

SARATOGA COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

**Saratoga County Planning Department
50 West High Street, Ballston Spa, NY 12020**

May 13, 2025-8:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Members: Chairman Sutton, Phil Klein, Tom Lewis, Erinn Kolligian, Kevin Tollisen, Mike Mooney

STAFF AND GUESTS: Scott Duffy, CEO; Jeff Many, CFO; Kimberly Lambert, Administrator; James Carminucci, Counsel to the Agency; Greg Connors, SEDC; Steve Bulger, County Administrator; Cassie Drake

ABSENT: Yvonne Manso

Chairman Sutton called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Minutes: April 8, 2025:

Chairman Sutton asked for the approval of the April 8, 2025 meeting minutes.

Ms. Lambert advised that there is an addition to the meeting minutes. The minutes did not reflect an attendee, Frank McClement, a Council person for the Town of Waterford.

Ms. Kolligian made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected; Mr. Tollisen seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, as all were in favor.

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Sutton stated that we have a short agenda today, but it is important to get clarification from the members on how we want to treat some of the applications coming into us that have been challenging when it pertains to our UTEP as it is now.

We have not made changes to the UTEP since 2014 but one of the things that have been happening in the past five or six months is a housing component that has been a challenge in terms of job creation and community benefits that they offer the county. There are quite a few housing projects that are in the hopper. We have made some exceptions on housing based on what we feel will satisfy some of the criteria that we have in our UTEP. We take cover on some of the items under commercial services which are jobs created, salaries, benefits, payroll, importance to local economy, jobs retained, capital investment, impact of a project of existing business or segment, impact of projects on public infrastructure and services, and projects that involve redevelopment of distressed or under-utilized properties.

We have been falling back on some of those definitions as to what type of benefits we might be able to afford for housing projects. Housing projects per se do not create jobs as we know but some of the applications that are coming in are mixing retail, infrastructure and various other areas where there may be some community benefits.

In the past couple weeks, Ms. Lambert was able to pick up a UTEP from Clinton County IDA. It is very comprehensive in their definition of housing. They have a points system in how they go about various benefits and if they don't meet the criteria, they won't offer a PILOT. We also got a note from Warren-Washington County IDA as to what they consider affordable housing. So, we have been looking into these

types of things. I think this board needs to have a better definition of how we go about offering or not offering a benefit package for housing projects whether they be workforce housing or affordable housing.

Mr. Connors stated that there are four projects now that were presented to the sub-committee last month. Out of those four projects, all but one has a housing component connected to it. One which is in the Town of Wilton, as this board is aware, is The Parc Community Project, which is 100% senior housing with a substantial dollar amount in public benefits.

Mr. Connors stated that Chairman Sutton is right; these housing projects don't create a number of jobs. They create some but typically always in single digits. Beyond the four projects that are under consideration by this board, I get several calls a week from developers that are interested in what the IDA does to support them but also employers who say to me, what are you doing about workforce housing?

Mr. Connors stated that is not in our wheelhouse, and I don't speak on behalf of the IDA but to give the Chairman a sense of the level of interest and the dollars, the four projects have close to \$300 million dollars in new investment in Saratoga County. There is substantial investment involved and despite the fact that minimal jobs are created for housing, I think the Chairman and the board are right on with deciding how we are going to handle these.

Mr. Connors stated that the Halfmoon Project is a mix of commercial and residential. The community and county benefits associated with that commercial investment are significant. So, I think the board has to think about the sales tax revenue that's generated because of these commercial projects. The medical project in Wilton that has a small residential component, as defined by the applicant, that's addressing the unmet health care needs there. So, there are a lot of different boxes that we are seeing right now and of course all of them are efforts to promote Saratoga County.

Mr. Connors stated that I hope that offers some kind of insight, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Sutton responded that in Saratoga Springs, the planning board wants to see retail on the bottom floor, offices on the second floor, and housing third and fourth floors. So again, I agree that there will be eventually sales tax benefit when these projects come before us.

Chairman Sutton stated that Ms. Lambert did the research on the Clinton County IDA's UTEP and that was a very extensive undertaking by that county to come up with a plan to go about how to come up the benefits. They go to a points system. Ms. Lambert, can you elaborate on what you learned from this?

Ms. Lambert stated a lot of the IDA's are assisting in different counties to do a needs assessment because you don't know what you don't know i.e. what type of housing, what does your inventory look like, is it all in one town, is it all before a certain date, etc.

Ms. Lambert stated that Clinton County did very extensive research and a needs assessment, and then from that they created a site-specific financial feasibility study, so what does it look like to develop a property and what are those costs and what is the financial gap in between. If you don't understand that then that makes it difficult to even attempt to put together a comprehensive UTEP. They went through that process and defined what does affordable housing mean, what does market rate housing mean and what does senior housing mean. They put all of that together in their UTEP and they just approved that in April.

Ms. Lambert stated that it is kind of complicated. This body can choose to go through a complicated route to try to figure out all of that or it can be simplified as with some of your discussions you have gone through to just be sales tax and mortgage tax. What the Clinton County IDA did come up with is a points-based spreadsheet based on different scenarios and based on those points then creates a specific tier on

what your PILOT would be or just sales tax or just mortgage tax exemptions. This body could identify certain community benefits that reach certain levels that could be tiered in as well. There are different ways and different ideas on going through it but Clinton County does have a comprehensive plan. They also addressed renewable energy projects as well since those typically don't create a lot of jobs either.

Chairman Sutton stated that I don't want to compare Saratoga County to Clinton County or any other county. I think we can sit on our own progress and projects we have approved in the past. I don't think we need to be as complicated as the Clinton County Project. But what I would like to approach is what does this board think we should be doing from this point forward when it comes to housing projects and what benefits we might be able to approve.

Mr. Connors stated that Ms. Lambert and Clinton County hit on something that is the problem across the state and that is that there is no clear definition as to what these housing projects are. Is it senior housing? Is it workforce housing? Is it affordable housing? Is it subsidized housing? There is no definition. It's really a problem so that may be a component of your thought process as well.

Chairman Sutton stated that in reading through Clinton County IDA's UTEP, they define the different types of housing and then give a criteria as to what percentage of benefit they might give to that project. They seem to go beyond the 10-year PILOT that we do. They go up to 15 years if it qualifies for benefits. Again, I don't want to compare ourselves to Clinton County because it became very complex, but Mr. Duffy put together an idea of how we might be able to go forward.

Chairman Sutton stated that some of the things that the subcommittee had been talking about is having a financial review of some of these projects. Some of the projects might not need one but some of the projects are so complex and their investments are so large, do we have the capacity to analyze them properly or should we get a third-party financial statement? Mr. Duffy, can you review what you came up?

Mr. Duffy stated that this came out of the subcommittee meeting last week. The goal was to accommodate discretionary allowances to the board with projects that include housing and/or retail components. Currently, these projects may fall under the commercial level in our UTEP but recent projects have pushed the board to more tightly define our consideration requirements.

Mr. Duffy stated that his first thought was a third-party financial review of a project pro forma to support the need for the IDA financial mitigation to illustrate that it's required to have for a successful project. It's so if someone came to us and said it's not going to happen if we don't get this, we aren't going forward. There are companies out there that review those pro formas and do it quickly. They would be able to tell us from a professional standpoint, this project does need some relief or else it's not going to happen because it's upside down. If we had a project that we were able to entertain, we would verify in that regard with this financial analysis and then it would also give the board some cover.

Ms. Kolligian stated that it would also show the next people coming in that we are doing our due diligence.

Mr. Connors states that typically when an applicant comes to us, the first thing we speak about is the 'but for' provision, but for the IDA's incentives and benefits, you don't qualify.

Chairman Sutton stated that the housing projects, the developers have done their due diligence and what they are going to charge for one bedroom, two bedroom, etc. So, do they need our assistance to move forward with that? Since they have already done their due diligence, it would just be icing on the cake to get money from us and that is what we are trying to avoid. We don't need that type of development. We

need manufacturing and businesses to come into the county to create jobs and that has been the purpose of this IDA since I have been a member and since it was established.

Mr. Duffy stated there is a much higher awareness of the IDA and SEDC functioning and more people are realizing there might be an opportunity for benefit here.

Mr. Kolligian stated you miss 100% of the shots you don't take.

Mr. Duffy stated that one of the things Mr. Mooney suggested was that the cost of the analysis should be the applicant's responsibility. We would commission it, so the applicant isn't doing it but if we commission it, we know a third party is handling the report.

Mr. Duffy stated that another option would be to have a minimum and a maximum on a housing project.

Mr. Lewis stated that Planning and Town Boards have been requesting third party reports for years, so it is nothing new about this. I wouldn't necessarily say it is required for all because certain ones are obviously right, so I think it's a good idea.

Mr. Connors stated I also think there is a difference between a 2.5-million-dollar investment and a 100-million-dollar investment so the board, using their discretion, can scale the benefit.

Mr. Duffy stated that goes along with the second point, a minimum community benefit. There is one project in the bucket right now, the community benefit might be around 7%. So, I put 5% community benefit as a start. The whole thing I tried to do was give the board discretion and opportunity to support something that would be beneficial to their community that is outside of what we typically do.

Mr. Tollisen stated that his concern with the 5% is that with a big project, 5% may be a super number. But I think the language that the board has the final discretion with that certainly gives us the wiggle room that this is substantial community benefit but it's not 5%.

Chairman Sutton whether it is this board or a future board, they have to have the discretion to be able to analyze the project and the merits of that project based on the application. No two applications that I have seen are the same, everyone and their needs are different.

Mr. Connors stated that another thing that I confront is that I have a different definition of community benefit than the applicant.

Ms. Kolligian stated we need to be careful not to lock ourselves into black and white language when it is such a gray area. I think it is important that this board maintains discretion and flexibility to every application. Everyone is going to go for the bare minimum of community benefit when it is not their specific project. So do I think we need a minimum, yes. But if we are looking at a project a few million vs a hundred million, that 5% we should expect to grow as the project grows and impacts the area.

Mr. Connors asked if the board would consider projects that have a housing component that have a connection to the area's median income. Some of the other regional economic groups have tied a percentage of the units and a percentage of the area median income as requirements to attract workforce housing.

Chairman Sutton stated we have seen that in the applications before us right now. All three of the projects that are before us right now have that component and there is an analysis of it but there's no statement in

the application stating this is what we are going to be charging, and it will have to be tied to some index. The AMI in each corner of the county is different.

Mr. Carminucci stated you will also need to consider how you monitor that. For instance, if you approve a project and only do sales tax and mortgage tax benefits, you are only in that project through construction. If you impose a requirement to meet AMI thresholds, you are going to be monitoring the project through 10 years even though there are no benefits after the first two years.

Mr. Duffy stated that Clinton County IDA does have a PILOT option in it and, but I think keeping that out absolves this board from having to follow up for the next 10-15 years, we don't have the staff to do that, it's just not possible.

Ms. Kolligian asked if Clinton went through the comprehensive plan to try to get housing and more people to move to Clinton County? Is that why they are throwing incentives out there? If so, we are not in the same boat so we can't compare ourselves to them.

Mr. Duffy stated that is why I think we can do it more simply and tightly and give the board discretion based on community benefit at the end of the day.

Mr. Tollisen stated this shows that other IDA's are struggling with this and trying to get a plan in place.

Mr. Connors stated the other issue, which is more of a public policy issue, is that each county's approach to providing benefits and incentives for housing is completely different. So, they are not consistent with each other.

Mr. Duffy stated after this current bucket of projects, we are going to draw a line in the sand and have a plan going forward that does protect this board and gives an option to consider projects and benefits.

Mr. Mooney stated that the state gives IDA's tremendous latitude on what to approve and what to not approve and their criteria is they allow the counties to do what's best for the county. So, our issue is whether these apartments are good for the county and do we want them. We are allowed to do this but if we do one, we will have to do them all. If we develop a specific policy for it, we are going to have every housing project in the county come before us. And personally, I don't think apartments are the best thing for the county.

Ms. Kolligian stated she had the same thought, why incentivize housing? What part of housing do we need, is it the affordability? Again, what is the difference between affordable, market rate, workforce and senior housing.

Mr. Connors stated the employers that have spoken to me would disagree with that comment. There is a need for housing. The difference is it has to be workforce housing. A two-bedroom apartment for \$6,500 a month is what we are talking about. We are talking about \$1,500 a month which doesn't exist here. That is why I think the IDA needs to consider something, whether in your discretion or in a policy for the ability for county employers to attract entry level workers.

Ms. Kolligian stated she does agree with the workforce housing, but to Mr. Carminucci's point, if we are only giving sales and mortgage tax, we have no oversight into what they are charging after they get their benefit.

Chairman Sutton stated that he agrees with Mr. Mooney. To weave in workforce housing it will have to be on an application basis. I just don't think we would be able to monitor that so it would have to stay at sales tax and mortgage tax abatements which can be large numbers.

Chairman Sutton stated that I think our job too at the IDA is to keep development rolling in the county whether we are creating jobs or we don't create jobs, but it just depends on how much money we want to allocate to certain projects. My opinion is that the housing should not be part of the criteria on how we give out money.

Ms. Kolligian asked if the IDA is the appropriate board for these developers to come to for housing incentives. For some of them, we are their last-ditch effort. But if we are looking for market rate housing, is this board really the ones that they should be coming to?

Mr. Connors stated that the housing project that is currently underway in Stillwater received benefits from Mechanicville-Stillwater IDA, the project applicant was encouraged by the planning board to go to the IDA for benefits. So, to your point, I think some of these other governing bodies look to the IDA as a financing arm, which is certainly not the case.

Mr. Carminucci stated that subsidized housing benefits through the state are monitored, you sign a regulatory agreement, and you have to maintain certain criteria to maintain your tax credits. The oversight and compliance are intense, but you are dealing with the state who is staffed to do that.

Mr. Klein asked what would stop us from hiring a firm to monitor these projects from not raising the rents?

Mr. Duffy stated that he thinks it is better off to weigh the community benefit whether it is infrastructure or something else, but it is tangible than to go down that route that would end up opening another can of worms.

Mr. Lewis stated where are the market forces? Saratoga County keeps growing. If I was in a small town, I would think of going to the IDA for benefits but not in this large county. I'm for reviewing case by case but as a general rule, I'm not for the IDA doing affordable housing.

Chairman Sutton asked Mr. Bulger is there are state run programs that will give benefits for affordable and workforce housing?

Mr. Bulger stated yes, there are, and Mr. Carminucci referred to them. It is on the builder to set those up. I think what this board must be aware of is that it is very different from town to town and county to county as to what the elected officials are looking for. I also agree that it should be on a case-by-case basis and that the wishes of the town need to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Lewis stated the example I will give you is at the County Planning Board, we always look at what does the town want. The County Planning Board goes out of its way to communicate with every town.

Mr. Carminucci asked that for these types of projects, would you require a letter of support from the town board indicating they are in favor of the project?

Ms. Kolligian stated that she would suggest getting a letter of support from the entire board as we don't know if everybody on the board would have the same opinion.

Mr. Connors stated to take it a step further, if there is a project the Town of Wilton let's say, and the planning board has given approval, isn't that an expression that the town is in favor.

Mr. Carminucci stated that you have Use of Right in New York. It is hard for a planning board to not approve something. I think what you would be asking the town board is if they support the IDA getting involved in the project.

Mr. Connors stated that the state money has some strings. There is a healthy line item in the budget to support housing of all types. But the first thing you have to do as an individual municipality is to accept by the town board's resolution is that you are housing ready. But that is the discretion of the town board too. And if the town board says no, then the state options are somewhat limited.

Ms. Kolligian asked if these housing projects should be going somewhere before they come in front of the IDA? If we are incentivizing housing that we don't need, besides affordable and workforce housing, are we the ones providing affordable and workforce housing? I would say no. They should go somewhere prior to us where they would get more benefits. And if they go somewhere before us, and they get accepted or denied, now we know why that is. If they do get accepted, now we know how much they received in state benefit or state aid. This gives us a parameter of how much they have already received and how we can help them. It seems like we are the last-ditch effort when we shouldn't be.

Chairman Sutton stated in the interest of time, would everyone feel comfortable in expressing their opinion to Scott so we can finish this in our next meeting, or do you want to continue now to see if we can come to a consensus. Ideas, thoughts?

Mr. Mooney stated that he is comfortable with the UTEP as it is. I would also like to see a cost benefit analysis done by a third party. I think we can determine if we will need them for all projects once we know the fee structure of the consultants. These reports are great because they show the true cost benefit so the benefit to the county and the cost to the county.

Mr. Tollisen asked how much these reports cost and how long did they take to complete?

Mr. Carminucci stated that they can be done quickly. Depending on who you are working with, it typically won't hold up the process.

Ms. Kolligian asked if we need them for projects that are receiving a PILOT because they have oversight and have to report numbers each year.

Mr. Mooney responded that he knows certain IDA's do them on every project. They list the projects on the website and show the cost benefits so anyone can go on and look at the benefit to the county.

Mr. Duffy responded, Mr. Mooney, you are suggesting keeping UTEP as it is, but the cost benefit analysis is the lever that gives you information to make a decision.

Mr. Lewis stated that I hope it's not required for every project because I do not want to put up unnecessary regulations and unnecessary costs.

Mr. Carminucci asked Mr. Mooney is this proposal just for housing projects.

Mr. Mooney responded for everything.

Mr. Connors stated that I would also like to see the board act on some type of definition for community benefit. I think that is an important part.

Chairman Sutton stated we do have this defined in commercial services, but it is broad where we can interpret it the way we want to interpret it depending on the economic conditions of the day.

Mr. Carminucci stated that I would caution you that when the UTEP was done, that commercial services category was never intended to cover housing projects. If you contemplate entertaining more projects down the road, I suggest modifying the UTEP to have it speak to that type of project. The whole purpose of the UTEP is to tell everyone for a specific project what type of benefit is available. The word housing is not included in there now. You are subject to criticism if you get involved in projects that involve housing, but your UTEP doesn't mention housing.

Mr. Duffy asked if everyone would be comfortable reviewing this document, marking it up and sending it back to me. We can use this as a starting point to start to define a housing project. We will keep it simple.

Mr. Tollisen stated he would like to know the costs.

Mr. Duffy stated he will find out the costs and the turnaround time for the reports.

Chairman Sutton stated this has been thought provoking and if you have any other ideas, get back to Mr. Duffy or Ms. Lambert on what your thoughts might be so that we can give direction to SEDC as we move forward. We would have to have an amendment to the UTEP which would be a public hearing. This is just for the housing component of the UTEP. Thank you for your discussion, it gives us some help on how to move forward.

Chairman Sutton stated the next item on our agenda is the CEO report.

CEO Report:

Mr. Duffy stated that we have covered everything so we can move on.

CFO Report:

Mr. Many stated for item number one, that was tabled due to the PARIS reporting. It is getting close, but I need some information from Mr. Duffy and Ms. Lambert to get this wrapped up in the next few days.

Administrator:

Ms. Lambert stated that I have received all PILOT payments and am doing the final distributions now.

There will be a closing for Core Tech Industrial Group today and the SEDC payment split will be \$9,375.

Agency Counsel:

Mr. Carminucci stated that the Saratoga County Authority Water Project that we did a few years ago has made their final payments. I have to reach out to their counsel and arrange to have the agreements satisfied.

We have the Core Tech closing this afternoon.

Other Business:

Mr. Connors stated that I have a few things for the board's consideration. I would like to hand out a proposed service agreement between SEDC and the County IDA. What I was able to find is that the last agreement was executed in 2015. That was fully executed by my predecessor and the Chairman. Then there was a 2019 agreement that wasn't signed and included the prosperity partnership. What I have distributed for the members' consideration is a new agreement with a few changes; obviously the address was updated, we have been in business for over 45 years, the SEDC SCIDA payment split is consistent with what Ms. Lambert, and I work on a regular basis, that hasn't changed.

Mr. Connors stated that the other thing that I have proposed for your consideration is that currently under the contract, the maximum fee paid to SEDC is \$75,000. I propose we increase that to \$100,000. As the board is aware, there have been very few projects to this point that have come close to that number, but as we see the projects currently under review by the subcommittee, that number is getting higher. I think that is just the impact we are having in Saratoga County.

Mr. Connors stated that to Mr. Duffy's request, section 8 of the agreement is simply titled Replacement. So, there are some very minor changes.

Mr. Connors stated that the other change that I would propose is that this is switched from a two-year agreement to a three-year agreement. I think a three-year agreement would be consistent with the IDA's past practice.

Mr. Connors stated that I would ask the board to consider accepting that agreement and authorizing the Chairman to sign.

Mr. Carminucci stated that he has reviewed the agreement and didn't have any concerns.

Mr. Tollisen made a motion to approve the proposed contract with the SEDC and Mr. Mooney seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, as all were in favor.

RESOLUTION #1618

RESOVLED, THAT the Saratoga County IDA does approve the proposed contract with the SEDC.

AYES: Mr. Tollisen, Mr. Mooney, Ms. Kolligian, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Klein, Chairman Sutton

NOES: None

ADOPTED: 6-0

Mr. Connors stated that the other thing that I would like to propose for the IDA's consideration is that the last few months I have been working with the Business Journal, which is the corporate arm of the Capital District Business Review, and I have discussed a marketing program that would market Saratoga County.

Mr. Connors stated that I would like to focus our marketing effort on those states that currently have semiconductor manufacturing facilities under construction like Arizona, Texas, Oregon and Ohio. The focus would be over an eight-month period, there's about 2.5 million touches that they have proposed. The proposal would be for Saratoga County to market in these specifically targeted areas the supply chain within the 21st century manufacturing economic sector and to be able to use GlobalFoundries as a conversation point to attract those companies in the supply chain to Saratoga County at some point.

Mr. Connors stated that the cost of the program is \$175,000. I have had a conversation with the county Administrator about Saratoga County also supporting the project economically. What I propose is that we share with the county and with SEDC each a third of the project in an effort over this eight-month period to attract 21st century supply chain to Saratoga County. What I have passed out to each of you is a plan of how this would be rolled out.

Mr. Bulger stated that we have talked about it, and it is something that I would bring before the board of supervisors to gauge their interest.

Chairman Sutton asked what the timeline is for this project?

Mr. Connors stated as soon as possible. I want to tie it into the racing season because of the international eyes on Saratoga at that time. This isn't a Capital Region program, it is a marketing program that goes beyond the geographic boundaries of New York State.

Mr. Klein asked to clarify the goal of this program.

Mr. Connors responded that the goal is to have companies within that supply chain learn more about Saratoga County, the quality of life we offer and the opportunity that we offer here to create an environment for them to make their next capital investment.

Chairman Sutton stated let's take a review of this and we would like to know the county's reaction to this program as well.

Mr. Connor stated I would like to extend my thanks to the IDA's support. The annual meeting at UPH was a great success. The Belmont on Broadway VIP experience is an exclusive for SEDC and we have extended free pass access to the member of the IDA if you are interested in that event.

Mr. Connors stated that in cooperation with Saratoga Chamber of Commerce, we are trying to put together a trade mission to Canada sometime in the month of June to support Seleno, which made an investment here in Saratoga County. More details to come on that.

Chairman Sutton asked how is the presale on the Belmont?

Mr. Connors responded that is rock star. We opened Belmont on Broadway last Thursday and by Sunday evening we had 130 of our member stakeholders sign up. The Belmont stakes festival, the July 4th festival, and then the regular meet, there will be 49 world class racing days this year. From the report that the IDA has generated, that is about a 450-million-dollar economic impact to the community and to the region.

Chairman Sutton stated that he would like to thank the board again for authorizing that study. I hear that the study is being used all the time. Money well spent.

Mr. Klein asked if the airport is going to meet the deadline.

Mr. Bulger stated that he had a walkthrough and the only word I can use is spectacular. It is state-of-the-art; a nice facility and it is going to blow people away. It is something that the county can be proud of. To your point, I received an email yesterday, the official ribbon cutting will not be until the end of June. We expect the governor to be there because it is primarily state funded project. They do think they will be able to open for the week of Belmont to use part of the terminal. The restaurant and other certain parts won't be open though.

Mr. Connors stated as a quick follow up, our energy effort at Grande Industrial Park is moving along. The presence of Regeneron has accelerated that. The approximate number of vehicles that would need EV support is over 200 vehicles, including the school district, that may require additional power.

Mr. Connors stated that I was on a call with National Grid and Regeneron and what we thought would be a 50-megawatt project is turning out to be an 80-megawatt project. So exciting things are happening there.

Chairman Sutton asked if there is anything else that needs to come before the board?

The meeting was adjourned on a motion made by Mr. Klein, seconded by Mr. Mooney with all voting in favor at 9:49 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Drake