Any comments? Let's take a vote. All those in favor say aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Motion carried. Item number nine, discussion regarding revised Uniform Tax Exemption policy for the Broome County Industrial Development Agency. Stacey?

MS. DUNCAN: Thank you. So, you should have received a copy. Really, it was significantly increased in the formatting and the look, the design I guess if you will, of the previous Uniform Tax Exemption policy. I hope that it provides a more straightforward outline of our policy, including the integration of a number of points that the Board has made over the course of the last several months. Just a little bit of background. I'm going to give you a quick summary and then happy to answer questions and get into a discussion.

Following today's discussion, we would incorporate any additional feedback and then move this toward an approval process. However, in that period of time, we would also like to get feedback from our municipal partners as we move this forward. So very quickly, just to give you some background, in addition to the feedback and discussions from this Board, we also developed this in coordination with National Development Council and we used templates from the City of Syracuse IDA and the New Rochelle IDA, both of which were different in their formatting. One was significantly more comprehensive and had details that I don't think apply to our community's demographics, but my point being both were NDC-reviewed, so we did have that independent third-party analysis. We are sending this, and it's in the process of review with NDC.

It does place more emphasis on the standard term, rather than deviations. I think it strengthens and kind of tightens our process as it relates to how our pilots are developed and moves things towards what I think what we want, the standard term being the rule rather than the exception. It also sets

forth criteria for review for deviations to the standard terms. That was a topic that this Board has discussed quite in detail, but I think this is an important point, that the pilots will be developed in-house by IDA in consultation with the developer and the municipality and, where necessary, a third party like NDC.

Most notably, we would not consider accepting outside proposals. I think that's an important point. The staff has the capacity to develop these pilots. We know where those third-party resources are when needed. But most importantly, we want to do this in partnership with the developer and the municipality, rather than this coming to us and then having the Board maybe consider something it has not really had its hands on if you will.

It eliminates the accepted practice of approval by municipal resolution. This was a topic we've talked about. Article 18-A really does not require that the municipality by resolution sign off on the pilot. Certainly, we want the endorsement of the municipality, but we've had a process in which we have waited for our Board to deliberate until that's happened, and I think that's caused maybe some of the confusion or questions from the Board.

This is brand new. It adds a 10-year and a 20-year standard term for housing projects. As we know, most of what we deliberate on now is related to market-rate and affordable housing, and as such, I think we've been a little bit behind in not having a standard housing pilot schedule. We did differentiate this by number of units because those housing projects can run the gamut. You can have small projects, so we've started this at 50. 50 units or below would receive a 10-year standard term, and anything above 50 would be considered for a 20-year pilot schedule.

It does define, I think in more detail, a qualified transferee for pilot benefits. That was also a discussion that's occurred with this Board, is what happens when a property is sold? How do we go about doing those transfers? Our process has been historically not a lot of due diligence per se, but just basically assuming that if the use of the project remains the same, there were really very little prohibitions on transferring the pilot. Not that we want to prohibit it, but I think I've gotten the sense that we want to gain more information before we make that decision.

It outlines all information required from the applicant at the time of approval, and that would include additional financial details where needed. I think it's a more straightforward outline of what an applicant would need to do to apply for benefits. It outlines our cost-benefit analysis process in greater detail, and then lastly outlines our application process inside the UTEP. So, the requirement of the developer seeking substantial benefits from this agency would be required to become very familiar as we always want them to be, but we've outlined the process inside our UTEP.

So, with that, I'm happy to get everybody's feedback, questions, comments, concerns.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: So aside from the comments that we may hear today, where do we go with this, Stacey? Does this go back to Governance to tweak it or to suggest wholesale changes? Or do we carve out a special meeting where you receive all these comments let's say between now and whenever, and then we get together as a Board and say, "This is what we really want". Which direction are you going in, prior to us talking with the municipalities and making sure that they understand what we have in mind?

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. I mean, certainly if there's any visible changes/modifications that are recommended today, we can make those, incorporate those. I think it would make more sense to run this through Governance. It's clearly an issue to me related to Governance. So, to do a final review, schedule a Governance meeting, and if it makes sense-

MR. BUCCI: Yeah. I think obviously a lot of work has been done. This is pretty comprehensive and, as you noted, it really addressed a lot of the issues raised throughout the process. So, I think it's great. I was going to kind of echo what John was saying, like what the next steps are. We're looking for municipal input, right? Anybody else besides...? I mean, who do you need to bring into it to...?

MS. DUNCAN: I mean, to be quite frank, the way the legislation is written, it's up to this body to determine the-

MR. BUCCI: Input is kind of a courtesy.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Absolutely.

MR. BUCCI: Which is fine. So, I just was wondering what kind of timeline are we looking at for that process do you think?

MS. DUNCAN: To be honest, whatever timeline you all feel comfortable with the language in the UTEP.

MR. BUCCI: So you like, you want us to finalize it on our end and then send it out?

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah.

MR. BUCCI: Okay. I mean, we could put it on Governance again. I mean, I think if anybody in the interim has any changes, they could submit them to you. I don't want to speak for the Governance Committee, but I can't imagine significant changes to this from what I can see. So, I mean, we could look it over and put our imprimatur on it, for lack of a better way of saying it. [crosstalk].

MS. DUNCAN: Once it has been approved by the Board, one of the important processes is the notification to all taxing jurisdictions including our school districts, our county, local village, city, etc. So, the notification is a requirement, and a good practice even if it wasn't a requirement.

MR. BUCCI: Oh, yeah. I think so.

MS. DUNCAN: So, I think what we should do is review. If there's anything glaringly omitted from this or things you just wanted to have tweaked, we can do that in the next couple of weeks, and we'll target moving this in February. I do think it makes sense to advance an approval on this before-

MR. BUCCI: Right. Before more big projects come along.

MS. DUNCAN: I do anticipate a few more pilot projects coming forth, so I think having this ready to go is going to be helpful to our process. It doesn't preclude deviations too. I think it just requires a lot more analysis to be done, and I think sort of sequences things in the way they should have been sequenced.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: May I make a suggestion?

MS. DUNCAN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Governance maybe. I hate to put you guys through this, but maybe Governance has a special meeting soon, weighs in. We all present our comments to you. We can send you an email if we don't like this or don't understand that. Then the Board has a look at what appears to be the final document, but before we bless the document, I would like it sent out to the municipalities so that they're cognizant of what we're going to be voting on. Recognizing that it's our authority to do what we're going to do, but I want them to see it in advance with an invitation from you, Stacey. We'd be happy to explain it and maybe even set up a Zoom call to explain how this is going to work going forward. That's my suggestion.

MS. DUNCAN: Absolutely. We can do that.

MR. BUCCI: Yeah. We could set up a special meeting to keep it moving. Then Joe?

MR. MIRABITO: No, I just have a couple questions. Go ahead.

MR. BUCCI: No, go ahead.

MR. MIRABITO: Just so I understand, less than 50 units. Is that multiple units or is it houses, a housing development? I mean, if a guy wants to build 20 houses in a development, is that?

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. You bring up a question I know that we've discussed over the course of the last couple of years, and I did check on that with our bond counsel, with Harris

Beach, on exactly what you're asking. We are within authority to provide a benefit such as housing, a new-

MR. MIRABITO: So, is that the purpose of having this in the schedule, so if a guy is looking to do housing development, to say look here?

MS. DUNCAN: It's funny. It wasn't, but I think it serves that purpose. I was going to... Actually, somebody brought that up to me recently. A local businessperson said we really need to address the new housing starts issue, and I said we've had some conversations and looking at mechanics. I think it's a more detailed conversation we should have as a body, but there is a mechanism. I did confirm that we are within our authority to do something. I think it just has to be up to this group to decide what it would want to do.

And the other reason for the differentiation is the price points, the costs. Things can vary so much from a 15 to 20-unit project to a 100-plus. The only instances where I would see a longer-term pilot being required, there may be those and as long as we can prove that with a financial analysis, we can do that. But often with affordable housing projects, it might be linked into their mortgage requirements. So, there will be nuance to that, but at least it sets a benchmark for where to begin in my estimation.

MR. MIRABITO: I think it's great. You said you spoke with Syracuse and Newburgh?

MS. DUNCAN: New Rochelle, yeah.

MR. MIRABITO: New Rochelle? So, do they have in their schedule this for housing units?

MS. DUNCAN: They do have it, yeah. Yeah, that was a clear recommendation from NDC that we include a housing pilot program, a standard I should say.

MS. HORNBECK: Joe, to be clear, I will add a heading on that that says Housing because I see where we can where-

MR. MIRABITO: Yeah. I wasn't sure.

MS. HORNBECK: Yeah. [crosstalk].

MR. MIRABITO: When I was looking at that I was thinking this is intended for new home building. This is great. This is what a lot of people would ask for. Number two, what I call the clawback schedule, recapture schedule, did we come up with that? Or is that what these other areas have?

MS. DUNCAN: Most all the IDAs have a recapture/clawback policy. We've actually not ever included it in there, but I think it's important to include it on our Appendix A to demonstrate what that implication is. So, we've always outlined a recapture benefit in our UTEP. This small table that's inside the content of the UTEP, we did strengthen that about, I think in 20', I want to say maybe '19. We really only had up to three years, so after three years, you could have a 30-year pilot and then after three years be noncompliant. We didn't really have a strong mechanism in which we could recapture, so we have strengthened that prior to this, which I think is important.

We've also identified, which I think we did in the previous, those trigger events for recapture. So, I think we've just made it more detailed and more black-and-white.

MR. MIRABITO: Well, kudos to you because when I saw this, I was excited. It just answers a lot of stuff that we've been talking about.

MR. BUCCI: Yeah. It's more concise. Like you said, it's just more concise and orderly. It's much-

MS. DUNCAN: Cleaner. Yeah, I found it a little bit challenging to follow it sometimes myself, so yeah, I wanted to clean that up.

MR. BUCCI: Another thing you said too, I believe there's a standard term now. Not too any fault of this Board, but I think for a long time, the deviated terms seemed to be the norm. I mean, people just came in with the anticipation of just going right for the deviated term, sometimes whether they needed it or not, and I think by doing it this way, you have to really kind of defend your deviated term.

MS. DUNCAN: Yeah. The deviation. Agreed.

MR. BUCCI: So, I go back to what John was saying. I guess we could schedule a special meeting and then any other Board members could put input in too. We finalize it, and before it comes to the full Board, we would want to send it out to the municipalities.

MS. DUNCAN: Absolutely. Request feedback, and then once the final draft is approved, then we would do a notification to all taxing jurisdictions. I'm happy to do more of a Slide Deck or a Zoom to make-

MR. BUCCI: Okay. That sounds like a plan.

Ms. DUNCAN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Great idea. Thank you. Executive Session, are we going into executive session, Stacey?

MS. DUNCAN: I currently don't have any items.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: Okay. Moving forward. Any old business?

MS. DUNCAN: [inaudible], sorry.

MR. BUCCI: It's pretty straightforward anyway.

CHAIRMAN BERNARDO: I'll take that as a no. I'm looking for a motion to adjourn this meeting.

[The meeting was adjourned on an approved motion by Mr. Peduto, seconded by Mr. Gates, at 12:35PM.]

[Attendees: John Bernardo, Jim Peduto, Rich Bucci, Dan Crocker, Joe Mirabito, Dan Gates, Cheryl Sacco, Stacey Duncan, Natalie Abbadessa, Carrie Hornbeck, Brendan O'Bryan, Theresa Ryan, Amy Williamson, Patrick Doyle, Joe Meagher, Michael Tanzini, Yosef Birnboim, Tzedek Gilmore, Jeff Patsky, Paul Cundiff.]