

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF DUTCHESS

-----X
DUTCHESS COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY RE:

NORTH CROSS, LLC
-----X

DATE: May 10, 2021
9:30 a.m. - 9:48 a.m.

Frances M. Elmes, Reporter

MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
CONDUCTED BY REMOTE VIDEOCONFERENCE

MARY T. BABIARZ COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
(845) 471-2511

1 APPEARING BY REMOTE VIDEOCONFERENCE:

2 DONALD CAPPILLINO, Hearing Officer
3 CAPPILLINO & ROTHSCHILD, LLP
4 Seven Broad Street
5 P.O. Box 390
6 Pawling, New York 12564
7 E-mail: Dc@cappillino.com

8 SARAH LEE, CFO, Think Dutchess Alliance
9 for Business
10 3 Neptune Avenue
11 Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
12 E-mail: Sarah@thinkdutchess.com

13 MARILYN YERKS

14 JAMES BERETTA

15 DOREEN TIGNANELLI

16 LAUREN O'NEILL

17 FINN O'NEILL

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Proceedings

2 MR. CAPPILLINO: Good morning,
3 everyone. Welcome to the Public
4 Hearing. Before this Public Hearing
5 began I had marked as Hearing Officer's
6 Exhibit Number 1 in evidence a Notice of
7 Public Hearing in this matter, the
8 Public Hearing concerning the
9 application of North Cross, LLC for
10 financial assistance from the Dutchess
11 County Industrial Agency. The notice of
12 Public Hearing indicates that this
13 Public Hearing be held today, May 10th,
14 at 9:30 a.m.

15 I have marked as Hearing
16 Officer's Exhibit Number 2 in evidence
17 the affidavit of the Poughkeepsie
18 Journal indicating that this Notice of
19 Public Hearing was run in the
20 Poughkeepsie Journal on April 26th. I
21 had marked as Hearing Officer's Exhibit
22 Number 3 in evidence the April 23, 2021
23 affidavit of Jenna Jones indicating that
24 a true copy of the Notice of Public
25 Hearing was served upon Supervisor

1 Proceedings

2 Aileen Rohr of the the Town of Hyde
3 Park, on the Superintendent of Schools
4 of Dutchess County --- I'm sorry, of the
5 Hyde Park Central School District,
6 Mrs. Aviva Kafka, and upon the Dutchess
7 County Executive, Honorable Marcus J.
8 Molinaro.

9 I had marked as Hearing Officer's
10 Exhibit Number 4 in evidence the
11 April 21, 2021 letter of Vice Chairman
12 Mark Doyle of the Dutchess County
13 Industrial Development Agency appointing
14 me the hearing officer in this Public
15 Hearing. And with that I will open the
16 Public Hearing. Does anyone on behalf
17 of the applicant want to make a short
18 statement?

19 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Hi. Thank
20 you. This is Lauren O'Neill on behalf
21 of North Cross, LLC. I'd like to thank
22 everyone for their time and attention to
23 this matter. I know at the preliminary
24 hearing there were a couple of open
25 concerns. We have worked with the IDA

1 Proceedings

2 to address those, including the revision
3 of the lot lines in order to solidify
4 the project's classification as a
5 commercial project, as well as we've
6 been talking through some additional
7 incentives.

8 So I'm happy to take any
9 questions from the public or listen to
10 any concerns. We want to make sure this
11 project is working out in everyone's
12 best interest as we move forward.

13 MR. CAPPILLINO: Okay. Does
14 anyone from the public want to be heard?
15 Mr. Beretta?

16 MR. BERETTA: Yeah. Hi, good
17 morning. So I sent in written comments,
18 hopefully you received those.

19 MR. CAPPILLINO: Yes, I received
20 them. They went to Sarah, she sent them
21 on to me.

22 MR. BERETTA: All right. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. CAPPILLINO: And they will be
25 sent to the board along with the

1 Proceedings

2 transcript, so they will see it.

3 MR. BERETTA: All right. Thank
4 you. I'm opposed to the granting of the
5 financial assistance. In general I feel
6 that these projects that give financial
7 assistance are just a transfer of tax
8 burden to the rest of the taxpaying
9 public. This particular project is only
10 going to --- according to their
11 application is only going to add three
12 jobs. I hardly see that that is
13 justification for this.

14 MR. CAPPILLINO: Yeah. Three
15 permanent jobs, yes.

16 MR. BERETTA: Right, three.
17 Right, three permanent jobs. The
18 preliminary vote was interesting, or I
19 should say the vote for the preliminary
20 approval was interesting in respect to
21 Vice Chairman Mark Doyle's vote which
22 was initially no until he realized that
23 they need a quorum and there were only
24 four voting members present and when he
25 realized that he scuttled the vote for

1 Proceedings

2 the preliminary approval he quickly
3 changed his mind to vote yes when there
4 was no additional information or changes
5 to the, you know, information that was
6 given. So it was clear --- it was clear
7 that he only changed his mind because he
8 didn't want to bear the burden of
9 scuttling the preliminary approval. So
10 I don't know what that says.

11 MR. CAPPILLINO: Well, it was for
12 a preliminary approval so that it could
13 go forward for a Public Hearing to allow
14 the public to comment, but the final
15 vote will come when the board meets on
16 the project, yes, and you're correct.

17 MR. BERETTA: Nonetheless, it was
18 a vote and he had some reservations that
19 caused him to vote no until he realized
20 that he bore the burden of, you know,
21 the preliminary approval not passing.

22 Chairman Dean keeps modifying his
23 position on whether a third-party
24 consultant is needed. First, you know,
25 he said that the board was growing more

1 Proceedings

2 and more uncomfortable, especially with
3 residential projects, then it became
4 residential with commercial. So, you
5 know, exactly what his position is, you
6 know, I'm not sure of that, and I'm not
7 sure what sort of direction the rest of
8 the board is getting on this.

9 The other thing, you know, two
10 members on the board have a conflict of
11 interest with this project and they
12 rightfully, you know, said that and they
13 recused themselves. There's a third
14 member who announced that he has
15 property across the street from this.
16 So, you know, there's just a lot of
17 relationships here that are also
18 questionable in my mind. So that will
19 conclude my comments. Thank you.

20 MR. CAPPILLINO: All right.
21 Thank you. Ms. Tignanelli, do you have
22 something to add?

23 MS. TIGNANELLI: Yes, I would,
24 and I will be sending momentarily my
25 written comments to Ms. Lee. So I am

1 Proceedings

2 also opposed to the issuance of any
3 financial assistance to this project. I
4 don't believe it is needed. The project
5 is likely to be profitable even without
6 assistance due to the low apartment
7 vacancy rates in the county and even the
8 2020 Dutchess County rental housing
9 survey prepared by Dutchess County
10 Planning notes that the low vacancy
11 rates for apartment rentals benefits
12 landlords.

13 Also this is --- there's no
14 manufacturing or commercial component to
15 this project. It's 50 residential units
16 and application materials show three new
17 FTEs will be created over a period of
18 two years. A potentially higher density
19 on this project could eliminate the need
20 for IDA financial assistance.

21 At the April 14th meeting this
22 was brought up by Board Member Piccone,
23 he wondered if a higher density would
24 require --- would not require the
25 developer to seek relief from the IDA

1 Proceedings

2 without details, such as number of
3 discounts, the rate of discounts and the
4 income limits for the workforce
5 population, they're under no obligation
6 to provide those discounts.

7 And income limits, if they do
8 agree to that in writing, then there
9 should be income limits, because not all
10 the targeted workforce populations as
11 defined, firefighters, teachers,
12 whatever, need subsidies. For example,
13 the Arlington Fire District
14 firefighters, in 2020 the majority
15 earned more than 100,000 in wages, as
16 much as --- with the highest wage being
17 over \$175,000. So you can't just make a
18 blanket statement that the targeted
19 workforce would be firefighters
20 included. There should be income
21 limits. And, again, there should be
22 something legal.

23 Also, speaking of the FTEs that
24 are to be created, they wouldn't --- two
25 of those job are projected at \$45,000 a

1 Proceedings

2 year salary and according to the
3 county's rental housing survey in order
4 to have a --- to afford a two bedroom
5 market rate apartment in a complex the
6 size of the North Cross project you'd
7 have to have a rental --- an annual
8 income of \$70,000. So two of the three
9 FTEs that are created by this project
10 couldn't even afford to live in the
11 complex on the projected salary. So at
12 minimum the IDA should require an
13 affordable housing component when
14 they're giving financial assistance to
15 residential projects.

16 Also, back to the vote by Mr.
17 --- Vice Chairman Doyle. The fact that
18 he flipped his vote the way he did
19 despite the couching by Attorney
20 Cappillino, the point is he voted ---
21 (Interrupted)

22 MR. CAPPILLINO: I'm sorry,
23 couching? What was I doing?

24 MS. TIGNANELLI: Your
25 explanation.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. CAPPILLINO: Okay. But go
3 ahead, I'll respond when you're
4 finished, please.

5 MS. TIGNANELLI: Okay. In spite
6 of that no --- he changed his vote with
7 no new information provided and, you
8 know, again, that just does not say much
9 for the thought process of board
10 members. It just seems like the board
11 members are there just to approve
12 projects and regardless, so...

13 And my last --- my last point is
14 that the financial assistance in the
15 form of tax breaks shifts the tax burden
16 to the remaining base often leading to
17 higher tax bills for all other
18 residents. Thank you.

19 MR. CAPPILLINO: All right.
20 Thank you. All right. I don't have
21 anything to say. Does anybody --- does
22 the applicant want to address any issues
23 here?

24 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Yeah, that
25 would be great. Thank you,

1 Proceedings

2 Mr. Cappillino. To Mr. Beretta's and
3 Ms. Tignanelli's point about the ---
4 they seem to believe the only benefits
5 that will be derived from the project
6 are the three permanent jobs, but the
7 project itself ---- and this was based
8 on us paying a lower tax. We had a
9 market study done, and at our own cost,
10 for the project and these numbers are
11 based on us receiving a pilot, but ---
12 which we are not, we'll be paying our
13 full property taxes.

14 The project is braced to generate
15 at least a cumulative \$12.5 million in
16 revenue to the municipal government
17 compared to the 5.5 million in costs.
18 So not only will it be generating those
19 jobs and the homes, there will also be
20 at least \$7 million in revenue over the
21 next 15 years from the project into the
22 local government tax-wise.

23 MR. CAPPILLINO: You indicate
24 that you have --- I'm sorry, I think
25 your picture is frozen, I don't know

1 Proceedings

2 whether your connection is lost here.

3 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Is it
4 restored now?

5 MR. CAPPILLINO: Yeah, yeah.

6 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Okay.

7 MR. CAPPILLINO: If you would
8 continue, please.9 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: So the
10 project will generate at least
11 \$7 million in revenue to the local
12 government and that would --- that was
13 back when we were still looking at a
14 pilot of an option, so that discounts a
15 lot. I would say it's actually almost
16 double that.17 To Ms. Tignanelli's point on the
18 workforce housing, we did agree, we did
19 come to an agreement with the IDA over
20 the past week that we will be setting
21 aside ten percent, we will guarantee
22 ten percent of those units will be
23 workforce housing. I'll take into
24 consideration the income limits, we can
25 regulate that internally. I mean, as

1 Proceedings

2 long as they can afford the rent there's
3 no reason why we wouldn't limit it.

4 So another thing is that both
5 parties I believe said that increasing
6 the density of the project would make it
7 unnecessary that we receive this
8 assistance. First of all, I mean,
9 everyone knows the cost of materials has
10 just risen astronomically, at least
11 30 percent over the last year and a
12 half, due to COVID.

13 I really don't think we could
14 pursue this project without the
15 incentives and I'm not sure where people
16 are getting that idea that we could.
17 But if we increase the density it would
18 completely change the characterization
19 of this project and no longer make it
20 what Hyde Park in that specific area is
21 looking for. So, you know, it's really
22 give and take.

23 We could. Yeah, we could build
24 300 units, we'd love building 300 units.
25 We would love to do it, but it would

1 Proceedings

2 completely change the characterization
3 of the project and not make it fit into
4 the area. I mean, that's why these kind
5 of incentives exist, to make projects
6 that can make everyone happy. It's
7 about compromise, it's...

8 MR. FINN O'NEILL: It's taken
9 several years to get to the approval
10 stage of the project to where we're
11 fully approved. I mean ---

12 (Interrupted)

13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry,
14 sir, I'm having a hard time hearing you
15 and I don't know who you are.

16 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: This is Finn
17 O'Neill from North Cross, LLC.

18 MR. FINN O'NEILL: So we've
19 maximized the density allowed as per the
20 zoning and the approval was fully
21 granted. I doubt very much that Hyde
22 Park would consider variances to
23 increase the density. And, as Lauren
24 has pointed out, it will change the
25 character of the project. I think it's

1 Proceedings

2 very well designed, conceived and
3 approved as it is and it just doesn't
4 make any sense to talk about increasing
5 density.

6 MR. CAPPILLINO: Okay. And
7 finally you indicate in your application
8 the construction jobs, 20 to 40
9 construction jobs; is that true, is that
10 accurate?

11 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Yes.

12 MR. FINN O'NEILL: Yes, I would
13 say an average of 30 full time jobs
14 during construction is a pretty good
15 guess. That could get to 40, maybe even
16 45 to 50 at some point, but 30 is
17 probably a very good average.

18 MR. CAPPILLINO: Okay.

19 MR. FINN O'NEILL: Just from
20 experience.

21 MR. CAPPILLINO: All right.

22 MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Yeah, that's
23 based on experience and our experience
24 is within the Hudson Valley region. I
25 want to quickly, if everyone will

1 Proceedings

2 indulge me, we also garner our supplies
3 almost exclusively locally, and I have
4 the numbers. So that's \$14.6 million in
5 local income due to supplies that this
6 project can expect to generate during
7 the first two years of construction, and
8 the year following we can expect a
9 \$3.4 million increase in local income.
10 So, yes, directly we have three jobs,
11 but indirectly there's a lot of revenue
12 entering the local area.

13 MR. O'NEILL: There's also a lot
14 of services that go along with that,
15 landscaping, you know, anything else
16 that we'd be doing there to, you know,
17 maintain and keep the property. So
18 indirectly there's quite a few jobs, as
19 well.

20 MR. CAPPILLINO: Okay. All
21 right. Thank you. Does anyone else
22 have anything to say? With that I will
23 now close the Public Hearing. Thank you
24 all for your comments. And, Frances,
25 would you please do an expedited

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings
transcript for the board?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
MR. CAPPILLINO: Thank you.
MS. LAUREN O'NEILL: Thank you.
Have a good day.

* * * *

	8:14	benefits (2) 9:11;14:4	17:25	county's (1) 12:3
\$	annual (1) 12:7	Beretta (6) 5:15,16,22;6:3,16; 7:17	characterization (2) 16:18;17:2	couple (1) 4:24
\$12.5 (1) 14:15	answered (1) 10:3	Beretta's (1) 14:2	classification (1) 5:4	COURT (2) 17:13;20:3
\$14.6 (1) 19:4	apartment (3) 9:6,11;12:5	best (1) 5:12	clear (2) 7:6,6	COVID (1) 16:12
\$175,000 (1) 11:17	applicant (2) 4:17;13:22	bids (1) 10:9	close (1) 19:23	created (3) 9:17;11:24;12:9
\$3.4 (1) 19:9	application (5) 3:9;6:11;9:16; 10:18;18:7	bills (1) 13:17	comment (1) 7:14	Cross (4) 3:9;4:21;12:6; 17:17
\$45,000 (1) 11:25	appointing (1) 4:13	blanket (1) 11:18	comments (4) 5:17;8:19,25;19:24	cumulative (1) 14:15
\$7 (2) 14:20;15:11	approach (1) 10:5	board (10) 5:25;7:15,25;8:8, 10;9:22;10:2;13:9, 10;20:2	commercial (3) 5:5;8:4;9:14	
\$70,000 (1) 12:8	approval (8) 6:20;7:2,9,12,21; 10:19;17:9,20	bores (1) 7:20	committed (1) 10:23	D
A	approve (2) 10:11;13:11	both (1) 16:4	compared (1) 14:17	day (1) 20:6
according (2) 6:10;12:2	approved (2) 17:11;18:3	braced (1) 14:14	completely (2) 16:18;17:2	Dean (1) 7:22
accurate (1) 18:10	April (4) 3:20,22;4:11;9:21	breaks (1) 13:15	complex (2) 12:5,11	defined (1) 11:11
across (2) 8:15;10:4	area (3) 16:20;17:4;19:12	brought (1) 9:22	component (2) 9:14;12:13	density (7) 9:18,23;16:6,17; 17:19,23;18:5
actually (1) 15:15	Arlington (1) 11:13	build (1) 16:23	compromise (1) 17:7	derived (1) 14:5
add (2) 6:11;8:22	aside (1) 15:21	building (1) 16:24	conceived (1) 18:2	designed (1) 18:2
additional (2) 5:6;7:4	assistance (9) 3:10;6:5,7;9:3,6, 20;12:14;13:14;16:8	burden (4) 6:8;7:8,20;13:15	concerning (1) 3:8	despite (1) 12:19
address (2) 5:2;13:22	astronomically (1) 16:10	C	conclude (1) 8:19	details (1) 11:2
affidavit (2) 3:17,23	attention (1) 4:22	can (5) 15:24;16:2;17:6; 19:6,8	conflict (2) 8:10;10:15	developer (2) 9:25;10:22
afford (3) 12:4,10;16:2	Attorney (1) 12:19	CAPPILLINO (20) 3:2;5:13,19,24; 6:14;7:11;8:20; 12:20,22;13:2,19; 14:2,23;15:5,7;18:6, 18,21;19:20;20:4	connection (1) 15:2	Development (1) 4:13
affordable (1) 12:13	average (2) 18:13,17		consider (2) 10:19;17:22	direction (1) 8:7
again (2) 11:21;13:8	Aviva (1) 4:6		consideration (1) 15:24	directly (1) 19:10
Agency (2) 3:11;4:13	B		Construction (5) 10:7;18:8,9,14; 19:7	disclosure (1) 10:14
agree (2) 11:8;15:18	back (2) 12:16;15:13	case (1) 10:9	consultant (1) 7:24	discounted (1) 10:19
agreement (3) 10:15,24;15:19	base (1) 13:16	caused (1) 7:19	continue (1) 15:8	discounts (6) 10:23,25;11:3,3,6; 15:14
ahead (1) 13:3	based (3) 14:7,11;18:23	Central (1) 4:5	copy (1) 3:24	District (2) 4:5;11:13
Aileen (1) 4:2	bear (1) 7:8	Chairman (4) 4:11;6:21;7:22; 12:17	correct (1) 7:16	done (1) 14:9
allow (1) 7:13	became (1) 8:3	change (3) 16:18;17:2,24	cost (2) 14:9;16:9	double (1) 15:16
allowed (1) 17:19	bedroom (1) 12:4	changed (3) 7:3,7;13:6	costs (1) 14:17	doubt (1) 17:21
almost (2) 15:15;19:3	began (1) 3:5	changes (1) 7:4	couching (2) 12:19,23	Doyle (2) 4:12;12:17
along (2) 5:25;19:14	behalf (2) 4:16,20	character (1)	County (7) 3:11;4:4,7,12;9:7, 8,9	Doyle's (1) 6:21
Amazon (3) 10:10,12,15				due (3)
announced (1)				

9:6;16:12;19:5 during (2) 18:14;19:6 Dutchess (6) 3:10;4:4,6,12;9:8,9	3:10;6:5,6;9:3,20; 12:14;13:14 finished (1) 13:4 FINN (5) 17:8,16,18;18:12, 19	growing (1) 7:25 guarantee (1) 15:21 guess (1) 18:15	15:24;19:5,9 increase (3) 16:17;17:23;19:9 increasing (2) 16:5;18:4 indicate (2) 14:23;18:7 indicates (1) 3:12 indicating (2) 3:18,23 indirectly (2) 19:11,18 indulge (1) 19:2 Industrial (2) 3:11;4:13 information (3) 7:4,5;13:7 initially (1) 6:22 interest (2) 5:12;8:11 interesting (2) 6:18,20 Interiors (1) 10:8 internally (1) 15:25 Interrupted (2) 12:21;17:12 into (3) 14:21;15:23;17:3 issuance (1) 9:2 issues (1) 13:22	Key (2) 10:7,8 kind (1) 17:4 knows (1) 16:9
E	Fire (1) 11:13 firefighters (3) 11:11,14,19 First (3) 7:24;16:8;19:7 Fishkill (1) 10:10 fit (1) 17:3 flipped (1) 12:18 following (1) 19:8 form (1) 13:15 forward (2) 5:12;7:13 four (1) 6:24 Frances (1) 19:24 frozen (1) 14:25 FTEs (3) 9:17;11:23;12:9 full (2) 14:13;18:13 fully (2) 17:11,20	H	J	L
earned (1) 11:15 East (1) 10:10 eliminate (1) 9:19 else (2) 19:15,21 entering (1) 19:12 especially (1) 8:2 even (4) 9:5,7;12:10;18:15 everyone (5) 3:3;4:22;16:9; 17:6;18:25 everyone's (1) 5:11 evidence (4) 3:6,16,22;4:10 exactly (1) 8:5 example (1) 11:12 exclusively (1) 19:3 Executive (1) 4:7 Exhibit (4) 3:6,16,21;4:10 exist (1) 17:5 expect (2) 19:6,8 expedited (1) 19:25 experience (3) 18:20,23,23 explanation (1) 12:25	G	I	K	landlords (1) 9:12 landscaping (1) 19:15 last (3) 13:13,13;16:11 LAUREN (11) 4:19,20;13:24; 15:3,6,9;17:16,23; 18:11,22;20:5 leading (1) 13:16 least (4) 14:15,20;15:10; 16:10 Lee (1) 8:25 legal (2) 10:24;11:22 letter (1) 4:11 likely (1) 9:5 limit (1) 16:3 limits (5) 11:4,7,9,21;15:24 lines (1) 5:3 listen (1) 5:9 live (1) 12:10 LLC (3) 3:9;4:21;17:17 local (5) 14:22;15:11;19:5, 9,12 locally (1) 19:3 long (1) 16:2 longer (1) 16:19 looking (2) 15:13;16:21 lost (1) 15:2 lot (5) 5:3;8:16;15:15; 19:11,13 love (2) 16:24,25 low (2)
F	garner (1) 19:2 general (1) 6:5 generate (3) 14:14;15:10;19:6 generating (1) 14:18 given (1) 7:6 giving (1) 12:14 Good (5) 3:2;5:16;18:14,17; 20:6 government (3) 14:16,22;15:12 granted (1) 17:21 granting (1) 6:4 great (1) 13:25	half (1) 16:12 happy (2) 5:8;17:6 hard (1) 17:14 hardly (1) 6:12 heard (1) 5:14 Hearing (19) 3:4,4,5,7,8,12,13, 15,19,21,25;4:9,14, 15,16,24;7:13;17:14; 19:23 held (1) 3:13 Hi (2) 4:19;5:16 higher (3) 9:18,23;13:17 highest (1) 11:16 homes (1) 14:19 Honorable (1) 4:7 hopefully (1) 5:18 housing (5) 9:8;12:3,13;15:18, 23 Hudson (1) 18:24 Hyde (4) 4:2,5;16:20;17:21	Jenna (1) 3:23 job (1) 11:25 jobs (10) 6:12,15,17;14:6, 19;18:8,9,13;19:10, 18 Jones (1) 3:23 Journal (2) 3:18,20 justification (1) 6:13	Kafka (1) 4:6 keep (1) 19:17 keeps (1) 7:22

9:6,10 lower (1) 14:8	Mrs (1) 4:6 much (3) 11:16;13:8;17:21 municipal (1) 14:16	own (1) 14:9 owns (1) 10:7	pretty (1) 18:14 probably (1) 18:17 Proceedings (18) 3:1;4:1;5:1;6:1; 7:1;8:1;9:1;10:1; 11:1;12:1;13:1;14:1; 15:1;16:1;17:1;18:1; 19:1;20:1 process (1) 13:9 profitable (1) 9:5 project (28) 5:5,11;6:9;7:16; 8:11;9:3,4,15,19; 10:9,10,12,13;12:6,9; 14:5,7,10,14,21; 15:10;16:6,14,19; 17:3,10,25;19:6 projected (2) 11:25;12:11 projects (5) 6:6;8:3;12:15; 13:12;17:5 project's (1) 5:4 property (4) 8:15;10:4;14:13; 19:17 provide (1) 11:6 provided (2) 10:25;13:7 providing (1) 10:23 Public (16) 3:3,4,7,8,12,13,19, 24;4:14,16;5:9,14; 6:9;7:13,14;19:23 pursue (1) 16:14	rates (3) 9:7,11;10:20 realized (3) 6:22,25;7:19 really (2) 16:13,21 reason (1) 16:3 receive (1) 16:7 received (2) 5:18,19 receiving (1) 14:11 recused (1) 8:13 regardless (1) 13:12 region (1) 18:24 regulate (1) 15:25 relationships (1) 8:17 relief (1) 9:25 remaining (1) 13:16 remains (1) 10:6 rent (1) 16:2 rental (4) 9:8;10:20;12:3,7 rentals (1) 9:11 REPORTER (2) 17:13;20:3 require (3) 9:24,24;12:12 required (1) 10:14 reservations (1) 7:18 residential (4) 8:3,4,9;15;12:15 residents (1) 13:18 respect (1) 6:20 respond (1) 13:3 rest (2) 6:8;8:7 restored (1) 15:4 revenue (4) 14:16,20;15:11; 19:11 revision (1) 5:2 right (9) 5:22;6:3,16,17;
M		P		
maintain (1) 19:17 majority (1) 11:14 manufacturing (1) 9:14 Marcus (1) 4:7 Mark (2) 4:12;6:21 marked (4) 3:5,15,21;4:9 market (2) 12:5;14:9 materials (3) 9:16;10:18;16:9 matter (2) 3:7;4:23 maximized (1) 17:19 May (1) 3:13 maybe (1) 18:15 mean (4) 15:25;16:8;17:4,11 meeting (1) 9:21 meets (1) 7:15 member (3) 8:14;9:22;10:2 members (4) 6:24;8:10;13:10,11 million (6) 14:15,17,20;15:11; 19:4,9 mind (3) 7:3,7;8:18 minimum (1) 12:12 modified (1) 10:16 modifying (1) 7:22 Molinaro (1) 4:8 momentarily (1) 8:24 more (3) 7:25;8:2;11:15 morning (2) 3:2;5:17 motivated (1) 10:22 move (1) 5:12	N need (3) 6:23;9:19;11:12 needed (2) 7:24;9:4 new (2) 9:16;13:7 next (1) 14:21 Nonetheless (1) 7:17 North (4) 3:9;4:21;12:6; 17:17 notes (1) 9:10 Notice (4) 3:6,11,18,24 Number (5) 3:6,16,22;4:10; 11:2 numbers (2) 14:10;19:4	Park (4) 4:3,5;16:20;17:22 particular (1) 6:9 parties (1) 16:5 passing (1) 7:21 past (1) 15:20 paying (2) 14:8,12 people (1) 16:15 per (1) 17:19 percent (3) 15:21,22;16:11 period (1) 9:17 permanent (3) 6:15,17;14:6 phrases (1) 10:21 Piccone (1) 9:22 picture (1) 14:25 pilot (2) 14:11;15:14 Planning (1) 9:10 please (3) 13:4;15:8;19:25 point (5) 12:20;13:13;14:3; 15:17;18:16 pointed (1) 17:24 population (1) 11:5 populations (2) 10:21;11:10 position (2) 7:23;8:5 potentially (1) 9:18 Poughkeepsie (2) 3:17,20 preliminary (7) 4:23;6:18,19;7:2,9, 12,21 prepared (1) 9:9 present (1) 6:24	Q	
	O obligation (1) 11:5 officer (1) 4:14 Officer's (4) 3:5,16,21;4:9 often (1) 13:16 O'NEILL (16) 4:19,20;13:24; 15:3,6,9;17:8,16,17, 18;18:11,12,19,22; 19:13;20:5 only (7) 6:9,11,23;7:7;10:5; 14:4,18 open (2) 4:15,24 opposed (2) 6:4;9:2 option (1) 15:14 order (2) 5:3;12:3 out (2) 5:11;17:24 over (5) 9:17;11:17;14:20; 15:19;16:11		R	
			rate (2) 11:3;12:5	

8:20;13:19,20;18:21; 19:21 rightfully (1) 8:12 risen (1) 16:10 Rohr (1) 4:2 run (1) 3:19	11:23 specific (1) 16:20 spite (1) 13:5 stage (1) 17:10 statement (2) 4:18;11:18 stating (1) 10:24 still (1) 15:13 street (2) 8:15;10:4 study (1) 14:9 submitted (1) 10:13 submitting (1) 10:8 subsequently (1) 10:12 subsidies (1) 11:12 Superintendent (1) 4:3 Supervisor (1) 3:25 supplies (2) 19:2,5 sure (4) 5:10;8:6,7;16:15 survey (2) 9:9;12:3	three (8) 6:11,14,16,17; 9:16;12:8;14:6;19:10 Tignanelli (4) 8:21,23;12:24;13:5 Tignanelli's (2) 14:3;15:17 today (1) 3:13 Torreggiani (3) 10:2,7,11 Town (1) 4:2 transcript (2) 6:2;20:2 transfer (1) 6:7 true (2) 3:24;18:9 two (6) 8:9;9:18;11:24; 12:4,8;19:7	11:16 wages (1) 11:15 way (1) 12:18 week (1) 15:20 Welcome (1) 3:3 within (1) 18:24 without (4) 9:5;10:24;11:2; 16:14 wondered (1) 9:23 worked (1) 4:25 workforce (6) 10:20;11:4,10,19; 15:18,23 working (1) 5:11 writing (1) 11:8 written (2) 5:17;8:25	3:22;4:11 21 (1) 4:11 23 (1) 3:22 26th (1) 3:20
S		U	Y	3
salary (2) 12:2,11 Sarah (1) 5:20 saying (1) 10:3 School (1) 4:5 Schools (1) 4:3 scuttled (1) 6:25 scuttling (1) 7:9 seek (1) 9:25 seem (1) 14:4 seems (1) 13:10 sending (1) 8:24 sense (1) 18:4 sent (3) 5:17,20,25 served (1) 3:25 services (1) 19:14 setting (1) 15:20 several (1) 17:9 shifts (1) 13:15 short (1) 4:17 show (1) 9:16 size (1) 12:6 solidify (1) 5:3 sorry (4) 4:4;12:22;14:24; 17:13 sort (1) 8:7 speaking (1)	T	uncomfortable (1) 8:2 under (1) 11:5 units (4) 9:15;15:22;16:24, 24 unnecessary (1) 16:7 up (1) 9:22 upon (2) 3:25;4:6 use (1) 10:21	Z	3 (1) 3:22 30 (3) 16:11;18:13,16 300 (2) 16:24,24
		V	1	4
	talk (2) 10:17;18:4 talking (1) 5:6 targeted (3) 10:20;11:10,18 tax (5) 6:7;13:15,15,17; 14:8 taxes (1) 14:13 taxpaying (1) 6:8 tax-wise (1) 14:22 teachers (1) 11:11 ten (2) 15:21,22 third (1) 8:13 third-party (1) 7:23 thought (1) 13:9	vacancy (2) 9:7,10 Valley (1) 18:24 variances (1) 17:22 Vice (3) 4:11;6:21;12:17 vote (11) 6:18,19,21,25;7:3, 15,18,19;12:16,18; 13:6 voted (2) 10:11;12:20 voting (1) 6:24	year (3) 12:2;16:11;19:8 years (4) 9:18;14:21;17:9; 19:7	5.5 (1) 14:17 50 (2) 9:15;18:16
		W	2	5
		wage (1)	zoning (1) 17:20	9
			1	9:30 (1) 3:14
			2	
			1 (1) 3:6 100,000 (1) 11:15 10th (1) 3:13 14th (1) 9:21 15 (1) 14:21	
			2 (1) 3:16 20 (1) 18:8 2020 (2) 9:8;11:14 2021 (2)	

From: [Jim Beretta](#)
To: [Sarah Lee](#)
Subject: North Cross, LLC, Public Comments
Date: Sunday, May 09, 2021 5:31:32 PM

Ms. Lee (DCIDA CEO),

Following are my comments for the public hearing on May 10, 2021 on the **North Cross, LLC** project .

I am **opposed** to the issuance of the requested financial assistance which include: exemptions from certain sales and use taxes, real estate transfer taxes and mortgage recording taxes listed by the DCIDA as follows:

"...residential facility (the “**Facility**”) consisting of the following: (A) approximately 107,728 total square feet of new construction consisting of eight (8) two-story townhouse style apartment buildings with a total of 50 approximately 2,155 square-foot residential units and the installation of infrastructure on the Land, including but not limited to a sewage treatment plant (the “**Improvements**”) located on an approximately 27.71 acres of land previously subdivided into 51 separate parcels, some of which may be consolidated at a future date, located at Blair Road, Daniels Way and North Cross Road in the Town of Hyde Park, County of Dutchess, State of New York...

My reasons for opposition are as follows:

1. All of these tax incentives are a transfer of tax burden to the rest of the taxpaying public.
2. While a cornerstone of the IDA's mission is job creation, the North Cross LLC project is 50 residential rental units with no manufacturing or commercial component. Based on the application, only 3 new FTEs will be created over a period of 2 years. This does not justify a financial incentive.
3. The DCIDA is rubberstamping the approvals for financial assistance on projects that come before them. This became unquestionably evident when the preliminary approval for this project, North Cross LLC, was defeated as Vice Chair Mark Doyle voted "No, not approved" but then quickly wanted to reverse his vote once he realized his vote scuttled the preliminary approval. The board then proceeded to call for a motion to reconsider and then a motion to vote on the same resolution to approve. This time, with no additional information or discussion, Doyle voted "Approved". Mr. Doyle did not have the conviction to stick with his dissenting vote once he realized he scuttled the (expected) approval. The exchange went as follows:

Mark Doyle, Vice Chair: "Alright, so we have a motion and a second. Jasmine would you like to take a roll call please?" Roll call was taken. Jamie Piccone voted "Approved", Kathy Bauer voted

"Approved", Al Torreggiani voted "Approved", Mark Doyle voted "No, not approved".

Doyle: "So despite my dissent, the motion passes". CEO Sarah Lee: "No, it didn't, the motion doesn't pass". Doyle: "Because of our?" Lee: "Because we need four positives and we have four in quorum right now so with your dissent the motion would not pass". Doyle: "Alright, understand that, so may I, I'd like to change my vote and but do we need to take another roll call to do that?". DCIDA Attorney Don Cappillino: "I think what you need to do, is the only person that can call for a reconsideration of the motion, because you were the, you are the dissent, if you would then make the motion to reconsider, have that motion then seconded and approved and then you can then reconsider ...".

Doyle: "Oh very good. So I'd like to make a motion to reconsider the vote, uh look for a second on that". Piccone: "I'll second it". Doyle: "Thank you and we'll take a vote on that please Jasmine". Roll call was taken. Al Torreggiani voted "Approved", Jamie Piccone voted "Approved", Kathy Bauer voted "Approved", Mark Doyle voted "Approved".

Doyle: "Very good so then we will take a motion, we'll have to restate the motion, take a motion and a second for the approval of this resolution". Torreggiani: "I'll make a motion to approve the Preliminary Resolution". Doyle: "Thank you". Piccone: "I'll second". Doyle: "Thank you Jamie and Jasmine would you like to go ahead with the roll call?" Roll call was taken. Kathy Bauer voted "Approved", Jamie Piccone voted "Approved", Al Torreggiani voted "Approved", Mark Doyle voted "Approved".

Attorney Lauran O'Neill for North Cross: "Thank you". Lee: "Okay, great, so the motion will pass and then we'll ask Tim Dean and Amy to return to the meeting". Doyle: "Thank you Sarah. Thank you and we look forward to this, hearing more about the project, thanks for attending today".

4. Chairman Tim Dean made extensive comments at the 3/19/21 DCIDA meeting, which I attended, about looking into third party reviews of applicant data for projects coming before the DCIDA because:

- a. "...the board has felt, has become more and more uncomfortable with their ability to evaluate some of the more complex aspects of projects" and,
- b. "the area that this has been most challenging for us recently, just because of the number, has been in the development of housing. But this same issues can apply to other areas as well."

Since the DCIDA is admitting their discomfort in the ability to evaluate projects, I don't know how the DCIDA can proceed to grant final approval on this project without a high degree of comfort with the cost analysis of the project and the reasonability study that the third party review is intended to provide. If the DCIDA board was uncomfortable before, it does not seem possible they can arrive at a comfort level now to provide financial assistance by using the same process that they used before.

Subsequently, Chairman Dean somewhat amended his position at the April 23, 2021 DCIDA meeting when the T-Rex Bellefield project was approved and said, in part, "...in regards to most projects our current methods of evaluation including the cost benefits analysis are actually very good."

The bottom line here is that the DCIDA board never rejects a project for financial incentives and in the vast majority of the cases, the projects receive unanimous

approval.

5. During this time of the COVID-19 pandemic, governments and municipalities have gaps in their budgets and absolving a special few from paying taxes is antithetical to the gaps in municipal budgets and fairness for all other taxpayers.

6. Millions of people in the country are facing unemployment and the lack of ability to put food on the table for their family. All taxes should be collected from non-tax-exempt projects.

7. Right here in the Hudson Valley, a recent article in the Poughkeepsie Journal pointed out that **"38% of Hudson Valley households struggle to make ends meet"**. I reference that article below:

Poughkeepsie Journal article by Ryan Santistvan, August 12, 2020.

"ALICE report shows 38% of Hudson Valley households struggle to make ends meet"

" Amid the COVID-19 pandemic, unemployment across the region and state has soared. But even before that, roughly 38% of Hudson Valley households and 45% of households across the state were not making enough money to cover their basic needs, according to the United Way of New York. And, those numbers were disproportionately higher when looking only at black and hispanic households."

8. Dutchess County experienced financial budget gaps due to the COVID-19 pandemic, having to furlough employees, offer early retirement and take other spending cuts to try and meet the financial challenge. The County can ill afford to be providing tax exemptions. As quoted in the following referenced article, Dutchess County is at the top of the list, "statewide", for sales tax loss, so far, in 2020 and the County Executive "was projecting 50% less revenue in sales tax this year amid the pandemic."

Rockland/Westchester Journal News, May 12, 2020, David McKay Wilson

"Dutchess County had the biggest year-to-year sales tax decline statewide in March, with a loss of 17%, as popular restaurants shifted to take-out, and tourists stayed home. April was even worse, with sales taxes revenue down 27%. For the first four months of 2020, Dutchess sales tax receipts are down \$4.5 million, or 7%. Last month, Dutchess County Executive Marc Molinaro said the county was projecting 50% less revenue in sales tax this year amid the pandemic. The restoration "I daresay, is going to last through the duration of 2020," he said. "

Again, I am opposed to the financial assistance being requested.

Jim Beretta
Dutchess County Resident & Taxpayer

From: [Doreen Tiganelli](#)
To: [Sarah Lee](#)
Subject: Public Comment, DCIDA Public Hearing, North Cross LLC, May 10, 2021
Date: Monday, May 10, 2021 9:41:54 AM

Ms. Lee, please include my comments as part of the official public record for the DCIDA Public Hearing for the North Cross, LLC project scheduled for May 10, 2021 at 9:30 a.m. and share these comments with the DCIDA Chair and Board members.

1) I am opposed to the issuance of any "Financial Assistance" to the Project in any form including, but not limited to, Sales and Use Tax Exemption, Mortgage Recording Tax Exemption, Real Estate Transfer Tax and Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT).

2) The "Financial Assistance" is simply not needed. The project is likely to be profitable without assistance due to the low apartment vacancy rate in the County. Even the 2020 Dutchess County Rental Housing Survey prepared by Dutchess County Planning notes that the low vacancy rate for apartment rentals benefits landlords.

3) In the year and a half that I have been attending DCIDA meetings, no project has ever been rejected. It has become apparent to me that the focus of the DCIDA is to approve projects, regardless. This was never more evident than at the April 14, 2021 DCIDA Meeting when Vice Chair Mark Doyle changed his "No, not approved" vote to an "Approved" vote after realizing a motion to grant Preliminary Approval for the North Cross project failed. No new or additional information had been provided between his two votes. He just flipped his dissenting vote so the motion would pass. That does not say much for the thought process of board members.

Board member Amy Bombardieri and Chairman Tim Dean had a conflict of interest with this project so Vice Chair Doyle was running the meeting for the North Cross, LLC agenda item due to Chairman Dean's conflict.

Doyle expressed concern about the project's separate lots and asked for a motion to amend the Preliminary Resolution to include a lot line consolidation. No motion to amend was made. Doyle also stated he was not sure why the DCIDA was "incentivizing" the project and that this was a "new level" of project for the IDA.

When it came time to vote on the resolution, Vice Chair Doyle voted "No, not approved". The vote was (3-1) and Doyle stated "*So despite my dissent, the motion passes*". However, DCIDA CEO Sarah Lee informed Doyle that due to quorum requirements, four "Yes" votes were required for the motion to pass. That was enough to cause Doyle to say "I'd like to change my vote" and, after a motion to reconsider, Doyle changed his vote to "Approved" and the Preliminary Resolution was approved (4-0). Doyle's willingness to change his vote without being provided with any new or additional information to warrant such a change demonstrates a flimsy criteria for approval.

4) While the mission of the DCIDA is to further job creation, this project is 50 residential rental units with no manufacturing or commercial component. According to the application, only 3 new FTEs will be created over a period of 2 years.

5) Higher density on this project could potentially eliminate the need for financial assistance from the DCIDA. At the April 14, 2021 DCIDA Meeting where Preliminary Approval was being considered, Board member Piccone stated he had a question, that 25 acres 50 units did not seem very dense and wondered if more units would benefit the builder, not requiring him to seek relief from the IDA. Board member Torreggiani immediately answered the question saying he had the property right across the street and stated "*this is the only approach*". Torreggiani then voted in favor of approval. It remains to be seen if Mr. Torreggiani, owner of Key Construction and Key Interiors, will submit bids for this project as was the recent case with the Amazon project in East Fishkill. Torreggiani voted to approve Amazon then subsequently submitted quotations to the project which required disclosure of a conflict when the DCIDA met to modify the previously approved Amazon agreement.

6) Regarding discounted rental rates for targeted workforce populations, application materials use phrases such as the developer "would be motivated to" and "is committed to" providing discounts if the DCIDA approves the project. Any DCIDA approval should include a legal agreement stating such discounts will be provided and should include details such as the number of discounts, the rate of the discounts and income limits for the "workforce populations" receiving the discounts. Income limits are required as not all targeted workforce tenants - defined in application materials as police, firefighters, teachers, EMS workers - require subsidies. For example, records obtained under the Freedom of Information Law show that the majority of firefighters in the Arlington Fire District in 2020 earned more than \$100,000 in wages with the highest wage being \$175,910.

7) At minimum, DCIDA should require an affordable housing component when financial assistance is given to residential projects. According to the Dutchess County 2020 Rental Housing Survey, a two-bedroom market rate apartment in a complex the size of the North Cross project would require an annual income of \$70,400. Based on the report, 2 of the 3 FTEs that are to be created by this project would not even be able to afford to live in the complex on their projected annual salaries of \$45,000.

The county report also states there was a considerable increase in rents, ranging from 4.5 to 7.5 percent, for all unit sizes in market-rate apartment complexes. The DCIDA should consider needs of residents, not just the profit margins of developers, and require affordable housing components.

8) Financial assistance in the form of tax breaks shifts the tax burden to the remaining base, often leading to higher tax bills for all other taxpayers.

9) Increase in property tax revenue is often cited as a project benefit and is based on "Current Assessed Value" and "Estimated New Assessed Value". However, this fails to take into consideration the fact that applicants often challenge the assessed

value after project completion. When that happens, projected tax revenues end up being lower than stated.

Doreen A. Tignanelli
29 Colburn Drive
Poughkeepsie NY 12603