



To: Board of Directors; Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation
John Sidd
From: Katelyn Wright
Date: August 5, 2014
Re: Board of Directors Meeting – August 7, 2014

The Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation Board of Directors will hold a special meeting of the Board of Directors on **Thursday, August 7, 2014 at 8:00 A.M.** in the Syracuse/Onondaga County Economic Development Office conference room at 333 W. Washington Street, Syracuse, NY 13202.

I. Call to order

II. Roll Call

III. Proof of Notice

IV. New Business

- A. Amend scope of work for asbestos abatement at 611 Park Street , H_U K
, AF 9<<ALAGF LG 8 M8Й33 K; GH= 9DJ=9<Q 9HHJGN=<Г K== HJGB=; LAGF G> 9DD <=; GFKLJM; LAGF ; GKLK AF o⁻k3 EAFML=K
- B. Award of deconstruction contracts , K== o⁻k3 EAFML=K 9LL9; @=< , H_U л
 - a. 201 Furman
 - b. 611 Park Street
 - c. 552 Gifford
- C. Approve Sale of 751 N. Salina Street , H_U p , HD=9K= J=9< L@= 9LL9; @=< J=KGDMLAGF =PHD9AFAP? L@= KH=; A9D ; AJ; MEKL9F; =K

V. Discussion

Update on Addis Building

Acknowledgement of Fiduciary Duties and Responsibilities

VI. Adjournment



PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST

PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

GREATER SYRACUSE PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

IS SCHEDULED FOR

Thursday, August 7, 2014

AT 8:00 A.M.

AT

WASHINGTON STATION
333 West Washington Street, Suite 130
Syracuse, NY 13202

For more information, please contact Katelyn Wright at 315-422-2301 or kwright@syracuselandbank.org



July 22, 2014

Mr. Andrew Erickson
Greater Syracuse Land Bank
333 W Washington Street, Suite 130
Syracuse, NY 13202

RE: Asbestos Abatement Additional Abatement
611 Park Street

Dear Mr. Erickson,

Summit Environmental Services is pleased to present the following cost for the abatement work to be performed at 611 Park Street in Syracuse, NY.

Summit will provide all labor, materials, equipment, fees and disposal for the removal of the additionally discovered asbestos containing coating on the exterior foundation per the amended survey performed by Churchill Environmental. The above mentioned work can be completed for the sum of:

Bid Price \$5,100.00

- *The price above excludes ICR56 air monitoring. To be hired by the owner.*
- *Water and power on site provided by owner.*

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a quote on this project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Tom Strong
Summit Environmental

*6075 Corporate Drive, East Syracuse, NY 13057
Phone: (315) 437-1418 Fax: (315) 437-1440
Email: strongsummit@gmail.com*



Minutes

Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation
2014 DECONSTRUCTION PILOT PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, July 30, 2014 8:00 A.M.
333 W. Washington Street, Suite 130
Syracuse, NY 13202

Committee Members Present: Vito Sciscioli, Dwight L. Hicks, Brenda Griffin, Katelyn Wright, Andrew Erickson

Committee Members participating via teleconference: Mark Lichtenstein

Others Present: Kevin Stack, Josh Stack, Dan Hoosac

I. Call to order

Vito Sciscioli called the meeting to order at 8:07 AM.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Sciscioli noted that all members of the committee were present except for Mr. Lichtenstein, participating via teleconference.

III. Proof of Notice

Mr. Sciscioli noted that proper notice of the meeting had been posted.

IV. New Business

Ms. Wright noted that this was the first meeting of this steering committee, which the board of directors voted to create on June 25, 2014. This committee, including both board members and other volunteers, is considered a committee of the corporation and is only authorized to advise the board of directors. In addition, the Land Bank has retained Northeast Green Building Consulting, LLC, (represented by Kevin and Josh Stack) to provide technical assistance in administering this pilot program.

Ms. Wright indicated that the first item of business was to review four bids received in response to the first of two requests for proposals included in the 2014 Deconstruction Pilot Program. Mr. Sciscioli asked if the summary tables distributed represented the scoring matrix included in the RFP and Ms. Wright explained that the summary tables were meant to distill the large amount of data received from the various contractors, but that the committee should, together, go through the scoring table and assign values to the various contractors based on their relative merit in each category. The committee proceeded to discuss each line of the scoring matrix and compare the contractors' responses relative to each rating factor. The points table developed is included on the next page:

	Points Possible	1st Point, LLC & The Reuse People	Hope 4 Us Housing, Inc.	Ultraclean, Inc.	ReClaim Syracuse, LLC
Cost	30	10	10	30	12
Appropriateness of Diversion Plan and % Diverted	25	15	20	20	22
Safety Plan	15	15	13	15	13
Knowledge of Applicable Regulations	10	5	7	10	7
Economic and Workforce Development	20	10	15	10	12
Total	100	55	65	85	66

The Committee reviewed the various proposals and discussed their relative merit in the above categories in order to assign points and compare each respondent's overall plan.

Cost:

Contractors were required to submit a budget for each property and permitted to submit a reduced price for the whole bundle of properties. 1st Point, LLC was the only contractor to submit a bundled price. 1st Point's bundled price was comparable to Hope 4 Us Housing's collective price for all three. It appeared that 1st Point's individual prices were so much higher because they planned to contract with The Reuse People to provide training on their first two houses deconstructed. ReClaim Syracuse's bids were slightly lower and Ultraclean's prices were significantly lower than any other bidder.

Some contractors included only heavy equipment rental and equipment costs directly attributable to these specific jobs in their equipment line and others included start-up costs such as the purchase of basic tools and equipment that would be used on numerous future jobs and should be amortized over several years as overhead costs.

Discussing all contractors' proposed costs Northeast Green Building Consulting stressed the importance of including a contingency line and planning for acceptable responses to various unexpected conditions discovered once work has begun within the contract.

Diversion Plan:

Ultraclean and 1st Point provided the most specific materials inventories and plans for diversion of various waste streams. Ultraclean plans to donate much material to the Habitat for Humanity ReStore and is developing strategies for online marketing of materials and a hierarchy of marketing strategies. 1st Point proposed a more limited hierarchy of strategies to dispose of diverted and included donation as one of those possible strategies, as well. Both entities would have to identify interim storage facilities if materials couldn't be sold directly off the site.

ReClaim Syracuse and Hope 4 Us lacked the detailed materials inventory, but each planned to reuse the materials themselves. ReClaim proposed to divert 100% and Hope 4 Us did not include a diversion rate for every structure. It was unclear how other materials not of use to these two entities would be recycled or disposed of. Hope 4 Us would utilize much of the material for the construction of 'reclaimed wood' furniture which they plan to sell and ReClaim would utilize much of the material in ongoing renovations that they are undertaking. Hope 4 Us possesses warehousing space to store these materials. Concern was expressed about the ability to track materials to their end-use if they are warehoused for an extended period of time.

Safety Plan:

Ultraclean and 1st Point/Reuse People scored the highest in this category. The safety plan presented by Ultraclean addressed all applicable regulations and their references spoke highly of their job-site organization and safety compliance. The Reuse People's safety manual is specifically designed for deconstruction. Hope 4 Us and ReClaim developed an adequate plan, but possessed less experience managing these conditions in the field. Ultraclean's plan to panelize and drop the structures to the ground for disassembly was the safest method proposed.

Knowledge of Applicable Regulations:

Josh and Kevin Stack indicated that they'd checked Ultraclean's references and were quite impressed with the positive reviews from customers having used them locally for selective demolition work. Deconstruction jobs are governed by the same regulations as demolition jobs, with which ultraclean has extensive experience.

It seemed that The Reuse People would be training the construction management team from 1st Point on their first two jobs, as well as the crew, and that they would employ that training independently on the third house. The other two respondents have some experience with deconstruction.

Economic and Workforce Development:

Hope 4 Us Housing, Inc. proposed to employ graduates of their CDBG-funded deconstruction training program, but to also sub out a large portion of the labor to an experienced contractor. ReClaim Syracuse proposed to sub out their labor to Hope 4 Us and thereby to create the same jobs. 1st Point proposed to hire on two full deconstruction crews, previously having received no deconstruction training, and for The Reuse People to train them on the first two job sites. Ultraclean plans to utilize existing employees experienced in selective demolition and to bring on at least two temporary workers from Syracuse Pavilion, a prisoner reentry program, and to provide them with on-the-job training. While this will result in less job-creation, it does address the RFP's question about workforce development and this ratio of trainees to experienced workers is less likely to cause delays in the project or prompt concerns about job-site safety.

1st Point, LLC is a certified MBE and Brenda Griffin reported that Hope 4 Us's MBE status is pending. ReClaim Syracuse would sub work out to Hope 4 Us. Ultraclean is not an M/WBE.

No respondents identified local businesses that might utilize materials by repurposing them into new products except Hope 4 Us, which planned to reuse the materials themselves. ReClaim and 1st Point described a desire to see materials reused in local building renovation projects. Hope 4 Us hopes to create jobs in furniture production. None of these projected job creation numbers.

Other factors of note:

Ms. Wright noted that of all the various proposals ReClaim's appeared to be the most collaborative and included a number of local contractors with experience in deconstruction. Others noted that might prompt concerns about coordination. Several participants also noted that several other deconstruction contractors had expressed interest in bidding on the next round of houses to be bid out.

Ultimately the committee concluded that Ultraclean's proposal was the most competitive and highest rated proposal and that the committee would recommend the Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation contact with Ultraclean, adding a contingency line to the price bid to arrive at a not to exceed amount, for the first three deconstruction projects.

V. Discussion

Ms. Wright indicated that she also wished to review the overall financial outlook for the 2014 Pilot Program and ensure that the committee was comfortable proceeding before issuing the next request for proposals. She presented a budget summary (attached) and indicated that some values included represent averages from Round 1 of the project, but serve as a projection of total program costs.

She noted that the Land Bank's hope is that by increasing the volume of deconstructions in 2015 the cost will be driven down. She also noted that the plan is to inventory and abate all demolition/deconstruction candidates over the winter so that they're lined up and ready for demolition or deconstruction in the spring and that those structures most appropriate for deconstruction will be identified and abated much earlier in the year. She noted that at this rate of spending the County funds restricted to deconstruction would likely fund the 'delta' or increased cost of 10 projects and that the base amount is being funded from the Attorney General's grant funds for demolition. She explained that the production benchmarks in that grant agreement are driving the completion timelines for these projects – three by September 30 and three more by December 31 this year.

Given the higher than expected costs of deconstruction she asked whether the committee thought it wise to proceed with bidding out the next three jobs. All agreed that it seemed appropriate given the financial outlook presented.

VI. Adjourn

All agreed unanimously to adjourn at 9:23 AM.

Address	Round 1			Round 2					
	552 Gifford	201 Furman	611 Park	123 Henderson	1806 Lodi	165 Culbert			
Asbestos/Lead Survey	\$ 2,502.00	\$ 2,596.00	\$ 3,625.00	\$ 4,054.00	\$ 5,315.00	\$ 3,718.00			
Asbestos Abatement	\$ 6,750.00	\$ 13,250.00	\$ 10,300.00	\$ 18,500.00	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 10,245.00			
Air Monitoring	\$ 2,750.00	\$ 332.00	\$ 1,624.00	\$ 3,727.00	\$ 930.00	\$ 1,624.00			
Land Survey	\$ 725.00	\$ 375.00	\$ 725.00	\$ 608.33	\$ 608.33	\$ 608.33			
Deconstruction	\$ 21,740.00	\$ 27,450.00	\$ 19,920.00	\$ 23,036.67	\$ 23,036.67	\$ 23,036.67			
Total Costs	\$ 34,467.00	\$ 44,003.00	\$ 36,194.00	\$ 49,926.00	\$ 32,090.00	\$ 39,232.00	\$ 235,912.00	admin fees	total draw
AG Grant	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ (22,500.00)	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 148,500.00
County Funds (Already Drawn)	\$ (12,727.00)	\$ (16,553.00)	\$ (16,274.00)	\$ (26,889.33)	\$ (9,053.33)	\$ (16,195.33)	\$ 97,692.00	\$ 9,769.20	\$ 107,461.20
Remaining costs (County)	\$ (760.00)	\$ 4,950.00	\$ (2,580.00)	\$ 536.67	\$ 536.67	\$ 536.67	\$ 3,220.00	\$ 322.00	\$ 3,542.00

sum

subtotal: \$ 111,003.20

Consultant costs: \$ 15,075.00

County total: \$ 126,078.20

remaining in restricted acct: \$ 73,921.80

Decon and Land Survey costs for Round 2 properties are averages from Round 1, inserted for planning purposes
Abatement costs are true costs across both Rounds

A special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation ("GSPDC") was convened in public session at the offices of the GSPDC located at 333 West Washington Street, Suite 130, Syracuse, New York 13202 on August 7, 2014 at 8:00 a.m.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman and, upon roll being called, the following directors of the GSPDC were:

PRESENT:

Vito Sciscioli, Chair
Daniel Barnaba, Treasurer
Dwight L. Hicks, Secretary
James Corbett
Julie Cerio

ABSENT:

FOLLOWING PERSONS WERE ALSO PRESENT:

Katelyn Wright	Executive Director
John P. Sidd, Esq.	GSPDC Counsel

The following resolution was offered by _____, seconded by _____, to wit:

Resolution No.: 28 of 2014

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF 751 NORTH SALINA STREET TO 751 NORTH SALINA STREET, LLC

WHEREAS, New York Not-For-Profit Corporation Law §1609(d) authorizes the GSPDC to convey, exchange, sell, or transfer any of its interests in, upon or to real property; and

WHEREAS, New York Not-For-Profit Corporation Law §1605(i)(5) requires that a sale of real property be approved a majority vote of the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, section 4 of the GSPDC's Disposition of Real and Personal Property Policy (the "Property Disposition Policy") permits the GSPDC to dispose of property for less than fair value by negotiation when the disposal is within the mission, purpose, or governing statute of the GSPDC; and

WHEREAS, Section 4 of the Property Disposition Policy also permits the GSPDC to dispose of property by negotiation when the fair market value of the property does not exceed Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00), subject to obtaining such competition as is feasible under the circumstances; and

WHEREAS, all disposals of GSPDC property must be made to qualified buyers pursuant to Section 5 of the Property Disposition Policy; and

WHEREAS, the GSPDC owns a certain parcel of real property situate in the City of Syracuse, County of Onondaga, and State of New York commonly known as 751 North Salina Street and identified by City of Syracuse tax map number 008.-07-03.0 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the two-story building on the Property is unoccupied and in a dilapidated condition (the "Building"); and

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2014, the City of Syracuse Division of Code Enforcement issued an Emergency Notice and Order informing the GSPDC that the City determined the Building to be unfit for human habitation, dangerous to human life and detrimental to health and posed an immediate danger to the health, safety and welfare of the general public and, as such, needed to be immediately demolished as an emergency and that the GSPDC would be liable for the costs associate therewith (the "Notice and Order"); and

WHEREAS, the City has not yet undertaken the demolition of the Building under the terms of the Notice and Order; and

WHEREAS, a restricted appraisal of the Property conducted by Grady Appraisals on behalf of the GSPDC and dated July 28, 2014 determined the fair market value of the Property to be \$14,000.00 as of July 20, 2014 (the "Restricted Appraisal"); and

WHEREAS, Grady Appraisals cautioned the GSPDC that the Restricted Appraisal has a lower level of reliability than an Appraisal report and the Restricted Appraisal does not reference the Notice and Order; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors believes Grady Appraisals was unaware of the Notice and Order as of the appraisal date; and

WHEREAS, 751 North Salina Street, LLC (the "Buyer") has submitted a purchase offer for the Property in the amount of one dollar (\$1.00); and

WHEREAS, the Buyer plans to perform an immediate structural stabilization of the Property and to renovate and lease the Property to commercial and/or residential tenants, thereby restoring the Property to productive use; and

WHEREAS, GSPDC staff have determined that the Buyer is a qualified buyer; and

WHEREAS, selling the Property to the Buyer will eliminate the GSPDC's liability with respect to the Property, including the GSPDC's liability for the cost of demolishing the Property in accordance with the Notice and Order which preliminary estimates indicate would exceed \$45,000.00; and

WHEREAS, transferring title to the Property to the Buyer will benefit the public by increasing tax revenues, helping to enhance property values in the neighborhood in which the Property is located, and abating safety hazards which may be present at the Property; and

WHEREAS, as the Buyer's plans are consistent with the mission, purpose, and governing statute of the GSPDC and the Property's fair market value does not exceed \$15,000.00, the Property Disposition Policy permits the GSPDC to transfer title to the Property to the Buyer for less than fair market value without holding a public auction or advertising for bids; and

WHEREAS, GSPDC staff have evaluated the proposed transfer in accordance with the Property Disposition Policy and have recommended that the GSPDC transfer title to the Property to the Buyer; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has considered the information set forth in section 4(g)(ii) of the Property Disposition Policy and has determined that there is no reasonable alternative to the proposed transfer that would achieve the same purpose of such transfer; and

WHEREAS, the GSPDC desires to sell the Property to the Buyer for a purchase price of one dollar (\$1.00); and

WHEREAS, the Buyer shall be required to execute and deliver a Development Enforcement Note and Mortgage to ensure that the Buyer fulfills its development and use commitments to the GSPDC.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GREATER SYRACUSE PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The recitals above are hereby incorporated into this Resolution as if fully set forth herein.

Section 2. The Members of the Board hereby authorize the GSPDC to sell the Property to the Buyer in accordance with the terms of this Resolution.

Section 3. The Chairman and the Executive Director of the GSPDC are each hereby authorized and directed to execute all documents on behalf of the GSPDC which

may be necessary or desirable to further the intent of this Resolution and do such further things or perform such acts as may be necessary or convenient to implement the provisions of this Resolution.

Section 4. The other officers, employees and agents of the GSPDC are hereby authorized and directed for and in the name and on behalf of the GSPDC to execute and deliver all such certificates, instruments and documents, to pay all such fees, charges and expenses and to do all such further acts and things as may be necessary or, in the opinion of the officer, employee or agent acting, desirable and proper to effect the purposes of the foregoing Resolution.

Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

The question of the adoption of the foregoing Resolution was duly put to a vote on roll call, which resulted as follows:

Vito Sciscioli	VOTING	_____
Daniel Barnaba	VOTING	_____
Dwight L. Hicks	VOTING	_____
James Corbett	VOTING	_____
Julie Cerio	VOTING	_____

The foregoing Resolution was thereupon declared and duly adopted.

STATE OF NEW YORK)
COUNTY OF ONONADAGA) ss.:

I, the undersigned Secretary of the Greater Syracuse Property Development Corporation (the "GSPDC"), DO HEREBY CERTIFY, that I have compared the foregoing extract of the minutes of the meeting of the directors of GSPDC, including the Resolution contained therein, held on August 7, 2014 with the original thereof on file in my office, and that the same is a true and correct copy of such proceedings of GSPDC and of such Resolution set forth therein and of the whole of said original so far as the same related to the subject matters therein referred to.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that (A) all directors of GSPDC had due notice of said meeting; (B) said meeting was in all respect duly held; (C) pursuant to Article 7 of the Public Officers Law (the "Open Meetings Law"), said meeting was open to the general public and due notice of the time and place of said meeting was given in accordance

with such Open Meetings Law; and (D) there was a quorum of the directors of GSPDC present through said meeting.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that, as of the date hereof, the attached Resolution is in full force and effect and has not been amended, repealed or rescinded.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of GSPDC this 7th day of August, 2014.

Dwight L. Hicks, Secretary