

# FINGER LAKES REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

## NOVEMBER 18, 2011

**Council Voting Members Present:** Joel Seligman, Bob Brown, Charlie Cook, Bill Destler, Steve Griffin, Pamela Heald, Theresa Mazzullo, John Noble, Cynthia Oswald, Mark Peterson, Tyrone Reaves, Hilda Rosario Escher, Rob Sands, Christine Whitman. **Representatives for Council Members Present:** Judy Seil for Maggie Brooks, Patrick Rountree for James Merrick, Bill Stassburg for Danny Wegman. **Council Voting Members Absent:** Brad MacDonald, Tom Macinski, Augustin Melendez, Sandy Parker, Danny Wegman, Kirsten Werner.

**Team Members Present:** Robert McNary, Joe Hamm, Dave Seeley, Kiska Stevens.

**State Agency Members:** Lee Loomis, Kevin Hurley

**Other Attendees:** Josh Farrelman, Peter Robinson, Bill Strassburg.

Mr. Seligman convened the meeting at 3:00 PM in the Empire Room at MCC. He welcomed the attendees, stating that Mr. Wegman sends his regrets that he cannot attend today's meeting. He stated that he and Mr. Wegman will be making the oral presentation of the Finger Lakes Strategic Plan on November 28, 2011 at the Capitol in Albany. He named the State Strategic Plan Review Committee members who will conduct the interview. He indicated that he had reviewed the other Plans and that we have one of the shortest documents, with fewer transformational projects.

He stated that in the coming months the Council will have to deal with a number of issues, including organizational matters (e.g. meeting times, telephonic meetings, etc.), how to implement the Plan, performance measures, the Local Government Shared Services Project, review of new CFA applications, etc. He stated that the review of the 300 CFA applications was burdensome to the scorers and difficult to perform, given broad range of topics. Mr. Cook commented that the quality of the final Plan document was excellent. He thanked the Co-Chairs and the staff who worked so diligently on it.

Next Mr. Peterson reviewed the scoring process that the four scorers performed on each CFA application, stating that they reviewed application information on each one of the 300 applications. They compared all scores, threw out the "outlying score" and arrived at two mutually agreeable scores. The average of these two scores was used by the State to reflect the recommended Council score for the project. In some cases they discussed disparities and arrived at conclusions. He also stated that the scorers recused themselves from scoring applications where they had a conflict of interest. These recusals will be described in today's voting. Mr. McNary indicated that some regions had many scoring teams for their applications, resulting in no consistency in how they scored projects overall. Ms. Oswald thanked her three scoring colleagues for their diligent work.

Mr. Seligman indicated that we intend to review the CFA applications in blocks, with the exception of the New York Power Authority (NYPA) applications (i.e. Recharge NY Program) and

the Housing and Community Renewal (HCR) applications. A breakdown of the voting blocks, with member recusals, was distributed to the Council (copy attached). The Recharge NY applications will be reviewed and scored after November 30, 2011, the due date for companies submitting these applications. The HCR applications (copy attached) were not scored using the CFA Review Process, and as a result, we will review these after we score the CFA applications today.

He indicated that any Council Member who has an objection to the recommended score can state their objection, the score that they would recommend and the reasons for the proposed change. This would be done during the discussion phase, after the motion and second on the scores for a given block. Members who have recused themselves from a given voting block must leave the room prior to the voting and not enter into discussion about the project.

Mr. McNary noted that Ms. Rosario Escher just identified today another application that she must recuse herself from. It is #8281.

Mr. Noble asked if the yellow highlighted applications were the Transformational Projects, the ones included in the Plan as Priority Projects. Mr. Seligman indicated that that was the case. He asked why some of the scores for these projects was lower than others. Mr. Peterson replied that the scorers had to score them according to six Regional Plan criteria (e.g. Vision, Strategies, Leverage, etc.) and how the applicants answered these questions.

Mr. Seligman then initiated the following voting procedure for the designated voting blocks:

- The first block consisted of applications: 1996, 2122, 2164, 2214, 2230, 2247, 2294, 2385, 2408, 2434, 2537, 2576, 2580, 2594, 2642, 2689, 2698, 2732, 2757, 2781, 2786, 2790, 2800, 2801, 2855, 2894, 2938, 3014, 3027, 3084, 3102, 3016, 3114, 3146, 3179, 3198, 3199, 3226, 3256, 3259, 3292, 3339, 3497, 3548, 3815, 3843, 3874, 3875, 3879, 3887, 3891, 3933, 3971, 3980, 3990, 4102, 4120, 4144, 4200, 4256, 4271, 4293, 4317, 4333, 4344, 4376, 4377, 4378, 4468, 4554, 4558, 4560, 4626, 4688, 4772, 4926, 4952, 5043, 5093, 5125, 5129, 5167, 5227, 5252, 5279, 5286, 5292, 5366, 5385, 5386, 5389, 5431, 5435, 5448, 5451, 5476, 5489, 5499, 5527, 5537, 5577, 5610, 5619, 5620, 5668, 5684, 5705, 5707, 5724, 5758, 5810, 5882, 6045, 6065, 6072, 6083, 6095, 6120, 6121, 6126, 6147, 6148, 6149, 6238, 6271, 6305, 6339, 6358, 6387, 6405, 6433, 6437, 6517, 6596, 6624, 6640, 6687, 6722, 6723, 6780, 6783, 6802, 6825, 6872, 6875, 6886, 6926, 6927, 6988, 6995, 6998, 7033, 7053, 7145, 7163, 7172, 7174, 7214, 7218, 7244, 7275, 7291, 7368, 7392, 7432, 7466, 7468, 7474, 7479, 7482, 7515, 7528, 7594, 7598, 7607, 7613, 7648, 7677, 7690, 7709, 7721, 7746, 7762, 7768, 7785, 7819, 7853, 7926, 7937, 7941, 7953, 7980, 7981, 8043, 8049, 8056, 8064, 8069, 8073, 8099, 8126, 8128, 8132, 8151, 8185, 8208, 8210, 8234, 8265, 8274, 8343, 8352, 8415, 8456, 8476, 8477, 8490, 8493, 8504, 8535, 8539, 8559, 8581, 8587, 8610, 8614, 8627, 8628, 8644, 8670, 8671, 8679, 8680, 8693, 8697, 8701, 8704, 8803, 8861, 8865, 8869, 8870, 8886, 9027, 9407, 9538. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to vote on this first block of CFA applications. Mr. Destler made the motion and Ms. Whitman seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Ms. Rosario Escher recused herself from applications 4401, 4883, 8810 and 8281, and then left the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to approve these applications. Mr. Brown made the

motion and Mr. Noble seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.

- Ms. Rosario Escher returned to the room and Mr. Destler and Ms. Whitman recused themselves from applications 5990, 6495, 7215, 8044, 8159, 8209, 8214, 8365, 8368 and then left the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to approve these applications. Ms. Heald made the motion and Mr. Brown seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Next Mr. Seligman recused himself from voting on application 7804 and left the room. Mr. Destler and Ms. Whitman remained out of the room, as they were also recused from this application. Mr. Peterson, performing the Co-Chair duties in Mr. Seligman's absence, asked for a motion to approve the application. Ms. Mazzullo made the motion and Mr. Brown seconded it. Mr. Peterson asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Peterson then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Ms. Mazzullo recused herself from voting on application 5392 and left the room. Mr. Seligman and Mr. Destler remained out of the room, as did Ms. Whitman, as they are also recused from this project. Mr. Peterson asked for a motion on the application. Ms. Heald made the motion and Mr. Brown seconded it. Mr. Peterson asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Peterson called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Ms. Whitman, Mr. Destler and Ms. Mazzullo returned to the room and Mr. Seligman remained out of the room as he had to recuse himself from applications 4748, 6232 and 6754. Mr. Peterson asked for a motion to vote on these applications. Ms. Mazzullo made the motion and Mr. Brown seconded it. Mr. Peterson asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Peterson then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Seligman returned to the room and Ms. Whitman recused herself from the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to vote on applications 4512 and 6764. Ms. Mazzullo made the motion and Mr. Noble seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman called for the vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Peterson, Mr. Griffin, Ms. Whitman and Ms. Mazzullo recused themselves from application 6361 and left the room. Mr. Seligman then asked for a motion to vote on this application. Ms. Heald made the motion and Mr. Cook seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Ms. Whitman, Ms. Mazzullo, Mr. Peterson and Mr. Griffin returned to the room and Mr. Noble recused himself from voting on application 6788 and left the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to vote on the application. Mr. Destler made the motion and Ms. Heald seconded it.

Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.

- Mr. Noble returned to the room. Mr. Sands and Mr. Destler recused themselves from voting on applications 3930 and 8144 and left the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to vote on applications 3930 and 8144. Ms. Mazzullo made the motion and Mr. Noble seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if any further discussion was needed and no one commented. Mr. Seligman then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Sands and Mr. Destler returned to the room. Next Mr. Griffin recused himself from voting on applications 2423, 2967, 3944, 4128, 4130, 4138, 4327, 5130, 5132, 5821, 6848, 7035 and 7968. He then left the room. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to vote on these applications. Mr. Cook made the motion and Mr. Brown seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman asked for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Griffin returned to the room and Mr. Seligman recused himself from voting on application 7136 and left the room. Mr. Peterson asked for a motion to vote on application 7136. Ms. Whitman made the motion and Mr. Destler seconded it. Mr. Peterson asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Peterson called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Seligman returned to the room and stated that next we would be voting on the Housing Community Renewal (HCR) applications and explained that they are all being recommended by the Scoring Committee for a High Priority rating, are aligned with the Regional Strategic Plan and are recommended for funding. HCR recommends these projects and has funding set aside to implement them. Mr. Seligman asked for a motion to approve the HCR applications. Ms. Whitman made the motion and Mr. Noble seconded it. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any need for recusals. Mr. Griffin stated he would need to recuse himself and left the room. Mr. Seligman asked if there was any further discussion and no one commented. Mr. Seligman then called for a vote and it was unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.
- Mr. Griffin returned to the room.
- Mr. Seligman stated we have concluded the voting and wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. The Council will be reconvened at a time yet to be determined.