

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

C E N T R A L   P I N E   B A R R E N S  
C O M M I S S I O N   M E E T I N G

-----x

LIPA PSEG-LI MEDFORD OPERATIONS CENTER  
COMPATIBLE GROWTH AREA  
HARDSHIP WAVIER APPLICATION

-----x

October 18, 2023  
3:00 p.m.  
  
Town Hall  
Southampton, New York

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

October 18, 2023

2

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ROBERT T. CALARCO, Governor's Representative

DORIAN DALE, Suffolk County Designated Representative

DANIELLE HURLEY, Riverhead Designated Representative

MICHELLE DI BRITA, Brookhaven Designated Representative

JANICE SCHERER, Southampton Designated Representative

JUDITH E. JAKOBSEN, Executive Director

JULIE HARGRAVE, Joint Planning and Policy Manager

JOHN C. MILAZZO, Commission Counsel

ANGELA BROWN-WALTON, Administrative Assistant

ALSO PRESENT:

Lara Urvat - Permitting Specialist Supervisor PSEG

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

None

MR. CALARCO: The next item is the LIPA PSEG Long Island Medford Operations Center Compatible Growth Area Hardship Waiver application, 3351 NYS Route 112, Medford.

Ms. Hargrave, do you want to give us a brief overview?

MS. HARGRAVE: I'll just go through the staff report and the exhibits, and then the applicant is here to present, to make a presentation as well.

So, you have staff report and you have all of the exhibits. This is a Compatible Growth Area development of a significance project because of the traffic impact that resulted in the traffic study. The applicant has submitted a review of the Standards and Guidelines that are necessary for an application of that type.

This is an operations facility for PSEG. It's a 24 acre site on the east side of Route 112 in the Compatible Growth Area south of Granny Road. This is an assemblage of three parcels: One of them is wooded and part of that property will be part of the

1  
2 project site, and part of that will be  
3 cleared, about half an acre is what they're  
4 asking for the waiver. We will need more  
5 information on that, on how they meet the  
6 waiver criteria.

7 But to go through some of the facts  
8 of the property. Again, it's about 24 acres.  
9 It's really on the border of the Pine  
10 Barrens. The east side of 112 is the  
11 Compatible Growth Area, the west side is not.  
12 So, in this area of Route 112 north of Granny  
13 Road is different. So, this is on the border  
14 of the Pine Barrens and the Compatible Growth  
15 Area in this location.

16 Most of the site is presently  
17 developed with a facility called Country Fair  
18 Amusements. There's an existing 10,690  
19 square foot building, and that will be reused  
20 by the applicant. There is a mini golf  
21 facility, a driving range. So much of this  
22 site is already disturbed, over 19 acres  
23 approximately.

24 There are two new buildings proposed;  
25 one is 16,000 square feet for a fleet garage,

1 and the second one is a warehouse for utility  
2 vehicles at 21,000 square feet. So, combined  
3 with the existing building, the total  
4 building area is about 47,690 square feet.  
5 There will be parking for approximately 409  
6 vehicles; that includes staff passenger  
7 vehicles and fleet vehicles. So, there are  
8 different sizes for parking spaces for those  
9 vehicles.  
10

11 Again, the site is split zoned. It  
12 contains -- part of the site is zoned A1  
13 residence, about four and a half acres, and  
14 the rest, over 19 acres, is J2. So, the  
15 clearing is a combined limit for each of the  
16 different areas in different zoning  
17 categories. So, 63 percent of the site will  
18 be allowed to be cleared, if it was all  
19 wooded today and going to be cleared.

20 Again, this site benefits from  
21 pre-existing excess clearing. So, they are  
22 going to utilize this cleared area, 19.34  
23 acres and, again, add about another half an  
24 acre of clearing for the project. So, it  
25 will be cleared to about 82 percent.

1  
2 Again, this is development and it's  
3 material increase of intensity of use. There  
4 is a new traffic light proposed as well for  
5 the project on Route 112. Again, the traffic  
6 impacts showed the level of service degrading  
7 from a C to D in at least two instances, and  
8 in the Pine Barrens Land Use plan, that is a  
9 definition of development regional  
10 significance. They have presented  
11 information that is necessary for that type  
12 of application.

13 PSEG coordinated this application  
14 with the Commission two months ago and the  
15 Commission deferred lead agency. This also  
16 requires -- the Town, I don't believe, is  
17 involved because it's a PSEG/LIPA project.  
18 The DEC will be involved to approve. There  
19 will be permit requirements. And the  
20 clearing may need to adhere to habitat  
21 restrictions for clearing. It's a state,  
22 Route 112, so there will be a new curb cut,  
23 and that will be required to get a permit  
24 from the DOT. And the Health Department  
25 proposed an innovative alternative treatment

1  
2 system for the project. There are also two  
3 large 20,000 gallon above-ground fuel storage  
4 tanks that are proposed and will need to meet  
5 Health Department requirements.

6 You are familiar with this area.  
7 Route 112 is heavily developed and a heavily  
8 traveled corridor. To the north is -- in  
9 this area is, again, heavily developed  
10 non-residential uses and commercial uses. In  
11 the north side of the study area in a  
12 cemetery on the northwest side of Route 112  
13 and in the Compatible Growth Area. Again,  
14 across the street from the site is not in the  
15 Pine Barrens at all, and to the east is  
16 industrial, other industrial and commercial  
17 development, and to the south as well; gas  
18 station, food retail establishments zoning in  
19 the area covers J2, J4, multi-family.  
20 There's a multi-family condominium.  
21 Development adjacent to this site.

22 The project again, from our  
23 understanding, does not conform with the land  
24 use clearing limits. They want to clear  
25 another half an acre. One of the questions

1 is, just if they can confirm, they have  
2 not -- there's no way they can avoid this  
3 clearing. If there is a way to squeeze the  
4 project on the over 19 acres that they have  
5 that's cleared, that would be ideal to avoid  
6 this hardship. They attempted to do that.  
7 They can speak more to that today, and they  
8 can't do it, so they're looking for an  
9 approval of the waiver.  
10

11 There are some large trees on the  
12 frontage of this property, and we're asking  
13 that they preserve those trees in place and  
14 maybe supplement as a buffer but not remove  
15 the large trees that are there. It seems to  
16 be to their benefit. Maybe they can avoid  
17 moving those.

18 Again, it's up to you, but if you  
19 would like to see them to discuss whether  
20 they can place this building more up front on  
21 the site rather than parking. There's a  
22 large parking lot in the front yard of the  
23 property. Maybe it would be more appropriate  
24 to have the buildings up front rather than  
25 seeing parking, over 409 parking spaces.



1  
2 Other items in the discussion  
3 include, again, retaining the large trees on  
4 the site and submitting plans to protect the  
5 open space and as-built plans to monitor open  
6 space in the future, dark sky lighting, and  
7 to minimize signage on the site.

8 And that's all I have. I don't know  
9 if you have any questions.

10 MR. CALARCO: To be clear, this is  
11 before us because this project results in  
12 significance and the traffic impact as well  
13 as asking for the ability to clear beyond  
14 what would be authorized on the spot?

15 MS. HARGRAVE: That's correct.

16 MR. DALE: You may not be able to  
17 answer this question in context. What is the  
18 approximate operation center to this one and  
19 where is that located?

20 MR. CALARCO: That would probably be  
21 a better question for the applicant.

22 MR. DALE: Julie finds out so many  
23 things.

24 MS. HARGRAVE: Bethpage or Melville.

25 MS. URBAT: I do address it in my

presentation. I will have your answer.

MR. CALARCO: Why don't we hear from the applicant.

MS. URBAT: Good afternoon, Members of the Commission. I want to thank you for your attention and giving me the opportunity to review the project that we are proposing today. My name is Lara Urvat. I am the Permitting Specialist Supervisor for PSEG Long Island. PSEG Long Island is the agent for LIPA. LIPA is the New York State authority that owns and manages the electric grid on Long Island.

I'm going to give a brief presentation today to give you an overview of the project and answer some important questions that you likely have. We also do have some of our engineers here today, in case you have additional questions you would like answered at this time.

I just wanted to give you a little bit of the project background, the purpose and the need. So, we're looking to create a new central operation center to help serve

1 this portion of the Island. That would  
2 include office space, fleet parking, training  
3 area, inventory storage, fleet maintenance,  
4 open yard area, EV charging station, and a  
5 company vehicle fueling station which will be  
6 phased out, as the company is required to  
7 move to all electric vehicles by 2030. This  
8 is kind of an interim need until the fleet  
9 reaches that electric status.  
10

11 So, we need this facility to enhance  
12 the service in this portion of the Island.  
13 Our current facilities that service the  
14 central portion of the Island are in  
15 Patchogue and Port Jefferson, and they really  
16 are on the very extreme end of the Island.  
17 Where they're located is actually fairly  
18 difficult to reach the more central portions  
19 of the Island in order to do construction, do  
20 restoration, do all the tasks that we  
21 typically do. So the idea here is to  
22 consolidate and create a centralized location  
23 that will allow us to more easily service the  
24 Medford area and the surrounding area and  
25 service and attend to our customers more

1 quickly.

2  
3 So, this is just an overview of what  
4 the site looks like right now. We have  
5 New York State 112 on the west. On the east  
6 end of the proper is Cedarhurst Avenue, and  
7 Granny Road is to the north. As Julie  
8 mentioned, the site is currently occupied by  
9 an amusement center. It is fairly heavily  
10 developed. The front portion of the site is  
11 more intensely used, rear portion of the site  
12 is mostly occupied by parking and a driving  
13 range. The southeast portion of this site is  
14 wooded, however it's fairly poor quality  
15 woodland. It's been very heavily impacted  
16 some landscape dumping. I believe there in  
17 some paint ball activity back there. So,  
18 even though from the aerial prospective it  
19 looks like a pretty good chunk of woodland.  
20 That portion of woodland is not in any sort  
21 of great quality.

22 So, what site features are we looking  
23 to improve the site with? We're looking to  
24 convert the existing building into an office  
25 building. One of our main goals is adaptive

1 reuse of that building. So, we have worked  
2 with engineers and architects to adaptively  
3 reuse the building and convert it to office  
4 and don't have to knock down the building and  
5 put more up. We're also going to have an  
6 inventory storage and fleet maintenance area.  
7 Again, this is going to be a centralized  
8 location that is going to be key to our  
9 vehicles, especially the new EV vehicles that  
10 are coming in. Of course we have to have  
11 parking for both the employees and the fleet  
12 that will be utilized on the site.  
13

14 There's an open yard area and that's  
15 where we store some of the larger equipment.  
16 We have some pole lay down areas and things  
17 like that, and that's where our employees  
18 need to go pick up the equipment required to  
19 do construction as necessary.

20 We also have a training area. Our  
21 linemen have to go through fairly extensive  
22 training. Currently, we only have one main  
23 facility for training and that's in  
24 Hicksville. So for our linemen that are  
25 stationed on this portion of the Island, it

1 is quite difficult to get over to the  
2 Hicksville training area. So, we're looking  
3 to have a training area to help, again,  
4 service this portion of the Island.

5  
6 The EV charging station, as I  
7 mentioned, as our company moves to fully  
8 electric vehicles, that's going to become a  
9 key component. The company vehicle fueling  
10 station which, again, is anticipated to be  
11 temporary as we phase out of traditional  
12 fossil fuel vehicles and move to our EV  
13 vehicles.

14 We have incorporated a lot of green  
15 infrastructure and low impact development  
16 features into this site. We have really  
17 taken a hard look on how do we meet our goals  
18 and try to make it a very environmentally  
19 friendly and responsible project. So, the  
20 first feature is a wet meadow for storm water  
21 retention and recharge; those are typically  
22 found to be more beneficial traditionally  
23 through infrastructure, so we incorporated  
24 that where feasible.

25 We're also proposing two innovative

1  
2 alternative treatment systems for the  
3 sanitary waste water from the building. So  
4 the existing building will have been replaced  
5 with a new system, and then the fleet  
6 maintenance building will also get this  
7 alternative.

8 We are looking to restore  
9 approximately 5.73 acres of land to native  
10 habitat which is going to be a combination of  
11 forest and meadow habitat. I'll go through  
12 that in a little bit.

13 We'll have solar panels for our fleet  
14 canopy lighting. Fleet canopy is in our  
15 safety features. Safety is paramount at PSEG  
16 Long Island and all LIPA staff, and during  
17 snowy conditions, it's very important that  
18 our linemen can access the vehicles without  
19 having to worry about slipping and falling;  
20 so, the canopy is a very important feature  
21 for you us.

22 And then invasive species and  
23 understory management for the southeast  
24 corner of the site, as I mentioned earlier,  
25 is a very impacted woodland area, and this

would help to enhance that.

So, this is a map of what our proposed improvements are. So, if we look in the upper left corner of the site that's where the existing building is that we're looking to convert to office space. As we move toward the right, you're going to see where we have proposed inventory storage and fleet facility, and then we're going to look to reuse that open existing parking area as an open yard area; that's where we have that pole storage. Fleet parking is proposed behind the office building and in front of the inventory building. And then the fueling/training area, those would all be in the south central portion of the site. The new traffic signal is going to be located at the proposed new entrance of the site.

It's important to note that the traffic signal is only proposed for safe egress of our fleet vehicles. As the traffic study demonstrated, there is no change to level of service on 112, and the change in the level of service that Julie was speaking



1 of before -- actually, I wanted to clarify --  
2 is actually the site driveway. So, we did  
3 the analysis to make sure we had enough queue  
4 space for any of our vehicles that are  
5 waiting at the light to exit onto 112. If  
6 you'd like, after the presentation, our  
7 traffic engineer can discuss that a little  
8 bit more. But the proposed signal is purely  
9 for safety purposes, as we pull large fleet  
10 vehicles. Of course it takes these vehicles  
11 more time to make turns and maneuvers and we  
12 want to make sure they get onto 112 very  
13 smoothly.  
14

15 Here are some of our proposed  
16 vegetation and green infrastructure  
17 components. So, we're proposing a vegetative  
18 berm on the front of the site along 112 to  
19 help screen the property, reduce the visual  
20 impact of the site redevelopment. It was  
21 something that we had heard from a lot of  
22 people that it was very concerning to them;  
23 they wanted to make sure that the site wasn't  
24 going to be very obtrusive in their visual  
25 travels along 112.

We have the wet meadow, which is going to be behind the parking area, and we are utilizing that for as much storm water recharge as possible. And then we have a native meadow and forest restoration. So, this was designed to try to really enhance the site. The forest buffers along the northern and eastern portions of the property edge are actually in fairly good condition it's; really nice oak overstory with a heap understory.

So, the idea here was to enhance that forested area but also provide a nice transition to that wet meadow. Meadow habitats are inherent to the Pine Barrens Community, and it's actually one of the largest disappearing type of habitats in the United States. So, this would kind of provide a little bit of a habitat patch and internals will provide the transition to our contiguous forest patch.

This, again, is existing wooded area, and the southeast portion of the site is heavily impacted. So, we're looking to do

1 targeted understory restoration to include  
2 invasive species removal and replacement with  
3 native species. And then there's that green  
4 amorphous shape in the south central portion  
5 of the site; that will also be some more  
6 forest restoration to provide that contiguous  
7 habitat in that area.  
8

9 So, our hardship request is, again,  
10 due to the need for a little bit of  
11 additional clearing on the site in -- it's  
12 probably easier to see right here. Where we  
13 have this restoration, the existing woodland,  
14 there's a little bit over here that is very  
15 heavily impacted, but it does get in the way  
16 of this turning radius. We do a very hard  
17 look at how we could minimize clearing on the  
18 site. We were trying to do everything to  
19 avoid the hardship request. Unfortunately  
20 again because of the size of the vehicles and  
21 the required turning radii, especially if  
22 they are trailering poles, we did need to  
23 design it so there would be a little bit of  
24 clearing over here. (Indicating.)

25 The site has been developed since

1 prior to the Pine Barrens Act, and there is a  
2 prior application history on this property  
3 that demonstrates that. The overall  
4 allowable clearing on the site is 15.21  
5 acres. Currently 19.34 are cleared. So,  
6 again, the proposal is to re-vegetate 5.73  
7 acres of native forest and meadow, and we'll  
8 have a future total acreage of 10.16 acres of  
9 native habitat.  
10

11 Again, our hardship request is to  
12 allow for the redevelopment of the site with  
13 minor additional clearing. We have provided  
14 significant amounts of mitigation and  
15 consideration of the redevelopment, again,  
16 just with the restoration, the invasive  
17 species management and retention of all  
18 remaining buffers.

19 We do need all the remaining  
20 standards and guidelines outlined in the  
21 CLUP. Again, I'm particularly reusing that  
22 the innovative alternative waste water  
23 treatment system and the estimated total  
24 nitrogen discharge from those is .74  
25 milligrams per liter over the site.

We are going to be meeting Suffolk County Sanitary Code Article 7 and 12 requirements for the fueling area through our standard secondary canopy overhead protection, fire suppression for that fuel storage area, again, which is anticipated to be phased out by 2030.

Also, the water is going to be recharged on site, and the wet meadow contributes to that.

MR. MILAZZO: Quick question. When do you think you will start construction, if approved?

MS. URBAT: I don't have that schedule. I would have to reach back out to our facilities manager.

MR. MILAZZO: We're in 2024. I'll defer to them. I'd be interested to know.

MS. URBAT: The restore vegetation on the site is going to create larger contiguous block of native habitat, rather than the fragmented patches of habitat that we currently have on the site. Only .42 acres of the site will consist of fertilizer

1  
2 dependent vegetation which is less than the  
3 15 percent allowable maximum. We're going to  
4 grade and stabilize the site to ensure that  
5 we have stabilize slopes throughout the  
6 property and have that vegetative berm on 112  
7 to serve as a buffer.

8           So, just in summary, we're going to  
9 improve the project through -- improve the  
10 site through the significant re-vegetation,  
11 innovative waste water systems, creation of  
12 the stabilized intersection and use of green  
13 infrastructure as of the redevelopment. It  
14 will allow for us to have our consolidated  
15 operation center which really is critical for  
16 serving this portion of Suffolk County. And  
17 we have designed the project to meet the  
18 standards of the CLUP.

19           So, we're happy to answer any  
20 questions you may have.

21           MR. DALE: So, okay, you expressed  
22 that the primary objective of this new  
23 operation center is to fill -- central and  
24 eastern Suffolk. But to what degree is it  
25 also in anticipation of the increased amount

1 of generation that is coming in from off  
2 shore, I think the enhancements of  
3 transmission systems and various other facets  
4 that have clearly been in place on the  
5 central and eastern portion of Suffolk  
6 County?  
7

8 MS. URBAT: You know that's really an  
9 interesting question, and it's a little bit  
10 hard to quantify that. A lot of the  
11 development that we have seen in terms of  
12 green energy really involve underground  
13 transmission, which requires substantially  
14 less maintenance than the overhead  
15 facilities. LIPA is primarily an overhead  
16 utility. When a lot of these underground  
17 transmission lines come in, it doesn't really  
18 increase the amount of maintenance that's  
19 required after installed. There is a regular  
20 maintenance cycle that is part of that but  
21 it's not as much, again, as the overhead  
22 infrastructure.

23 On the converse side, when you do  
24 have to do maintenance of the underground  
25 facility, it does take substantially longer,

1  
2 I would say, than the overhead facilities,  
3 because there are challenges accessing.

4 There's pluses and minuses to each,  
5 but I don't know that we can truly quantify  
6 how much more work we anticipate would be  
7 generated because of that. But this really  
8 is to centralize and optimize the facilities  
9 and services that we provide right now.

10 MR. DALE: Right. I mean, there is  
11 unquestionably an increased demand for energy  
12 on the south fork in particular.

13 MS. URBAT: Yes, there is.

14 MR. DALE: Again, that would seem to  
15 be a driving component of why this Medford  
16 center would be in play at this point in  
17 time.

18 MS. URBAT: Yes. We do actually have  
19 a separate yard on the south fork. There is  
20 a yard in Bridgehampton that serves that  
21 area. This yard really is more for the  
22 central portion of the Island, you know, and  
23 our fleet would kind of radiate out from  
24 there. We also have Greenlawn and Brentwood  
25 on Suffolk Avenue in Brentwood.



1  
2 MS. HURLEY: You said you did a  
3 traffic study for this property?

4 MS. URBAT: Yes.

5 MS. HURLEY: You saw no impact.

6 MS. URBAT: No level service  
7 increases. The one that Julie noticed,  
8 again, was from our vehicles that would be  
9 queuing up on the site driveway at the  
10 signal. If you have more specific questions  
11 about that, again, we do have the traffic  
12 engineer here to answer those.

13 MR. MILAZZO: My question about when  
14 you were starting. You indicated that the  
15 fueling will be sort of phased out in 2030.  
16 So the project by '24, it's a six year  
17 window. All of the clearing necessary is to  
18 locate the fueling station, it looks like.  
19 So, is there a way, given that that is sort  
20 of a diminishing entity that those could be  
21 adjusted for that, if it's only there for  
22 five years?

23 MS. URBAT: So, the fueling station  
24 it was located there for now. So, believe it  
25 or not, we actually do need a much larger

1 training area than what is depicted. The  
2 overall goal is, once we abandon those  
3 fueling stations, is to make that part of the  
4 more robust training area. Lineman training  
5 is a very, very intensive thing. Right now  
6 it's only depicted to have a pole climbing  
7 area, but there is a lot more work that goes  
8 into training. So, that is the overall goal.  
9 Rather than come back to you in six years and  
10 say, "Okay, now we need more area for  
11 training." If we can cite something that  
12 benefits our operations now and convert that  
13 to the training area later on in the  
14 currently cleared space. To us, it made more  
15 sense to design it that way at the moment.  
16

17 MR. MILAZZO: How are the two  
18 areas -- you have the lay down area in the  
19 back, adjacent to that.

20 MS. URBAT: This is the parking lot.

21 MR. MILAZZO: That's a lay down area  
22 for the larger infrastructure.

23 How tall are the areas to the south  
24 of that protected?

25 MS. URBAT: You mean the

re-vegetation area?

MR. MILAZZO: Yes.

MS. URBAT: We can protect it in ways that you see fit. You know, it could be as simple as a post and rail fence, it could be signage. If you require covenants, you can put on that as well. But the intention really is to leave this as a natural habitat restoration area.

MS. DI BRITA: I assume that because you're going to transition to EV's that EV's will be installed, the charging stations will be installed as part of the project, the initial project or will they go in afterwards?

MS. URBAT: I would have to check the sequencing with our facilities manager. I do know that there are some proposed as part of the initial project. I don't know if there would be additional that would be required as time goes on. I could check with our facilities manager on that.

MR. MILAZZO: Who is the applicant; LIPA, PSEG? Who owns this? When completed,

who owns the asset?

MS. URBAT: LIPA would own the asset.

MR. CALARCO: Any other questions?

(No response was heard.)

MS. URBAT: Thank you so much for  
your time.

MR. CALARCO: Is there anyone else in  
the audience who would like to address this  
particular application?

(No response was heard.)

MR. CALARCO: Seeing none, where are  
we?

MR. MILAZZO: A motion to close.  
Keep the record open for two weeks. I think  
that's what the staff recommends. If the  
applicant wants to supply a hardship criteria  
analysis, they should do that in two weeks.

MS. URBAT: We had provided the  
hardship analysis.

MR. MILAZZO: We have what I'll call  
the "Chic" chart, a Chic special. Do you  
have the analysis which is sort of the  
hardship of "We need this hardship because"?  
I don't know if Chic is involved in this

project.

MS. URBAT: I apologize. I thought it was part of our application package. If it was inadvertently omitted, we can provide it.

MS. HARGRAVE: I may have missed it, but I didn't see it.

MR. MILAZZO: I'm sure he knows how to write it.

MS. URBAT: I will check and make sure that we provide it to you. I apologize if it was omitted.

MR. CALARCO: I'll entertain a motion to close the public hearing and leave the record open for two weeks. Do we need an extended deadline on this decision?

MR. MILAZZO: No.

MS. HARGRAVE: The December meeting.

MR. MILAZZO: December.

MR. CALARCO: The extended deadline is the December meeting. Is the applicant okay with that?

MS. URBAT: We have some contractual deadlines that are very hard. I don't know

that I can authorize that. I can take it back and see if there's anything we can do, if I can get back to you tomorrow, if that would be okay.

MR. MILAZZO: You can get back to us in November.

MR. CALARCO: Let us know in November.

So, we have a motion to close the public hearing and to leave the record open for two weeks. Motion from Ms. Scherer.

MR. DALE: Second.

MR. CALARCO: Seconded by Mr. Dale.

All in favor.

(WHEREUPON, there was a unanimous affirmative vote of the Board.)

MR. CALARCO: Any opposed, abstentions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Board.)

(Time Ended: 3:53 p.m.)

\* \* \*

October 18, 2023

31

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, BETHANNE MENNONNA, a Notary Public  
within and for the State of New York do  
hereby certify that the foregoing is a true  
and accurate transcript of the proceedings,  
as taken stenographically by myself to the  
best of my ability, at the time and place  
aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 29th day of October, 2023.

  
BETHANNE MENNONNA