Greene County Industrial Development Authority

93 E. East High Street
Waynesburg, PA 15370
Tel: 724.852.5259

GCIDA Board Meeting
Minutes
August 12, 2025

I. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM. Those present were as follows:

George Scull, Vice Chairman
Greta Mooney, Secretary
Cheryl Semonick, Treasurer
Tim Fox, Board, Member
Ernie DeHaas, Solicitor
Connie Bloom, Director
Jared Edgreen, Commissioner
Blair Zimmerman, Commissioner

Phone:
None

Public:
John Bokat, CST Investments
Eric Harris, CST Investments

II. "If a potential conflict exists, you are duty bound to disclose."

III. Approval of Minutes – July 8, 2025

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the July 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes.

Motion to approve- Ms. Mooney
Second- Mr. Fox
All in favor.

IV. Treasurers Report

a. **Balance Sheet** as of July 31, 2025
b. **Profit & Loss** as of July 31, 2025
c. **Deposit Detail** as of July 31, 2025

Ms. Bloom stated the normal reports are included in the Board packet. She indicated there is nothing out of the ordinary for the report. Ms. Mooney asked what the situation is with Momma Martin's. Ms. Bloom replied the Board provided them with the option to continue paying their loan even though they closed, but didn't receive a response. She added a mortgage was filed but they have declared bankruptcy.

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the Treasurer's Report.

Motion to approve- Mr. Fox
Second- Ms. Mooney
All in favor.

V. Deposits

Revolving Loan Payments

a. 7/17/25 - **$299.25**
   i. Hydraulic Solutions (May 26)
b. 7/17/25 - **$600.00**
   i. Blessed Valley Lodging (June & July 25)
c. 7/17/25 - **$321.75**
   i. Vending Solutions
d. 7/17/25 - **$299.25**
   i. MR Structures
e. 7/17/25 - **$299.25**
   i. LK Cafe
f. 7/17/25 - **$299.25**
   i. 7 One Eight Design Build
g. 7/17/25 - **$586.52**
   i. Sweet Baby's at Rising Creek (June & July 25)
h. 7/17/25 - **$742.47**
   i. Hydraulic Solutions #2 (Dec 25)
i. 7/17/25 - **$299.25**
   i. JCNH Rentals
j. 7/22/25 - **$252.41**
   i. Adam Lewis Trucking #5 (Aug 25)
k. 7/22/25 - **$261.73**
   i. Adam Lewis Trucking #4 (Aug 25)
l. 7/22/25 - **$424.26**
   i. DILLIGAF Brewing
m. 7/31/25 - **$300.00**
   i. 7 One Eight Design Build (Aug 25)

SIP

a. 7/17/25 - **$455.47**
   i. Boondock Sales

General Account

None

EPA Assessment Grant
None
EPA Cleanup Grant
CLOSED

Ms. Bloom reviewed the July 2025 deposits. She explained if a payment was made for some time other than the current month it is notated. Ms. Bloom indicated Pennsyltucky was 3 months in arrears, however, he did come in an make a payment to get his account current. She added he also set up an automatic payment with this bank so hopefully he will remain current.

VI. Approval of Checks for Payment

General Account

a. DeHaas Law, LLC, - **$735.00**
   i. General Services - $270.00
   ii. Crucible - $465.00
b. Observer Reporter - **$ 306.50**
   i. RFQ Environmental Consultant

Ms. Bloom reviewed the checks for payment for the Board and indicated these invoices were included in the email for the Board's review.

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the checks for payment.

Motion to approve- Ms. Semonick
Second- Ms. Mooney
All in favor.

VII. Brownfields Initiative

a. Assessment Grant
   i. RFQ Environmental Engineer

Ms. Bloom explained the RFQ was advertised on August 5th and 15th with the RFQ's being due on August 22nd and being approved during the September 9th meeting. She added she emailed the RFQ's to nine interested potential consultants.

   ii. Review Committee

Ms. Bloom stated she included the scoring sheet and included in the RFQ it indicated the Review Committee would consist of a Commissioner, Board Members as well as staff. She recommended herself and Ms. Mooney because they were on the previous Review Committee. Ms. Bloom explained Mr. Hook indicated he would like to be on the Review Committee as well. Ms. Mooney stated that would be three and Ms. Bloom stated if Commissioner Edgreen would agree that would be four. Mr. Scull indicated he feels that four is adequate.

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the RFQ Review Committee to include, Commissioner Edgreen, Mr. Hook, Ms. Mooney and Ms. Bloom.

Motion to approve- Mr. Fox
Second- Ms. Semonick
All in favor

VIII. New Business

a. PEDFA Fee Item #3 update

Ms. Bloom stated she provided the Board with the original proposal for Item #3. She added Mr. Hook sent an email as to his suggestion for Item #3. Ms. Mooney asked Mr. DeHaas if he had any thoughts on the recommendation from Mr. Hook of $10,000. Mr. DeHaas stated he feels that would be fine. Ms. Mooney stated she likes the fact of having a set fee schedule and advertising so it is out there. Ms. Bloom indicated she will add the fee schedule to the IDA website.

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the PEDFA Fee Schedule.

Motion to approve- Ms. Mooney
Second- Ms. Semonick
All in favor

b. CST Extension Request

Mr. Harris, CST Investment's council, stated during the last meeting a discussion was had regarding the information provided to confirm the satisfaction of Paragraph 2A for the extension of the Option Agreement. He added a Board member suggested an extension for six months through March 2026 and he had requested a confirmation letter. Mr. Harris stated the amendment that was sent didn't mention the satisfaction, but added at the March 2026 review period the Board had the ability to charge additional fees for an additional extension. He mentioned that was not part of the original Agreement that was signed in 2023 and the additional fees for extension would only be applicable if CST does not satisfy Paragraph 2A. Mr. Harris indicated the CST is only requesting a letter indicating an extension has been provided. Mr. Bokat asked if there is a reason this needs to be done as an amendment and can't be done by an issue of a notice. Mr. DeHaas explained it is not an amendment, but a verification of an extension of the deadline or term of the option. He added it does not rewrite or change anything as far as the agreement. Mr. DeHaas stated the Board learned after the meeting(through communication with Mr. Harris) that there is no application pending before DEP. He added what was stated was there was an application that needed to be tied to the site across the river. Mr. DeHaas stated in good faith the Authority is willing to extend the term of the option and then await further information regarding the status of any application with DEP. He added the premise of the right to an extension is that there is some type of application pending that has not yet been approved by DEP. Mr. Bokat stated there is an application pending, and asked where that information came from that it hasn't happened. Mr. DeHaas read Mr. Harris email stating CST cannot provide any evidence of an application. He continued CST cannot apply for any application because of the joining of the Hereford Hollow to the riverfront site. Mr. DeHaas confirmed that is confirmation that there is no application. Mr. Bokat stated CST is not the one filing for the grant and the bottom can't file for the grant because it has to be attached to the Hereford Hollow site. He added CST is currently in the process of getting the access permit filed and the grant and *permits cannot be filed until the access permit is completed. Mr. DeHaas stated the communication from Mr. Harris contradicts something that was presented to the Authority. He added up until today there is nothing that has been provided to the Authority from DEP, which has been requested multiple times. Mr. Bokat asked specifically what is the Board requesting and Mr. DeHaas stated the status with DEP. Mr. Bokat asked if it is regarding the grant that has been approved or the lower site. He continued a grant has been approved and reclamation is happening for the north side. Mr. Bokat asked Mr. DeHaas to clarify. Mr. DeHaas asked if a permit is needed to reclaim the river site and Mr. Bokat replied an access permit is needed for Hereford Hollow so that can be reclaimed. Mr. DeHaas asked if there is a permit for the north site from DEP and Mr. Bokat stated there is a grant approval but he wouldn't consider that a permit. Mr. Bokat stated that portion is going through the engineering process currently. Mr. DeHaas stated a grant and permit are different from his understanding. Mr. Harris stated CST is not the one who reclaims it, DEP reclaims it so why would CST need a permit and CST does not own the property either. Mr. Bokat stated he is unsure of the intent of the Board. He added they have shown they received a grant of $8M to reclaim the north site, which that property has sat with the County for 30 years and nothing has happened with it. Mr. Bokat explained they have run into road block after road block for the bottom, but now have some loop holes to get the bottom reclaimed. He added if the intent of the Board is to get the property off the County's rolls just let him know he will will make that happen. Ms. Mooney asked Mr. Bokat if that means he is willing to buy the property right now and Mr. Bokat stated he didn't understand what that means. Mr. Bokat stated if that means executing the agreement and taking the property then no. Ms. Mooney stated that is what she understood he meant by taking it off of the County. Mr. Bokat replied if the intent is to convey the property regardless then that is fine and that situation would need to be addressed. He added if the intent is to get it reclaimed and redeveloped conveying it to CST doesn't allow the project to go further. Mr. Bokat questioned if the property is harming the County by not conveying it. Mr. Scull explained it has been difficult communicating with CST. He added the Board is requiring bi-monthly updates but they don't really have a whole lot of information to update the Board. Mr. Scull stated when the project first started there was a sense of urgency on your part and the Board has done their best to meet those items. He added the County wants to get this property back on the tax rolls not just dump the property. Mr. Scull mentioned the Board is not in the loop on the correspondence with DEP which is what has been requested numerous times. Mr. Bokat stated he has given bi-monthly updates to Ms. Bloom as well as presented to the Board. Ms. Bloom mentioned according to Mr. Harris, the site that received the grant is not the economic development portion therefore the river front site is what is important. Mr. Bokat stated if the reclamation doesn't happen on the river front site, the project will continue but the scope would just change. Mr. Bokat explained that if he would disturb the soil, CST takes on full liability on the site. He added if the grant is not going through, they would need to switch gears to see how to develop the site, which would include bringing in massive amounts of dirt. Mr. Bokat stated that is happening due to the signing of a solar deal and taking the soil and piling it up. Mr. DeHaas stated the only thing that was requested and hasn't been done so far is to provide documents that support what the status is with DEP. Mr. Bokat stated a copy of the grant award letter was provided and the NSF letter was provided. He asked what else is there that the Board would like. Mr. DeHaas stated again confirmation of the status with DEP. Mr. Bokat replied they have denied the river site. Ms. Bloom asked Mr. Bokat to provide the denial. Mr. Bokat stated that he previously provided two DEP denial letters. Mr. Scull stated the IDA is in favor of the project and understands the difficulty working with government agencies. He added if the Board has copies of the denial letters maybe there are contacts we have that could help the process. Mr. Scull requested some documentation showing the obstacles so the Board can see if they can help. Mr. DeHaas stated between now and the end of the term of the option as extended the Board is requesting something from DEP regarding the status. Mr. Bokat provided the two denial letters to Ms. Bloom. Ms. Bloom stated the two denial letters are dated 2024 and both are for the north site. Mr. Bokat confirmed. Ms. Bloom mentioned those denial letters are from before the grant and Mr. Bokat confirmed. Ms. Bloom stated the denial letter from May 2024 is the latest correspondence and there is nothing from May 2024 until current from DEP. Mr. Bokat stated the approval of the grant came after this letter. Ms. Bloom then inquired on the river site denial and Mr. Bokat stated if you read the letter it is mentioned in there. Ms.*

Bloom stated these letters are from May 2024 and we are in August 2025. She asked for any correspondence between May 2024 and August 2025. Mr. Bokat stated there are no denial letters since the focus changed to the north site to get it approved. He added once that got approved the focus is back on the river site. Mr. Harris stated there are no denial letters because north was separate, then it was combined, and then separate again which is when north got approved. He added the river site is now being tied to Hereford Hollow. Ms. Bloom asked when the two sites were tied together and Mr. Harris replied he sent the right of access in June 2025. Ms. Bloom asked what correspondence CST has between May 2025 and June 2025 to show forward progress. Mr. Bokat stated there has been none because the focus as been on the north site with the grant. Ms. Bloom stated that is the concern of the Board. Mr. Bokat explained in the application you can tie adjacent properties together and this is the last-ditch effort to get this to go through or the river site will not get reclaimed. He added the Hereford Hollow site needs to get approved and then the river site can be tied to it. Ms. Bloom asked if DEP approached NSF to tie Hereford Hollow to the river site and Mr. Bokat replied DEP approached NSF and said to get the river site done the Hereford Hollow site must get done. He explained they were going to tie it to the north but there wasn't enough value in it to do it that way. Mr. Bokat stated the Hereford Hollow site owner has the right access agreement but won't agree to an eighteen-month timeframe. He explained the owners want a shorter timeframe. Mr. Bokat stated it is frustrating that the Board is implying he has done nothing. Ms. Bloom explained the way information has been presented is that they have been multiple denials and communication with DEP and all the Board is requesting is for CST to provide that information. Ms. Mooney mentioned after the last meeting, she feels the Board did give CST what they asked for and no one was trying to be hindering. She added CST needs to come back after the six-month extension and update the Board. She asked Mr. Bokat if CST can't get all the moving parts working is there a Plan B because from what she is hearing there is not one currently. She added she hopes there is not a need for a Plan B. Commissioner Zimmerman mentioned what he is getting out of this conversation is communication is what is needed, whether it is good, bad or indifferent. Ms. Bloom added there are bi-monthly updates required currently. Mr. Scull asked what the issue is for the Hereford Hollow property owner and Mr. Bokat replied he is wanting payment. Ms. Bloom recapped after the six-month extension the Board will review. Mr. DeHaas stated the current option expires September 29th but only continues to the extent that there is something out there pending that has not yet been approved. He added now there is a definite extension date and if during that term documentation is provided showing the status of any application that is needed to reclaim the river site then the Board can be in a position to extend the term without any payment. Mr. DeHaas continued to explain, if CST is not in that position, then CST must decide to exercise the option to buy the property or request an extension that is not a matter of right. Mr. Harris asked if Mr. DeHaas is referencing the original or the extension. Mr. DeHaas replied the extension and CST only has the right to extend the option if there was some application pending that hadn't yet been approved. He added there is no such document currently. Ms. Mooney explained she understands the situation of working with government agencies which is why she was in favor of the extension for six-months. Mr. Bokat explained he doesn't have any issues with the six-month extension, and in his eyes, it either extends or doesn't. He added after the six-month extension if CST is no further along in the process the property either conveys or it doesn't. Mr. DeHaas stated then CST would need to make a decision to exercise the option or request something CST doesn't have the right. Ms. Mooney stated the Board will revisit in six-months. Mr. Bokat stated that is all CST is wanting and there doesn't need to be an amendment. Mr. Harris mentioned he sent Mr. DeHaas a revised version. Mr. Bokat asked if there were any issues with the version Mr. Harris sent and Mr. DeHaas replied the Authority approved what was sent and the facts that were now confirmed today by CST that within six months CST will know one way or another. Mr. DeHaas added if CST is not going to be able to reclaim then the choice is to exercise the option, the option expires or if CST would want to request an extension for some other reason the Authority would have to determine what the price to extend would be. Mr. DeHaas stated he doesn't understand what the issue with the document was and Mr. Bokat replied it was the portion related to paying for an extension. Mr. Harris confirmed. Ms. Bloom clarified that portion relating to payment is after the six-month extension. Mr. Harris stated it doesn't need to be memorialized that the board can charge for additional option extensions and at the March 29th date CST will either decide to convey the *property, satisfy Paragraph 2A or walk away. Ms. Mooney confirmed that CST is saying at the end of the six-month extension CST will either buy the property or walk away and Mr. Bokat replied that Ms. Mooney is incorrect. He explained either Paragraph 2A is satisfied or it isn't or they take the property. Mr. Harris added if CST doesn't satisfy Paragraph 2A the Board has the ability to extend the option for a price or convey the property. Mr. DeHaas confirmed that is what the current document states. Ms. Mooney discussed currently CST does not technically meet Paragraph 2A but the Board is in favor of a six-month extension. Mr. Bokat asked if it is the Board's opinion that they do not meet the requirements of Paragraph 2A and Mr. DeHaas replied it seems so since there is no active application with DEP. Mr. DeHaas recommended the Board discuss this in Executive Session as to whether any changes will be made.*

Mr. Scull requested a motion to approve the revision to the last clause of Paragraph 2 in the existing agreement to read "the Authority will determine whether CST has the right to do so under Paragraph 2A of the Agreement or whether some additional condition is required to be met to further extend the term of the Option."

Motion to approve- Ms. Mooney
Second - Ms. Semonick
All in favor.

IX. Old Business

a. NJR

Ms. Bloom indicated there is no update from NJR, however, the agreement expires at the end of September.

b. Mather Property

Ms. Bloom stated the mowing was completed.

c. PRA Project
   i. Fitness
   ii. So Awesome
   iii. Bloom

Ms. Bloom stated the projects listed were received in July.

d. Business Expansion
   i. Waynesburg University Invoice

Mr. Fox stated he will reach out for a copy of the invoice.

   ii. *Data Share*

Ms. Bloom stated she was in a meeting for the County's Incubator and the representatives from Waynesburg University requested a copy of the data for their use. Mr. Scull stated he doesn't see any issues and the Board agreed.

X. Public Comment

None

XI. Executive Session

Mr. Scull requested a motion to enter into Executive Session at 9:53 AM.

Motion to approve- Ms. Semonick
Second – Ms. Mooney
All in favor

Mr. Scull requested a motion to exit out of Executive Session at 10:14 AM.

Motion to approve- Mr. Fox
Second – Ms. Semonick
All in favor

XII. Next Meeting – September 9, 2025

XIII. Adjournment

Mr. Scull requested a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 AM.

Motion to approve- Ms. Mooney
Second- Ms. Semonick
All in favor.

MEETING MINUTES CERTIFICATION

We, the undersigned, agree that the minutes taken above were approved in their entirety by the Greene County Industrial Development Authority on September 9, 2025.

____
Chairman, Greene County Industrial Development Authority

____
Vice Chairman, Greene County Industrial Development Authority

____
Secretary, Greene County Industrial Development Authority