



GGLDC Audit & Finance Committee Meeting

Tuesday, December 2, 2025

Location – 99 MedTech Drive, Innovation Zone

8:30 a.m.

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members P. Battaglia, J. Tretter, M. Brooks
Staff: L. Farrell, M. Masse, P. Kennett, K. Galdun, J. Krencik, C. Suozzi
Guests: K. Manne (GCEDC Board Member)
Absent: D. Cunningham

1. CALL TO ORDER / ENTER PUBLIC SESSION

M. Brooks called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. in the Innovation Zone.

2. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT & ACTIVITIES

2a. Agenda Additions / Other Business – Nothing at this time.

2b. Minutes: October 28, 2025

P. Battaglia made a motion to approve the minutes from October 28, 2025; the motion was seconded by J. Tretter. Roll call resulted as follows:

J. Tretter - Yes
P. Battaglia - Yes
M. Brooks - Yes
D. Cunningham – Absent

The item was approved as presented.

3. DISCUSSIONS / OFFICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD:

3a. Insurance Renewal – The same discussion that took place during the GCEDC Audit and Finance Committee meeting also applies to the GGLDC. The details of that discussion have been included for ease of reference.

Included with the meeting materials were the renewal quotes provided by Selective for the Package Renewal and Worker's Compensation. The quotes from Tompkins on the umbrella policy are still in process and will be shared as soon as they are received. J. Teresi will be present at the board meeting on Thursday to answer any questions. A recent update from J. Teresi was provided via email and was included in the meeting materials.

L. Farrell presented the information provided by J. Teresi regarding insurance quotes. She reported that two carriers were still reviewing and could potentially provide quotes. The updated quote from Selective is approximately \$2,000 lower than the current premium. She noted that a 6% increase had been included in the budgets for insurance, across all entities. Expenses will be allocated in accordance with the budget.

No umbrella policy quotes have been received yet. Selective remains unwilling to provide umbrella coverage, which is consistent with recent years. L. Farrell stated that umbrella coverage could be revisited at the December 18th meeting or deferred until the January meeting if quotes are still not available. She recommended proceeding with Selective considering the reduced price for the same level of coverage.

During discussion, P. Battaglia asked about the reduction from \$77,000 to \$72,000, and L. Farrell explained that the initial figure was a preliminary estimate provided before the formal proposal. J. Teresi confirmed with her that coverage levels remain the same. In response to a question from M. Brooks regarding the two carriers that are noted as “still reviewing”, L. Farrell indicated that no timeline had been provided regarding additional quotes. P. Zeff recommended postponing a vote to allow time for the remaining companies to respond. L. Farrell agreed to update J. Teresi and inquire further about the cost decrease. When asked by J. Tretter, L. Farrell indicated she did not believe Chubb or Cincinnati had quoted last year but would confirm. P. Zeff inquired about general liability limits; K. Manne referenced page 23 showing a \$2 million limit, and L. Farrell confirmed that land falls under general liability while the building is covered under commercial insurance.

No vote was taken as this item was tabled until the next meeting on December 18th, 2025.

3b. October 2025 Financial Statements – L. Farrell reviewed with the Committee the significant items on the long form financial statements for October 2025.

- Balance Sheet items for October were similar to those at the end of September.
- Quarterly amounts due to the EDC were recorded as accounts payable for the Economic Development Support Grant and MedTech Center property management fee.
- Income Statements show normal monthly activity and are at 83% of budget, with the majority of activity in the Medtech Center
- “Professional Services other” are over budget due to the First Wave Tech collections.

J. Tretter made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the October 2025 Financial Statements as presented; the motion was seconded by P. Battaglia. Roll call resulted as follows:

J. Tretter - Yes
P. Battaglia - Yes
M. Brooks - Yes
D. Cunningham - Absent

The item was approved as presented.

3c. Loan Policy Review – The same discussion that took place during the GCEDC Audit and Finance Committee meeting also applies to the GGLDC. The details of that discussion have been included for ease of reference.

L. Farrell advised that there is a comparison chart of the loan funds in the packets. The loan policies were also included with the meeting materials. L. Farrell stated that the first column on page 51 of the meeting materials is for the GAIN Loan Fund. No changes can be made to this fund. The GCEDC entered into an agreement, whereby the GCEDC is acting as a subrecipient to the Genesee Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council for a portion of an ESD grant. Cash available in this fund at the end of October was \$328K. Loans receivable is \$170K. The interest rate is 1% but it is very specific as to what types of companies or projects can benefit from this loan fund.

With the other three loan funds, the board has full discretion over how we use these funds.

The other loan fund in the GCEDC is the Revolving Loan Fund #1. This fund was established with grant funds that Genesee County received from the Federal Small Cities Program in 1985 and 1986. These funds were defederalized in 2009 and are no longer subject to CDBG guidelines. In this fund, there is \$0 cash and \$0 loans receivable. These funds have been used as an internal line of credit to cover the expenses related to STAMP. Therefore, there is a due to/due from of \$914,000 that is due from the STAMP fund.

L. Farrell presented two options regarding the due to/due from balance associated with the STAMP fund: the organization could retain the balance and reimburse itself from future land sale proceeds at STAMP, or it could forgive the amount and consider this EDC's contribution to the project. She noted that the State periodically requests reporting on total dollars invested in the STAMP site, and she includes this figure when submitting information.

During discussion, P. Battaglia noted that STAMP is not charged interest and stated that, whether the funds remain or are forgiven, interest should be applied. P. Zeff expressed support for forgiving the balance. J. Tretter asked whether forgiving the amount—thereby eliminating available loanable funds—would effectively dissolve the fund, and L. Farrell confirmed that it would. She added that she supports forgiveness given the availability and greater flexibility of the organization's two other loan funds.

The Economic Development Loan Fund (RLF #2) is administered by the GGLDC. It was originally established in the GCEDC in 2003 with funds that were received by Genesee County from a Small Cities Grant. In 2012, an amended agreement was entered into with Genesee County restricting GCEDC's use of the related funds to necessary administrative costs as part of the defederalization process. To defederalize those funds the money needed to flow through a 501C3, so the County directed us to move those funds to the GGLDC. There are no longer any federal requirements attached to these funds and the board is free to make whatever policy they want for this loan fund. Cash available is \$682K and loans receivable is \$240K.

The last loan Fund is the Batavia Micropolitan Area Community Redevelopment Fund. This fund was established years ago with \$500,000 from strategic investment funds. L. Farrell stated that the board can always discuss what should be done with this fund and if there is some way to repurpose these funds that would better help the community. This fund is not specific to Batavia, but for all of Genesee County. Cash available is \$411K and loans receivable is \$207K.

L. Farrell reported that loan interest rates are set at prime at the time of issuance and are readjusted each January. In response, P. Battaglia reiterated his prior concern regarding low utilization of the loan funds, noting his belief that the prime rate may be a contributing factor. He emphasized that the stated purpose of the funds is to provide supportive, non-competitive financing with favorable terms, and he did not view a prime-based rate as sufficiently accommodating.

P. Zelif observed that banks typically charge prime plus, while M. Brooks indicated that, based on his experience, a prime rate is reasonable. L. Farrell questioned why the funds are seeing little activity despite these terms. After further discussion, L. Farrell stated she would research what other IDAs are offering for loans and rates and again discuss lowering the rate, even if it's only for a specified amount of time to monitor if there is an increased interest in any loan programs offered by the GCEDC/GGLDC.

No changes will be made at this time.

3d. Grant Consulting Agreement – The GGLDC issued a Request for Proposals on 10/22/24 for technical consulting services in the areas of community and economic development. The Office of Community Renewal (OCR) requires bidding for these services every three years. One proposal was received from H. Sichertman & Company, Inc. dba The Harrison Studio.

The team at The Harrison Studio provides technical services in the areas of economic development, community development, management and administrative services related to Community Block Grant (CDBG) Program.

We are requesting approval of a one-year extension to this contract with H. Sichertman & Company, Inc. for 2026 grant consulting services.

Total contract charges for 2026 under the proposed agreement shall not exceed \$25,000.

Total contract charges for 2026 that are not reimbursable to the GGLDC from third-party sources shall not exceed \$15,000.

L. Farrell explained that, consistent with emerging practices in other communities, the organization has begun collecting fees from project applicants to support preparation of their grant applications. She noted that once a grant is awarded, the organization can be reimbursed for all associated costs.

P. Battaglia made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the Grant Consulting Agreement not to exceed \$25,000 as presented; the motion was seconded by J. Tretter. Roll call resulted as follows:

J. Tretter - Yes
P. Battaglia - Yes
M. Brooks - Yes
D. Cunningham – Absent

The item was approved as presented.

4. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, J. Tretter made a motion to adjourn at 9:28 a.m., seconded by P. Battaglia and passed unanimously.