

**COUNTY OF CATTARAUGUS  
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**February 7, 2025**

**CCIDA Offices**

**9 East Washington Street**

**Ellicottville NY 14731**

**9:00 a.m. In Person or via Teleconference Call/Zoom**

**Roll Call:**     -Taken-

**Members**

**Present:**

Mr. Thomas Buffamante-Chairman  
Mr. Joseph Higgins  
Mr. Brent Driscoll  
Mr. James (Joe) Snyder  
Ms. Ginger Schroder (via video conference)  
Mr. Michael Wimer  
Mr. Thomas Cullen

**Excused:**

None

**CCIDA Staff/Counsel:**

Mr. Corey R. Wiktor, Executive Director CCIDA  
Mr. Robert Murray, Harris Beach PLLC Legal Counsel

**Presenters/Guests:**

Mr. Bob Clark, Olean Times Herald (via zoom)  
Mr. Rick Miller, Olean Star  
Mr. Sean Perry, Invenergy  
Mr. Brandon Cottrell, Hodgson Russ LLP Legal Counsel for Invenergy  
Mr. Charles Malcomb, Hodgson Russ LLP Legal Counsel for Invenergy  
Ms. Pam Tilton  
Mr. Peter Sorgi  
Mr. Josh Cutler

Mr. Buffamante called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

**A roll** call of the Board of Directors of the CCIDA was taken Mr. Buffamante, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Cullen, Mr. Wimer and Ms. Schroder were present. Ms. Schroeder attended via video conference.

-Mr. Buffamante: We have quorum and the sole purpose of today's meeting is to review the application and materials related to the Alle-Catt Wind project and it is my intention at the end of the meeting to call for a vote to approve or not approve the project. This is a very emotional project, a lot of feelings one way or the other about the project, and we hope the meeting remains civil and we respect each other's opinions. We are not taking any public comments but the guests are certainly welcome to stay for the meeting. Mr. Buffamante turns the meeting over to Mr. Wiktor.

-Mr. Wiktor: Good Morning everyone and thank you for joining us here today, especially Ginger Schroder who joining us here today via remotely and took time out of her busy schedule to attend. Obviously, it is a Special Board Meeting and I appreciate everyone's time and juggling of schedules, thank you guests for attending in our office here in Ellicottville at 9:00 a.m. on February 7, 2025. As Tom indicated, the only action item on the agenda is Alle-Catt Wind and we do have a meeting on February 18, 2025 that is our standard IDA meeting. With that, I will turn the floor over to Sean Perry of Invenergy for an early discussion and then we can roll back in for any questions or comments from the Board and indicate where the company is at, where the project sits, general updates and anything the Board to know of where you are at with the proposed project.

-Sean Perry: Certainly, as a general project update since the last time we met in July, Alle-Catt is in receipt of its permit with the Army Corp. of Engineers and limited notice to proceed with the State for tree cutting, rubbing and construction and continuing work on the O&M facility in the Town of Freedom as well as our laydown yard which is currently under construction in Farmersville. In terms of the project, we have 38 proposed turbine sites in Cattaraugus County, 25 in the Town of Freedom and 13 in the Town of Farmersville and also includes a 10 mile gen-tie transmission line, 345 toll volt to transport the power to the substation in Freedom to the point of connection in the switchyard in the Town of Yorkshire which is something we called out in our real property schedule that is a switchyard that we are building for National Grid that will be conveyed to the utility once the project achieves operation. Our contractor is the Wesson Group our of Johnstown, New York, a pretty experienced contractor that has built several wind farms all over the State and O'Connell Electric is the contractor for our substation and transmission line. To date, they have completed just under 150 orientations to bring in local laborers and operators for construction of the laydown yard, O&M facility, tree cutting and have been fortunate to work with the local unions and they have been able to provide us with enough labor to support us right now, despite their other competing projects so we are looking forward to working with them. Right now, we are on schedule to begin construction in April of this year and anticipating compliance approval later this month and looking to achieve financial closing by the end of the month. Overall, that is general project update at the moment, if you want to dive into anything specific, I can answer any questions.

-Mr. Wiktor: Certainly, is there anyone with questions?

-Ms. Schroder: I have a question, I had heard the project still had not received its permission to construction because it has not complied with the noise requirements, so where are you on that Sean?

-Sean Perry: Noise requirements are currently with DPS and are currently working with the State on our noise complaint filings and are not approved as of yet, but are anticipating approval at either the February or March meeting.

-Mr. Wiktor: On those meetings, as a general question, are those meetings something you can watch online?

-Sean Perry: Yep. I believe they are in either NYC or Albany. The agendas usually come out the Friday before the meeting and the meetings are typically on Fridays.

-Mr. Wiktor: Ok, thank you.

-Mr. Buffamante: Have activities started in the other two counties that are within the project and are you doing the same thing in Cattaraugus County that you are doing over there?

-Sean Perry: Yes, that is correct. We have commenced tree cutting in Allegany and Wyoming Counties as well, we do not have any building facilities or laydown yards.

-Mr. Wiktor: Sean, what are the size of those project in a dollar amount in Wyoming and Allegany County, generally?

-Sean Perry: I think it is around \$150 million in Wyoming County and \$400 million Allegany County.

-Mr. Wiktor: Ok, this portion is the biggest piece of the project, correct?

-Sean Perry: Yes, that is correct. Cattaraugus County has the entirety of the transmission facility and also roughly 50% of the generation passing.

-Mr. Wiktor: In the board packets, we did include the application that was submitted in July, and there were some applicable revisions to it back in the fall right before we had the public hearing, so that is the most recent, updated application, 2 maps, the breakdown monetarily of the PILOT and how it tracks down over the proposed 20 years so obviously this project is seeking a deviation from Agency's current standard 15 year policy for UTEP on wind to a 20 year request that would match the host community agreement, should that go forward. The company is also seeking NYS mortgage recording tax, 1.25% is the county's filing tax, as well as NYS sales tax which is 8%. Any of the FFE that is not generating equipment that is already tax exempt, such as cement, lumber, bolts, wire as there are already portions of the project that are tax exempt, so they are seeking those 3 benefits and that information is broken down on page 6 of the application of what those benefits would entail. We have also included some documents on the decommissioning and other information from the PSE and 2 cost benefit analysis' which we will get in to.

-Mr. Wiktor: Sean, on the map, how much deviation do you anticipate to go from a primary site to a secondary site? How do we know that this is the map?

-Sean Perry: We got an updated facility layout as of January 2025, as I said, we have 25 turbine sites in Freedom and 13 in Farmersville, we don't have any alternate sites within those two towns. Any deviation in turbine sites as this point would pull turbines out of Freedom or Farmersville and put them in Allegany County, whether it be Rushford or 3 alternate sites in Centerville. We ideally would not like to make changes but there are factors that are obviously out of our control both from PILOT perspective and also from environmental and state compliance. We have executed the turbine supply agreement and there are no sites that are safe harbor or specific to one turbine site. Every change that would be made would require state approval and compliance filing.

-Mr. Wiktor: Sean, what is the rough idea for labor as general range of trades and suppliers? What do you anticipate for a general construction workforce?

-Sean Perry: This is a big job for New York State. We looking at about 400 construction workers at peak construction. We have had roughly 150 orientations, that is folks that have joined the O&M site for the week to rough in electric or hang sheet rock, or different trades and also includes the operators that are running color bunchers and working on tree clearing or pushing dirt at the laydown yard. We are looking a peak construction to be this Summer where we have a lot of scopes to complete. We are starting construction on all the access roads, foundation and trenches. The following year (2026) will be scheduling the turbines so we will take delivery of the turbines at the end of this year then the turbines will go up in 2026.

-Mr. Buffamante: The project should be done by the end of 2026, as you are anticipating?

-Sean Perry: Yes, that is correct.

-Mr. Buffamante: Would you expect it to be hooked into the electric grid shortly thereafter or right away?

-Sean Perry: Right away, we are expecting substantial mechanical completion earlier in 2026, around the Fall, and we have a buffer built in.

-Mr. Wimer: Sean, I am curious about decommissioning. I have read the information and it shows essentially an estimated cost of \$135,000 per turbine. Does that seem realistic to you and are there similar projects, obviously smaller structure than this project, that have already been decommissioned and might perform an estimate like this?

-Sean Perry: These numbers are set or proposed by an independent engineer approved by DPS, so the state ultimately has to sign off on it and if it is enough. These numbers are in line with two projects that we just completed. I would also like to say, this is what is required for us to have in place to get letters of credit during construction and every 5 years the state hires an independent engineer to reassess based on inflation or other cost of material adjustments and they set that amount.

-Mr. Buffamante: Our benefits on the PILOT are spread over 20 years, so the decommissioning letters of credit and agreement survive that, so as long as the turbines are up, there is a decommissioning process in place and it has funds to do it, correct?

-Sean Perry: Correct, that is correct. It is part of our permit conditions that these policies stay in place during the life of the project.

-Ms. Schroder: Did I hear you say that somehow the PILOT interplays with the site locations or alternate locations?

-Sean Perry: In sense, what would happen in terms of having a PILOT in Cattaraugus County or not, I would say we would want to in any situation site turbines where we have a PILOT agreement because we would have an easy model of revenue that we have to pay in terms of our annual property tax payment at a 5,000 per megawatt and 5,950 for a host community agreement so it makes sense to site turbines there in areas where we have a PILOT. I would say also, not having a PILOT in Cattaraugus County would mean significantly less revenue for the towns because of the breakdown of the dollars under the NYS UTEP compared to the host community agreement and PILOT agreement. On top of that, there is also local labor requirements that we would have to abide by which we wouldn't if we didn't have a PILOT, and in terms of our sales tax abatement, we would prefer to work with vendors in other counties as well for fuel, materials and other items.

-Ms. Schroder: Are you saying without a PILOT, you will move turbines to counties where you do have a PILOT because the revenue stream is more predictable?

-Sean Perry: I will say that it is not a complete ditch of Cattaraugus County as we only have a few alternate sites and Cattaraugus County is half the generation of this project and has all of our transmission lines so it's not like the project will not happen in Cattaraugus County, it would just be slightly different.

-Ms. Schroder: I understand that and I think for the purpose of the discussion today we assume the project is going forward and wanted to ask if the project would change and it sounds like it may change, but you are not able to offer any clarity to that.

-Sean Perry: I do not have clarity as to how much it will change, but I can say that we would absolutely try and assess the situation if we did not receive the PILOT and see what works best for us.

-Mr. Buffamante: Everyone has in their packet a cost benefit calculator which may be a little easier to go through. The PILOT payment is \$5,000 per megawatt, I believe there is 171 megawatts in the project in Cattaraugus County so the chart has the total PILOT amount of \$855,000 the 1<sup>st</sup> year then 2% escalator on that and you can see on the bottom of that column in the narrative the 20-year PILOT payments total \$20.8 million dollars.

-Mr. Driscoll: Roughly a million a year.

-Mr. Buffamante: On the chart, the property tax abatement is almost \$38 million so if you add those 2 numbers together, that's about \$58 million, so if the project was not approved, that is what the estimated tax would be based on upon the state's methodology of assessing wind energy projects. They have their formula which is what it is today, and then the estimated actual tax rates by jurisdiction would be applied to that assessment. There are a couple of estimates in there, the State could change their methodology at any point in time and we do not know in the increase or decrease to future property tax rates in each municipality. One of the items the project is looking at is cost certainty and the PILOT payment would give them cost certainty which certainly helps them secure financing and investor certainty so that is one of the reasons they are seeking a PILOT plus the cost savings to the project.

-Mr. Driscoll: This makes an assumption that the project doesn't change and these are all future numbers.

-Mr. Buffamante: Correct, this is based upon the project and numbers as we know it now. Also, part of the project benefits is estimated sales tax abatement of almost \$6.5 million and estimated mortgage recording tax abatement of estimated \$7.5 million, sales tax half goes to the County and half goes to the State and then the County has a formula for dividing it up. As far as the host community agreements go, Yorkshire only has a one-year payment as there are no windmills, only a transmission station, Farmersville HCA starts at \$348,000 and adds up to almost \$7.7 million, Freedom HCA starts at \$669,375 and adds up to \$14.7 million and I believe those are all fixed numbers with escalators and those also would not change.

-Mr. Perry: That is correct, the rate for those is \$5,950 per megawatt.

-Mr. Buffamante: That is for both municipalities?

-Mr. Perry: That is correct.

-Mr. Buffamante: The HCA payments only get made if the IDA approves the project as the HCA Agreements are linked to the IDA approval of the project and without project approval there will be no HCA payments.

-Ms. Schroder: So if I were to translate the numbers, are you saying if there is no PILOT, for the taxing jurisdictions, the way I am reading it, the numbers are moved around and the money is shorted so there is \$14.1 million that does not go to school districts, \$15.02 million will not go to the county for property taxes, \$7.3 million that does not go to county for mortgage recording tax and \$6.5 million in sales tax is absent, is that an accurate read?

-Mr. Driscoll: It is if the project doesn't change.

-Mr. Buffamante: It is qualified by half of the sales tax and half of the mortgage tax does not go to the county, it goes to the state.

-Ms. Schroder: Correct. In terms of taxing jurisdictions, we share that.

-Mr. Buffamante: Is there any questions on the PILOT numbers, the sales tax numbers, mortgage tax numbers or HCA numbers?

-Mr. Wiktor: Any and all special district taxes are never party to an IDA PILOT, so those are paid on normal rate.

-Mr. Buffamante: Those numbers are \$1.1 million and presumably based on the assessed values?

-Mr. Wiktor: Yes, they are outside of the PILOT. We note those as some of the benefits that are not attached to the PILOT such as light, sewer, fire, library is a net plus based on the assessment.

-Mr. Buffamante: The last page of the cost benefit calculator, Corey and Bob want to go over.

-Mr. Wiktor: Yes, there were 2 cost benefit analysis', by law we are required to run a cost benefit analysis on all projects so this is a service that the IDA pays for from a third party vendor on all projects to put in the real time data of the project from the application based off a few parameters and it computes the cost of the project fees, the savings based on the investment on the first few pages and then on the back it shows fiscal impacts which breaks out anticipated additional expenditures, revenues and monetary things that are not party to the incentives, it is additional spending on the project and that is over the 20 year window that we compute that data. We utilize this when holding a public hearing because often when I am in a public hearing with the town, village or city, often they will say here comes the IDA and they are just going to take my money and throw my taxes out and the answer is no, it is a benefit based on an investment and it is a baseline on an investment and nothing is removed and these reports help quantify what the project means.

-Mr. Buffamante: Are there any questions at this point?

-Ms. Schroder: Some of those benefits still occur anyway if the project gets built, for example payroll, payroll taxes etc., they are not going to go away if the project gets built regardless of a PILOT.

-Mr. Wiktor: Potentially, I would bounce it to Sean, as what is the current economic impact in the county if there was not a PILOT. So, this is based off the application and the project, so if the project was to change its scope, obviously these numbers some would reflect differently, but some would stay the same and there still would be benefits for construction, labor, payroll taxes and expenditures.

-Invenergy Counsel: I can say we would be affected negatively by the changes we would need to make as Sean described. We would try and react to the changes to the project, whether it be moving purchases out of the county or changes to the project, so yes there would still be some benefits as reflected in the chart, but it would be reduced.

-Mr. Murry: One comment on the MRB analysis, it says in the local benefits column, this model does not show the HCA payments but there are other benefits being provided in the PILOT scenario that are not included in this which means the costs benefit ratio is 6:1 and 2:1 would change because there are more dollars coming in than otherwise shown on this formula.

-Mr. Buffamante: Corey, you have lived and slept this project for the last several months. As Executive Director of the Agency, what is your recommendation to the Board?

-Mr. Wiktor: I'm not sure I have a recommendation, per se, it is a bit of a job for me to be the collector of information, to get answers to questions, to get comments of the public hearing, to get letters to respond to where we need to. Obviously this project is as stated and I say this very respectfully to people who have been around this project since day one whether they are residents, business officials, elected officials or farmers that it is very

emotional and seemingly controversial and I say that Sean, not as a snide, it is the reality of certain energy collection, distribution and harnessing so the IDA staff and our counsel have more or less been trying to get information that we believe the board will have questions on, thoughts and ideas and to get what we feel are the high points. I have to give Dan Martonis a lot of relentless credit as he has been at our call trying to hammer in the rates, the properties and multitude of fine details that are very impactful in terms of making a decision. Dan has been excellent and Bob has been working diligently helping me get information to the board. As in any project, I try and look at the pros of the benefit, does it outweigh the forgone elected abatements and again on any project, we work in this industry that as anytime the IDA is a party to a project, we are abating dollars that otherwise would not be, so we have to look at how we measure the return and return is like are their increased revenues, increased employment, what is the construction trade, what is their spending and what do they anticipate where they are going to shop, eat and stay. These are all factors we try and maximize. Every project is very different and unique, and the hardest part of my job is to try and outline and explain to people that every project has multitude of layers of why we would come to a conclusion, it's not just jobs, or just a tax base. What I have tried to do is as on any project, look at the comments, there are 479 pages, the SEQR, the expenditures, the investment and the jobs. The way New York State values and assesses power generating equipment that we are one of the only states that requires an IDA to consider help because without it, you are not going to have any energy projects and I do not mean that just to wind, natural gas is still the number one subsidized fuel in the Country. Energy is so costly and I try not to overstep that because what we can control and vote on is I think, what is the IDA abating, what is the return, and how do we maximize local jobs, local expenditures, the businesses that are a part of it can grow, the people that live in those communities how does it impact them. Unfortunately, there is never an easy answer and I think that is the challenge particularly on this project. You have 3 towns out of 32 that have supported this project and have asked us to consider support based on the host community agreements. The work has started and the company is ordering turbines so you can look at it on one hand to maximize the deal for the towns, do we maximize the deal without a PILOT and what are the nuances of that. I think we look at it as an economic development point and how to we maximize the return locally to the towns, the region and the county.

-Mr. Buffamante: We have all had a chance to look through the public hearing comments. I went to 2 of the public hearings and I thought they were reasonable civil. There were a wide range of opinions both for and against but what I think we really need to decide here is this project is in 3 towns, substantially in 2 towns and those towns have a chance to get about \$22 plus million in HCA payments over a 20-year term. They would also get 15% of the PILOT payments so they would end up with a little over \$25 to \$26 million in revenues for a project which is in their towns, which their town boards supported through the last couple elections versus no PILOT and the towns only get about \$10-\$12 million of the normal tax payments so that is really what we are talking about. The towns where these projects are, should they reap the bulk of the benefits from the revenues, this is all future money, none of this exists today, we are not taking any current tax revenue away from anyone, it is all future money. All IDA projects with approved PILOTs do take future tax money away, but hopefully for the good of the project and the things they create over the long term whether it be jobs, or in this case, it's not about jobs but there will be some construction jobs for a few years which is good for the area, there is a handful of new jobs to be created that probably will be decent jobs so you can agree or not agree, the purpose of the project is to provide energy needs to New York State. We can argue whether the energy is efficient, but the fact is, it does produce energy. Everything you read about states a shortage of energy and electricity and going forward needs to be solved whether by wind, solar or nuclear. Is there any other questions or comments anyone would like to make?

-Mr. Driscoll: It seems the towns in good faith have negotiated and they are the ones that are impacted, so from my point of view, they should get that benefit. I believe this project will go forward and I am for giving the benefit to the town as much as possible. I think that is the case in a lot of our projects, we look to the towns for their approval, which they have given here, and I think they should get the benefit, that is my opinion.

-Ms. Schroder: I think there is a way of giving them the benefit and still maximizing the project. I guess what I am struggling with, and continue to struggle with, is my lack of interest in helping a billion-dollar company secure better financing, or security in their return of investments on the backs of all Cattaraugus County residents and taxpayers. We are talking \$57 million that is \$4.75 million per permanent job which is a lot different than the cheese plant, but I think what could happen here is and what I would support, and what I would do, as a county legislature, turn down the county PILOT and take the \$15.02 million coming to the county and pass either a resolution or a local law to have that money go to the benefit of the 2 towns and then the school districts make out because they get \$14.1 million extra and the county also does not lose because we get the mortgage recording tax and the sales tax in the millions. That to me, seems like a much better financial deal. I am struggling with the fact that I know for those of you who read all the comments, it is a business deal and when look at my business partner, I want to know who my business partner is, who am I getting into bed with, and I do not have a lot of confidence in this company. This is a company that does not think anything about violating its contracts with the Attorney General, engaging in less than transparent interactions with town boards that have compromised board members on it, the ones that tapped the host community agreement, a company that has had lawsuits for fraud, and I think about our Agency that has such an excellent reputation souring it by having a business relationship with a company, in my own opinion, that is not a very good company. I commit to at the county level sponsoring a resolution/local law that takes the \$15.02 million and allocate it to the benefit of the towns, the school districts make off with \$14.1 million and the county still makes extra benefits in the millions in mortgage recording tax and sales tax. To me, that's a win, win, we don't get into bed with an unsavory developer and the towns get the benefits. That is what think should happen and I would support that.

-Mr. Snyder: Good idea Ginger. Do you think the legislature would support that?

-Ms. Schroder: I do.

-Mr. Snyder: That would be a better solution for everyone, at least in the county.

-Mr. Buffamante: How would that be guaranteed for 20 years?

-Ms. Schroder: If you passed a local law.

-Mr. Driscoll: I think that is a big if, in my opinion, it is a big if and the other if is, if we do not pass this PILOT then how is this project going to change.

-Ms. Schroder: From my perspective, from what I heard, it can only change for the better because there will be less in Cattaraugus County so that is a good thing as nobody wants this project, very few people do. You heard the public comments.

-Mr. Driscoll: We have 3 letters from the towns which state they want this project, so I respectfully disagree.

-Ms. Schroder: Fine, we have all said setting around the table we would have differences in opinions. I am for the entire county and that is my position, I am not for the towns. I feel bad for the residents that elected the people that engaged in this less than transparent activity to line their own pockets, I feel bad for that, but it is what it is.

-Mr. Buffamante: The voters in the 2 towns have had several opportunities to change the board and it did not happen and I don't know why.

-Ms. Schroder: I can tell you why, because the project had already been approved and they had their certificates and once the town did change the board and change the local law that was put in place by the residents and the town board members who had leases on the project and financial interests in the project, once the town board



was changed by the voters, the signing board said they did not care and sided in favor of the law that was put in place by the compromised town board.

-Mr. Buffamante: Any other comments?

-Mr. Wimer: I have a question. Obviously, this is one of the more consequential votes we will take so I have a couple of questions that would benefit by the advice from counsel and am interested in an executive session.

-Mr. Murray: I would like to be very clear; we need to identify what we will be going into executive session for. We will be going into execution session for attorney/client privilege.

-Mr. Wiktor: For everyone on zoom, it is currently 10:08 a.m. and in about 15 minutes we will restart the meeting, so 10:25 a.m. and we appreciate everyone's patience.

### **Executive Session:**

**A Motion was made by Michael Wimer seconded by Joe Snyder** to go into Executive Session for Attorney/Client Privilege at 10:06 a.m. All in Favor – **Motion Carried.**

**A Motion was made by Brent Driscoll seconded by Joseph Higgins** to exit Executive Session and return to the regular meeting at 10:26 a.m. All in Favor – **Motion Carried.** For the official record, no action was taken in the Executive Session.

-Invenergy Counsel: We will have an ability to respond to some of the comments that we made?

-Mr. Driscoll: Sure.

-Invenergy Counsel: First, I would like to make some objections to some of the comments that were made about my client, Invenergy. They have a great track record of working with communities and developers and I also take issue with the attacks on the dully elected representatives in communities who have done their best to represent their constituents. I would also like to say this idea that somehow a county legislature can adopt a local law and divert revenue to the communities, there is no support for that in the law, it's illegal and would violate Article 8 of the Constitution, there is no ability to do that and that does not account for the shortfall. I don't know where that number comes from, but it would not make up for the shortfall in the host community agreements. If that was ever an idea that was going to be proposed, why is it being dropped at the last minute, not having it vetted by counsel, not having it been discussed nor introduced to the legislature, the resolution of the legislature says to consider the PILOT.

-Mr. Buffamante: If there are no more comments, we are going to call for a vote.

-Mr. Wiktor: I want to make sure there are not any more comments.

-Mr. Buffamante: Are there any more comments?

-Ms. Schroder: I think I would like to respond that as I don't know where someone gets off giving legal advice without our counsel, but I will say that I am committed to making sure that money is spent in those towns and there are ways to do that and we will do it whatever lawful way that needs to be done, that is my commitment.

-Mr. Buffamante: Any other comments? I call for a motion to vote.

**\*Resolution from Prior Approved Projects\***

**Resolution:**

A Motion was made by Brent Driscoll seconded by James Snyder, RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY OF CATTARAUGUS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY: (i) ACCEPTING THE APPLICATION OF ALLE-CATT WIND ENERGY LLC, AND/OR INDIVIDUAL(S) OR AFFILIATE(S), SUBSIDIARY(IES), OR ENTITY(IES) FORMED OR TO BE FORMED ON ITS BEHALF (INDIVIDUALLY, AND/OR COLLECTIVELY, THE “COMPANY”) IN CONNECTION WITH A CERTAIN PROJECT DESCRIBED BELOW; (ii) RATIFYING THE SCHEDULING, NOTICING, AND CONDUCTING OF A PUBLIC HEARING IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT; (iii) APPOINTING THE COMPANY, OR ITS DESIGNEE, AS ITS AGENT TO UNDERTAKE THE PROJECT; (iv) AUTHORIZING THE UNDERTAKING OF THE PROJECT TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE COMPANY IN THE FORM OF (A) A SALES TAX EXEMPTION BENEFIT FOR PURCHASES AND RENTALS RELATED TO THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPPING OF THE PROJECT, (B) A MORTGAGE RECORDING TAX EXEMPTION BENEFIT FOR FINANCING RELATED TO THE PROJECT, AND (C) A PARTIAL ABATEMENT FROM REAL PROPERTY TAXES BENEFIT THROUGH THE PILOT AGREEMENT; AND (v) AUTHORIZING THE NEGOTIATION AND EXECUTION OF A LEASE AGREEMENT, LEASEBACK AGREEMENT, A PAYMENT-IN-LIEU-OF-TAX AGREEMENT, AN AGENT AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT AGREEMENT, AND RELATED DOCUMENTS. A roll call of the Board of Directors of the CCIDA was taken, Mr. Buffamante, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Wimer voted yes. Mr. Snyder and Ms. Schroder voted no. **Motion Carried 5 to 2.**

A Motion was made by Brent Driscoll seconded by Joseph Higgins to adjourn the meeting at 10:41 a.m. All in Favor – **Motion Carried.**

**\* Next CCIDA Board of Directors Meeting: February 18, 2025 at 11:15 a.m.**  
**at the CCIDA Offices**  
**9 E. Washington Street, Ellicottville, NY**  
**and also, via Zoom.**