OCIDA
ONONDAGA COUNTY
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Regular Meeting Minutes
June 4, 2026

A Regular meeting of the Onondaga County Industrial Development Agency was held on Thursday, June 4, 2026, at 335 Montgomery Street, Floor 2M, Syracuse, New York.

Randy Wolken called the meeting to order at 8:33 AM with the following in attendance:

PRESENT:
Randy Wolken
Alan Marzullo
Mark Muthumbi
Michael Greene
Christina Hollenback
Sally Santangelo
Deka Eysaman

ALSO PRESENT:
Robert M. Petrovich, Executive Director
Nate Stevens, Treasurer
Alexis Rodriguez, Secretary
Robert Schoeneck, Assistant Treasurer
Evan Carter, Assistant Secretary
Jeffrey Davis, Esq., Agency Counsel
Amanda Fitzgerald, Esq., Agency Counsel
Patrick Rock, Jordan Landing LLC
Neil Patel, Clay Hospitality, LLC
Sandeep Gautam, Baywood Hotels
Matt Elderbroom, Baywood Hotels
Matthew Wells, Clay Hospitality, LLC
Thomas Clifford, Clay Hospitality, LLC
Mike Dieroff, D & D Motor Systems, Inc.
Carson Henry, Micron New York Semiconductor Manufacturing LLC
Katie Birchenough, Micron New York Semiconductor Manufacturing LLC
Kenneth Bush III, Town of Elbridge

Approval of Meeting Minutes: May 14, 2026

Upon motion by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Sally Santangelo, the Board approved the Regular meeting minutes of May 14, 2026. Motion was carried.

Treasurer's Report:

Nate Stevens gave a brief overview of the Treasurer's Report for the month of May 2026.

Upon motion by Michael Greene, seconded by Alan Marzullo, the Board approved the Treasurer's Report for the month of May 2026. Motion was carried.

Payment of Bills:

Upon motion by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Christina Hollenback, the Board approved the Payment of Bills. Motion was carried.

Action Items:

1. **Jordan Landing LLC and Jordan Landing Housing Development Fund Corporation (Project #3101-25-07A) Second Meeting**
   The applicant is proposing to construct 65 mixed-income housing units on approximately 8 vacant acres of land in the Village of Jordan. The project will also include a community room, fitness area, supporting housing services, offices, and laundry facilities.

   Robert Petrovich told the Board that because there are new Board members, the Applicant should present the project again with the updates that have been made along the application process.

   Patrick Rock introduced the development team: Rock Property Management Company (Rock PMC), Rockabill Development, and Eagle Star Housing. P. Rock is also the owner/operator of Rock PMC, building and operating affordable housing for almost 35 years in Central New York.

   The Applicant is proposing to build a 65 affordable housing unit community in the Village of Jordan. The development will provide high-quality housing for working families making between 30% and 70% of area median income (AMI). Additionally, 30 of those units will be reserved for supportive housing for veterans. The project will be constructed on 8 acres, adjacent to the Erie Canal as well as another one of Rock PMC's facilities, Old Erie Place Apartments, which is a 96-unit affordable housing community. This was first opened in the late '80s.

   P. Rock's family has owned the site where the project will be built since the '80s. These are the last 8 acres, which have been investigated multiple times for various developments such as single-family homes and market-rate housing, but have been unable to secure development for years.

The Applicant's development process started in the summer of 2024 when the Applicant met with the Village (of Jordan) Mayor to discuss the need for more affordable housing and walked away with a way to fulfill that need. Since that meeting, the Applicant's team has secured all the required municipal approvals and submitted a competitive application to New York State's Homes and Community Renewal. In February of 2026, the Applicant was rewarded with the necessary tax credits to build the site. Since then, the Applicant has been working to push towards a closing date of July 2026 regarding their finances and hopes to have shovels in the ground in August 2026. Throughout the process, the Applicant has met with representatives of the Town (of Elbridge), School (Jordan Elbridge Central School District), and Village (of Jordan) to discuss the proposed PILOT. The Applicant explained that in trying to listen to their concerns regarding the PILOT, they decreased the term of the PILOT from the original proposed 15 years to 13 years instead. The Applicant stated that the PILOT is essential to the project. Unlike market-rate housing, the Applicant will not be able to raise rent to meet operating costs due to the rent restrictions associated with their tax credit financed housing. The PILOT as part of the cost structure allows the units to be developed and without the PILOT, the cash flows for the property are negative. The Applicant stated that but for this PILOT, the development does not work.

Christina Hollenback asked for the Applicant to walk the new Board members through the engagement timeline.

The Applicant explained that they met with the Village about two years ago to discuss the need for this type of housing. The proposal was brought before the planning commission in early 2025 to seek municipal approvals, which were then received. The Applicant then submitted an Application to the Agency, notifying all municipalities. The PILOT was met with resistance, which prompted the Applicant to meet with Ken (Bush III), Jim (Froio), the school district superintendent, as well as the mayor (of Jordan) to hear their concerns regarding the PILOT and other concerns they may have. The Applicant invited them to another one of Eagle Star's supportive housing properties to offer a model of the type of facility the Applicant is trying to build. The Applicant had a lot of positive engagement with them regarding that visit. The Applicant and its development team have been in the community for 40 years, talking with residents and community members, acknowledging their need for housing like the proposed project, and receiving appreciation for how they maintain their properties.

R. Petrovich added that the Agency has its UTEP (Uniform Tax Exemption Policy), which has its PILOT schedules and abatement percentages. He wanted to add comments that the Agency has deviated from the typical schedule, starting year 1 of the PILOT at 100% exemption and dropping to 60% in year 2. This was done to be on the knife's edge of where the project works and does not work. He also added that the project is a $32 million capital investment, and the PILOT holds an abatement of about $744,000. He pointed out that this is a substantial project in terms of investment to abatement ratio.

Amanda Fitzgerald noted that because this is a deviation from the Agency's UTEP, members from the taxing jurisdictions are able to speak regarding the project.

Ken Bush III, the Town of Elbridge Supervisor wanted to speak, to which he first pointed out that he believes there have been a lot of issues with the process. He explained that he was not aware of the Agency's meeting and had only 24 hours of notice, which is why the mayor and superintendent are not in attendance. He went on to say that two years ago the Applicant came to discuss a project, he was excited because what community would not be excited to hear about a proposed $32 million investment into their community. He said that since then, the underlying factors have come out. He noted a $32 million investment, assessed at $3.6 million, resulting in an 89% reduction immediately. K. Bush III refers to an email from the mayor that depicts the negative impact the incentive package will have on the taxing jurisdictions.

Moving to the topic of education, he told the Board that he was asking himself what his father would think about the impact the PILOT would have on the education system, noting that he would've thought it would be devastating. He said that the school district has been able to do more with less, explaining that at some point the school district cannot keep providing the services to the residents when looking at the taxing structure. He pointed out that the Village of Jordan has limited special districts, having their own police force and fire department in addition to not being a fire district or having a town-wide police force. K. Bush III noted that 40% of all police calls within the last year in the Village of Jordan came from P. Rock's Old Erie Place Apartments that were referenced earlier. Using tax numbers, K. Bush III noted that the property's less than $20,000 in tax revenue equates to 16%, explaining that the police force cannot be sustained with giving these tax breaks. He states that there is a ripple effect that will happen regarding the police force. He encouraged the Board to take the time to look at the article that he was referring to regarding their acceptance of affordable housing, showing that outside of the City of Syracuse, the Town of Elbridge has some of the most affordable housing projects/units in the County.

K. Bush III stated that the first time the mayor heard that there was going to be a PILOT was from reading the article that he was quoted in. Therefore, none of his feelings are reflected in the article if he'd known all the information of the proposed project from the start. 30% to 70% (AMI) is as low as you can go and will only exacerbate the issues in the taxing jurisdictions. He went on to explain the demographics of the Town of Elbridge, noting that the population of 65 years and older makes up 22% of the population, higher than the County as a whole, and in turn, the population from 18 to 64 is 58% and less than the County. He explains that the Town of Elbridge has aging people who are trying to stay in their own homes but goes on to say that the burden of the PILOT and tax will be pushed onto the residents. He encouraged the Board to take a look at the census data.

K. Bush III said that it wasn't until January that they were notified of a public hearing for the PILOT, receiving notice days before the public hearing, on a random Friday at 2:00 PM. He informed the Board that the room was full and not one person spoke in favor of the PILOT, as well as the developer not being in attendance. The process has been very behind closed doors, not working with the community and developing something. The new proposed 13-year PILOT is still opposed by the community and its stakeholders.

K. Bush III also highlighted the 15 out of the 30 units for veterans saying that's all that's designated for them. He went on to point out that the Town of Elbridge has a veteran population of 7.5%, which is higher than the County. He agreed that people should have a place to live, especially the vulnerable population. He then went on to talk about manufactured homes, mobile home parks, noting that these make up 1% of the stock County-wide, but it's 17% in the Town of Elbridge, noting that the Town is very welcoming to affordable housing. He spoke directly to the Applicant saying, pay your fair share, pay for the equitable share, be reasonable, work with the community, and make sure you're not putting the burden on the people that are just trying to keep their own home and have something of their own. He acknowledged that people want and need to rent, and that they need affordable housing, but also that municipalities need to be reasonable and on board about it.

K. Bush III shared with the Board that he was just put into office in January like some of them, bringing fresh eyes, new energy, transparency, and communication. He built off that statement by saying that the project has not been transparent and that communication has been lacking. He explained that the lack of communication has not been regarding the style of building, but how it has come about and what the Applicant is asking them to give up and put on the other residents in the municipality. He criticized the 8:30 AM start time for the Agency's meeting, noting that no superintendent will ever be at the meeting due to educational schedules. He explained that he felt disenfranchised when he received the mail at about 10:30 AM to see that the Agency's meeting was happening but did state that the letter was postmarked on the 27th (of May). He stated that it is unfair to take action when not everyone was given ample time to prepare.

R. Petrovich wanted to respond to some points that K. Bush III made. He also asked Alexis Rodriguez to speak to the notice process. He stated that that the Agency's meetings are fully forward-facing, having the schedule out a year in advance. The meetings are every month of the year. He stated that without the proposed project, the Village of Jordan and Town of Elbridge will be receiving substantially less tax revenue. He pointed out that the Village would get $205 per year resulting in $2,665 over 13 years, whereas with the project, it gets more than $143,000 over the same 13-year period. He also pointed out that the Town gets

$114 per year, and over the 13-year period it will get over $80,000. He wanted the Board to know that the assessed value of the project came from the Town of Elbridge Assessor.

A. Rodriguez spoke to the notice and process. She confirmed what R. Petrovich had said regarding the timeline of posting the schedule of the meetings of the Agency. She added that the Agency staff posts notices of the meeting at the Onondaga County Courthouse as well as the Agency's website. The agendas for the meetings are posted on the Monday prior to the meeting, which she confirmed was the case for the current meeting.

A. Fitzgerald also explained that the statutorily required 10-day notice was provided to the taxing jurisdictions and published for the public hearing back in January. An original deviation letter was mailed to the jurisdictions as required, and when the PILOT was amended, an additional deviation letter was mailed, allowing the taxing jurisdictions to speak.

Jeffrey Davis added that this project was one where the local municipality had completed SEQR, but had not done it not in accordance to the statute for SEQR. It was listed as an Unlisted action and given a negative declaration, but the Unlisted action category was incorrect. He explained that this action is actually a Type I action under SEQR, meaning it required a full coordinated review. So, the first action the Agency took was to declare its intent to be lead agency in order to perform SEQR correctly. There was no objection within that 30-day period, so the Agency sent out letters to involved agencies, including the municipalities and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC). The Agency received comment letters back, including a lengthy letter from NYS DEC. J. Davis pointed out that from January until present, Agency staff has been working on SEQR items. The NYS DEC letter required that the Applicant complete an environmental justice study, which the Applicant provided. Following that, Agency staff then went through what was provided as well as what was originally completed in SEQR at the local level, which brings to the Board a full Type I action under SEQR, including a coordinated review. He explains that if the Board would like to move forward with the project, the first action would be relating to SEQR, and his recommendation would be a Negative Declaration, consistent with what the local level did. This means there are no negative adverse environmental impacts requiring an environmental impact statement. This is consistent with the local level, just classified under a different category.

Christina Hollenback questioned the difference between a Type I action and an Unlisted action.

J. Davis responded that a Type I action is specifically enumerated in the statute such as if the project would exceed certain thresholds, location, and size. Anything that is not considered a Type I action under statute is then considered an Unlisted action. For the proposed project, it's considered a Type I action due to the size of the development. J. Davis confirmed that with the Applicant and its architect. Type I actions mean that there is a greater likelihood of adverse environmental impacts. He noted that due to some of the changes being made at the State level, this project could possibly be exempt from SEQR in the future. He explained that instead of agreeing with the SEQR process that was done at the local level, the Agency completed the SEQR process.

Sally Santangelo had questions regarding the process. She questioned if the frustrations regarding the noticing process are normal, or if there are ways to improve that process.

A. Fitzgerald spoke to the legal requirements, such as the 10-day notice relating to the public hearing, and that there is no statutorily required noticing time period for the deviation letter.

R. Petrovich added that this process is a lot of back and forth, explaining that the Agency gets involved only after an application is submitted, and the Agency doesn't have any say in the process before that. He noted that for this project, there has been a lot of back and forth since January with not only the Applicant, but the localities as well. He believes that in terms of the Agency's process, they have always tried to be forward-facing. In the history of the Agency, the meetings have always been at 8:30 AM.

J. Davis noted that the meetings used to be at 8:00 AM.

Sally Santangelo added that knowing when the meetings take place and knowing what items are on the agenda are two different things, but she can appreciate that having sufficient notice to those two things. She questioned if there was a way to bring the elected and school officials in on the process earlier to discuss the impacts on them.

R. Petrovich responded that the Agency staff is a small team, and there is a lot of running around the tree at the end to ensure that the agenda is finalized. He said that the team does a great job in trying to make sure that everything is complete before it goes to the Board or public so there isn't a project that needs to get pulled at the last second. He noted that in some instances, the Agency staff has to tell Applicants that they will need to be pushed to the following month's meeting because the Applicant isn't ready.

J. Davis added that Agency staff and legal counsel do not make the determinations of financial assistance, only the Board can make the determinations. All the information necessary is within the board packet for consideration, and as a Board member, they can elect not to move forward or move forward with the actions that are before them.

Mark Muthumbi had a question as to if some of the abatements could be recovered to not feel the pressure of PILOTs. He explained that it seems that everyone is in favor of the project, according to the public hearing, but ultimately asked if there are other channels where some of the entities such as the fire department or police department could seek relief.

J. Davis responded that he does not believe so, absent legislative change. A PILOT for the Agency applies to town, county, village, and school district tax revenue, not any special district tax revenue. He added that K. Bush III noted that they do not have special districts, but if they did, the Agency's PILOT would not abate that tax revenue. Giving another example, if a municipality has a fire district or another special district, the municipality will collect 100% of the special district tax revenue if a project is under a PILOT.

R. Petrovich added that the current assessed value of the vacant land is $37,950, and the Agency worked with the Town Assessor to determine the full assessment.

A. Rodriguez added that because this is a fully affordable project, the Town Assessor has a limit as to what they can assess the property at. That is where the $3.6 million came from.

R. Petrovich added that the overall value increased by 10 times.

Alan Marzullo asked for clarification as to if the PILOT is driven by the "estimated of increase in value" line.

A. Rodriguez confirmed that the land is always included in the PILOT payment schedule, but the abatement is only attached to the improvements being made.

R. Petrovich helped by explaining that nobody today makes less than they did yesterday. He added that the conversation surrounding school districts is a much larger conversation to be had. The Agency has worked closely with the Town of Elbridge to come up with an assessed value for the project. He also added that the issue of the tax cap is something that needs to be resolved in Albany and cannot be resolved locally.

J. Davis added that every IDA across New York has questioned the same thing.

Sally Santangelo asked if there was any other way that IDAs are structuring their PILOTs to address the school districts' tax cap issues.

J. Davis's response was that a PILOT needs to send out payments that are consistent with the tax percentages for the area.

Randy Wolken added that he believes that, unless done at the New York State level, there would be significant disadvantages to the communities if the Agency started allocating differently.

Alan Marzullo shared with the Board that when looking at table 1 on the estimated table worksheet, there has always been a misconception that the municipalities aren't getting any tax at all. In just year 1, the Applicant will pay $116, whereas they would've only gotten $114.

R. Petrovich added that in year 2 it jumps considerably.

Alan Marzullo added that the municipalities are getting more rather than less all the way from year 1 to year 13.

P. Rock added that in regard to the school district, he's met with the school district multiple times, hearing the concerns about funding and potential new students, concerns he shares. He explained that there is a regulatory number of people who can live in the proposed 65 units. The development team worked with the school district to help provide the potential maximum number of new students that could come from the proposed project. He added that they will inform the school district of incoming students as soon as they know of them due to the school district's timing issue.

R. Petrovich gave additional information about New York State's population declining and in turn the number of students declining. He believes that of all problems to be had, figuring out how to get more students in the education system is not a bad problem to have.

Michael Greene added that he's supportive of the project because he believes the need will be there whether the project gets built or not. He is also sympathetic to K. Bush III's argument about notice, acknowledging that the Agency met the statutory requirements. He gave suggestion that even if the Agency isn't sure of what will be on the agenda for future meetings, it can be in communication with stakeholders as to what could potentially be on the next agenda.

Randy Wolken also supports the project and believes that it's important to take in all of the comments being made and work to improve the process.

K. Bush III responded to the point made earlier that the Town Assessor came up with the assessment by saying that when it comes to affordable housing, New York State sets the requirements. He added that the $3.6 million assessment was determined based on the income and expenses that were provided by the Applicant.

R. Petrovich asked for more clarification regarding K. Bush III's comment, which he thought that K. Bush III was suggesting that someone from the Agency staff came up with a number for the assessment of the project that no one agreed with.

K. Bush III's response to that was that he believes that people do not think that a $32 million project should be assessed at $3.6 million.

K. Bush III added that the police have never been called to his vacant land that he currently owns in response to the argument that the Town of Elbridge will receive $116 versus $114 in year 1 of the PILOT. He explained that vacant land is not a tax burden to the municipalities as adding 150-200 people to a property all at once will be without the necessary tax revenue to support them. He stated that a PILOT removes the structure necessary to support the new residents.

Randy Wolken pointed out the two options: vacant land or a project on said land. He acknowledged that PILOTs are not well understood but noted that they are about growth and investment in the communities.

K. Bush III pointed out that the proposed project is not an industrial project.

Randy Wolken responded to this by explaining that these kinds of projects are necessary.

J. Davis gave legal context saying that IDAs are allowed to do housing projects, referring to a recent case in New York State that confirms this, despite the word "industrial" being in the names. According to that case, housing supports the mission of IDAs. Without housing, there is nowhere for the workforce to live. This case came out two months ago. He added that IDAs have been doing housing since the 80's, and the most recent challenge went up to the highest court in New York State to confirm that IDAs can do housing projects.

Christina Hollenback asked the Applicant if they expect that members of the existing community will be accessing the proposed units.

The Applicant responded that their housing study confirms this.

Christina Hollenback went on to ask K. Bush III if the people who are already in the community will then benefit from the fire and police services.

K. Bush III answered that a lot of the community is made up of single-family homes with residents that want to stay in their homes. The residents rely on stability in taxing structure. He added that the facilities with the greatest waitlist are the age-restricted senior facilities, which is something he believes the Town needs. He explained that outside of the City of Syracuse and the Town of Salina, the Town of Elbridge has the lowest median income, which means that the tax base is not there. He explained that there are people that are working to build the tax base. He moved on to say that there is zero public transportation and no manufacturing jobs in the Town of Elbridge, saying that the Applicant is putting this project in the Town of Elbridge, but the residents won't have any work in the area and won't have a way to get to work.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board to authorize adoption of SEQRA determination." Motion was made by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Christina Hollenback. Motion was carried.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board authorizing the financial assistance the Agency will provide. Agency benefits requested include exemptions from certain real property taxes and real estate transfer taxes." Motion was made by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Sally Santangelo. Motion was carried.

2. **Clay Hospitality, LLC (Project #3101-25-08A) First Meeting**

The applicant is proposing to construct an approximately 64,000 sq. ft. extended stay hotel consisting of approximately 103 extended-stay suites with kitchenettes, and approximately 1,100 square feet of meeting space on an approximately 2.5-acre site in the Town of Clay. The project will also include an indoor pool, fitness center, outdoor patio with fire pits, grills, heaters, and seating, laundry facilities, market pantry, breakfast dining area and multi-functional lobby/lounge, and parking to accommodate trailers, boats, construction vehicles, etc. The hotel will be operated under the Home2 Suites by Hilton brand.

Matthew Wells presented the project to the Board on behalf of the Applicant, who is an affiliate of Baywood Hotels, a hotel development and management company who has more than 35 years of development and operational experience. The company owns and operates more than 50 hotels across the United States. Baywood Hotels currently operates two hotels in Onondaga County, the Hampton Inn in Clay and the Hampton Inn & Suites in Carrier Circle, employing over 50 associates.

The Applicant will own and operate the proposed Home2 Suites by Hilton on an approximately 2.5-acre parcel of vacant land off of Rt. 31, adjacent to the shopping plaza in the Town of Clay. The Applicant acquired the property in April 2026. The proposed project is designed for families, extended stay contractors, business travelers, and other guests seeking contemporary lodging experience. The currently vacant site will be turned into a four-story, 64,000 sq. ft. hotel with a range of amenities including 103 extended stay units with kitchens, an indoor pool, a fitness center, an outdoor patio, firepits, barbeques, heaters, seating, guest laundry, 1,100 sq. ft. of meeting space, a market pantry, a breakfast dining area, a multifunctional lobby/lounge, and parking to accommodate trailers, boats, and construction vehicles. Construction on the project is scheduled to begin in spring/summer of 2026, contingent upon Agency benefits and securing lending financing. Once construction begins, the project will take approximately 14 months to complete, with an anticipated opening date of November 2027.

The project has been through the Town of Clay Planning Board site plan approval process and received a negative SEQR declaration from the Planning Board. The Town of Clay has also completed its subdivision approval. According to the Applicant, the project aligns with goals to expand hotel room inventory to meet current and future demands and there's an existing demand for this type of room in the Town of Clay with Micron's construction commencing. According to the market study submitted with the application, there is a demand for hotel rooms like the ones that this Home2 Suites would bring online.

Currently, the returns are less than expected and would not be feasible without the Agency's financial assistance. Reasons for the low returns include rising construction costs since the pandemic, current demand for construction in the region, as well as the 2025 NYS Energy Conservation Construction Code that took effect which furthers New York State's green initiatives.

Additionally, the uncertainty of international affairs, trade, and war have made it difficult for developers to understand what the cost to develop will be in the present and future. There is also a challenging lending environment that requires higher equity percentages, higher interest rates, and insurance requirements.

Also noted, there have been changes in Syracuse's local lodging industry, such as Syracuse University turning what was once a hotel into dormitory housing, which took about 600 rooms offline. Visit Syracuse acknowledged the negative impact on the market and stated that it is not sustainable given the investment taking place with the Micron project, forecasted growth for youth sporting facilities, and the aging facilities that are the current supply in the market. According to Visit Syracuse, there is a need for an additional 1,000 hotel rooms in the Downtown Syracuse area, and in the Clay and Liverpool area 500 to 750 additional rooms are needed.

The total project cost is approximately $19.2 million, and the Applicant is seeking $12.9 million to be bank-financed and $6.3 million in the form of equity. The project is estimated to create 15 FTE positions, including 11 positions in Year 1. The project will also create over 50 construction jobs.

According to the Applicant, the project will be able to provide goods and services that would not otherwise be reasonably available to the surrounding community, and the Agency benefits will close the feasibility gap in the project and allow it to move forward.

In summary, the Applicant believes that this project will generate new visitor spending at different businesses in the surrounding area, increase occupancy and local sales tax revenue for Onondaga County and other municipalities, generate increased PILOT and other tax revenue after its development, create permanent and short-term construction jobs, provide extended stay accommodations for travelers, help local employers recruit talent by expanding quality lodging options, increase business retention and expansion efforts, provide accommodations to travelers for local events, bring a nationally recognized extended stay hotel brand with a broad customer base to the area, and promote energy efficient systems and an environmentally conscious design.

Neil Patel explained that the brand of Baywood Hotels is one of the fastest growing brands in the country and has 700 locations across the US and 800 in the pipeline. He also explained that this design is sustainable seeing that most of the supply in Syracuse is aging and doesn't have the amenities that some travelers need. He said that they are excited to bring this project to the area.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board authorizing a public hearing." Motion was made by Mark Muthumbi, seconded by Christina Hollenback. Motion was carried.

3. **<u>D & D Motor Systems, Inc. (Project #3101-26-03A) First Meeting</u>**
The applicant is proposing to acquire an interest in real property containing a 32,344 sq. ft. building in the Village of East Syracuse and move and expand their motor manufacturing business.

Mike Dieroff presented the following about the project:

The business is located at 215 Park Avenue just outside of Downtown Syracuse. The business designs and manufactures high performance, specialty electric motors, primarily for golf carts, electric vehicles, utility vehicles, material handling, agriculture, mining, go-karts, and other specialty electric vehicle markets. Their public lines include controllers, solenoids, and wire kits. The Applicant is not a warehouse or distributor, but a manufacturer who supports their customers from across the country in their space in Onondaga County.

As part of the proposed project, the Applicant is committing to contribute eight jobs over the next five years, ranging from technical, sales, engineering, manufacturing, shipping and purchasing, and administrative jobs. The Applicant is planning to spend $2 million on a larger manufacturing footprint, property improvements, equipment, tooling, and the expansion of existing motor lines, further developing AC and permanent magnet motors.

The Applicant's challenge is that other states are actively recruiting the business to relocate such as Alabama, who has significantly less tax burdens. M. Dieroff cited that Alabama has them paying $53,000 in property taxes over 10 years compared to the Agency's $395,000 over the same period. This property tax affects the amount of equipment the business can buy, hire employees, and compete against oversees manufacturing. We want to stay in the area.

M. Dieroff gave a background to the once booming Central New York manufacturing hub home to companies like General Motors, Carrier, New Process Gear, producing typewriters, electrical devices, automobiles, air conditioners, and industrial products. In 2002, M. Dieroff and his brother started D & D Motor Systems, Inc. 95% of the Applicant's components are from the United States, and a significant percentage of that comes from New York suppliers. We are not looking for a handout, not a special favor, but a competitive adjustment that allows the real manufacturing expansion to happen here versus somewhere else.

The proposal is straightforward: we are asking OCIDA to adjust the PILOT so that the property assessment remains where it is for the next 10 years, allowing us to continue to pay approximately the same amount of taxes currently being brought into the County, school, and local tax base." He claimed that this would result in paying $250,000 over 10 years. Even though it's not as competitive as the Alabama offer, the Applicant claimed that it was enough to close the gap to stay in the area. M. Dieroff explained that from the taxpayer's standpoint, he believes that this is a very strong deal. What we are asking for is that the property assessment remains fixed for 10 years. The County would get 17 existing jobs, an additional eight jobs over five years, as well as $2 million in capital expenditure, local construction, property improvements, and opportunities for local suppliers. The Applicant asked the Board to adjust the tax assessment to maintain the current taxes of $250,000.

J. Davis questioned if the application that was submitted and the PILOT put forth by OCIDA is different from what he's asking for right now.

M. Dieroff responded yes.

J. Davis stated that the Applicant submitted an application and OCIDA has put forth a PILOT that's consistent with their UTEP and that's what's in the Board members' packets currently.

J. Davis asked the Applicant if he requested that the PILOT that's in the Board's packet be modified and deviated from the Agency's UTEP.

M. Dieroff responded yes.

R. Petrovich explained that he's confused because the Applicant and Agency staff have gone back and forth numerous times and the PILOT schedule has been agreed upon. The Agency has put forth the application for a public hearing based on the current PILOT schedule and now the Applicant is pivoting off that unbeknownst to the Agency.

M. Dieroff stated that's what he's always communicated from the beginning.

R. Petrovich responded that the Agency had communicated back to him that it wasn't a possibility.

J. Davis explained that this is an important procedural issue because a deviation requires the Agency to take certain steps in mailing deviation letters to the taxing jurisdictions, and that has not happened.

J. Davis advised that currently the plan is what is presented to the Board. If the Applicant is asking for a deviation, he does not think that the Agency is in a position to move forward with the request for a public hearing.

A. Rodriguez stated for the Board's transparency that she and the Applicant have gone back and forth for a couple of months regarding the application and PILOT, ultimately coming to the determination that the proposed PILOT was what was agreed upon by both parties. This PILOT would never have been presented today at the meeting if Agency staff had thought any different. It was already discussed internally that there was no deviation that would be made for this PILOT.

M. Dieroff stated if there's no deviation, you do what you have to do. My goal is to grow as many jobs as possible and for us to compete at a high level against foreign companies, I'm trying to get in the best cost position so I can grow as many jobs. There are certain jobs that I cannot go after now due to the cost structure of the business. If Robert what you're saying is that what the Board has in front of them is the only thing that you can vote on today is this proposal, then that is what I would like you to do.

R. Petrovich stated that Agency Counsel made an important point for the Board's consideration, which is that Agency staff has been going back and forth with the Applicant for the last few months to structure a proposal for consideration for review and a public hearing based on what the Board has in front of them. What the Applicant has put forth this morning is not part of that conversation.

R. Petrovich advised that the Board could table this or the Board can vote to advance a public hearing based on the packet that the Agency staff has put forward to the Board.

M. Dieroff questioned the time frame of tabling it.

R. Petrovich responded that the Agency would revisit this in July at the next scheduled Board meeting.

M. Dieroff stated that he would like to stick to the proposal that's currently presented to the Board.

Randy Wolken asked the Applicant for assurance that he is accepting this proposal moving forward and the Agency wouldn't end up at a public hearing with him presenting a different proposal.

M. Dieroff explained that he has to make a decision rather quickly, so he can't have the project be delayed.

Randy Wolken asked if the Applicant would be supportive of the proposal and stated that it's important that he is.

M. Dieroff responded yes.

Randy Wolken clarified that the resolution in front of the Board is one to authorize a public hearing associated with the existing PILOT schedule and financial assistance.

R. Petrovich wanted to make sure the Board understood that the package of incentives includes a PILOT, but also sales and use tax exemption as well as mortgage recording tax exemption.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board authorizing a public hearing." Motion was made by Sally Santangelo, seconded by Alan Marzullo. Motion was carried.

Prior to continuing the agenda items at hand, the Agency took a 5-minute break to allow for use of the restrooms.

4. <u>Micron New York Semiconductor Manufacturing LLC - Project Updates Main Campus (Project #3101-23-07A), Rail Spur (Project #3101-25-06A)</u>

Carson Henry and Katie Birchenough presented the update to the Micron Semiconductor and Rail projects.

C. Henry stated the following:

He introduced Joe Nehme and Perer Pianoto who could not be at the meeting but have been instrumental in Micron project. Micron was founded in 1978 and is the only U.S. manufacturer of memory semiconductors, holding about 61,000 patents and growing. He highlighted one of Micron's products, High Bandwidth Memory (HBM), which has been driving Micron's growth recently. Micron's memory uses 30% less power than the competition, but at a higher speed. Even though Micron's name is not on most products, a product of Micron is likely in everyday items. Across the world, Micron has 13 manufacturing sites and 13 customer labs, including Japan, Taiwan, Singapore, India, Idaho, Virgina, and New York. He explained that Micron is building two fabs out in Idaho, and that since the center of gravity for manufacturing is in Asia, the size of what is in Asia is what the size of the New York fabs will be. The chips that will be made in New York will then go to Asia to get packaged into what will ultimately go into people's technology products.

Micron is investing $200 billion into U.S. manufacturing and R&D, which is $50 billion more than what was originally planned in 2022. This increase will raise the amount of DRAM produced in the U.S. to 40% of the total output of Micron. Today, only 2% of world supply is manufactured in the U.S. The way that Micron is building out its fabs in Idaho is how they will in New York. They're building the fabs in phases. The south end of the first fab will be built up first where the bedrock is, making it easier to build on that ground.

There's continuous trade activity going on at the site. Not only is Micron constructing large fabs, but they are also turning over the equipment in the fabs every 18 months. Just one of the wet chemical pieces of equipment draws a lot of electrical and pipefitting work, and Micron has thousands of those pieces of equipment. Normally for trades, you have to travel, but with the amount of work happening around the site and fabs, trade workers will not have to travel, as there will be more than a thousand trades people on the site.

Referring to the image on the screen, the long building is the fab cleanroom, and in front of that building is the test and admin building, and next to that is a parking garage to supplement the surface parking. To the left of the fab is the utility building, and next to that is the wastewater treatment. Just behind the fab at the top of the rendering is an on-site gas plant as well. Micron takes measures in both their wastewater treatment as well as the on-site gas plant to help keep themselves as sustainable and efficient as possible. In the lower left corner of the slide is a rendering of what the front of the building will look like. Not shown in that rendering are the solar panels that they will be installing as well. In the lower right corner is a map of where construction is. Anything within the green lines is area of disturbance for the first fab. The first fab will be on the left-hand side of the map, building from west to east.

C. Henry stated that come this time next year, there will be roughly 3,000 trades on the site every day. In the blue areas of the map are areas of focus. So far, everything is ahead of schedule. Not shown is the rail spur, which is across Caughdenoy Road and is also ahead of schedule.

C. Henry delved into the project economics according to a REMI study that was published: 88% of employment growth will come from the Central New York region, 85% of the local fiscal revenues and annual GDP impact will go to the local government. The amount of additional local government revenues will be $4.9 billion over the next 10 years, which is a 30% increase, but the population growth will only be approximately 9%. This population growth is lower because Micron is working in local labor development in construction and workforce. Micron typically hires 65% of its workforce from the local area, and in New York they're hoping to do more than that. C. Henry predicts that local governments are going to have a surplus of revenue that they're going to have to find what to do with. Apart of a $500 million Green CHIPS community investment fund, Micron has invested $250 million, which will target workforce development, education, community assets and organizations, and affordable housing. $50 million has been pledged and $15 million has been spent.

The picture presented is the OCC Cleanroom Simulation Lab where they are training the future technicians of America. About 40% of Micron's workforce are technicians who will maintain the thousands of pieces of equipment in the fabs. Before moving on to where Micron has invested in the community, he touched on the barriers to getting into construction trades, mentioning transportation, education, and childcare.

Firstly, he highlighted Micron's community pillar investments. In partnership with CENTRO, Micron is funding a direct express line to Downtown Syracuse as well as the northern Syracuse suburbs from the site. In partnership with PEACE, Inc., Micron has invested to help expand the amount of childcare in the region, ultimately making it more affordable. In partnership with CNY Housing Fund, Micron is investing to help create affordable housing in the area.

He moved on to education & workforce pillar investments. The first was the OCM BOCES Apprenticeship program that helps train the workforce. In partnership with Jefferson Community College, Micron is assisting in projects supporting transitioning veterans.

He moved to the fourth pillar, Micron Gives. This is something unique to Micron, where every Micron employee participates in. Micron also donates up to $10,000 per year per employee, to a charity of their choice. He gave the example of him and his wife donating every month to a local food bank and Micron matches that. Additionally, every year Micron will choose a charity which it will try to direct all employee giving to. On the sustainability side, Micron is looking to make commitments such as net-zero emissions in 2050, as well as utilizing the fact that 85% of energy produced in Region C (where Micron is located) is made carbon-free. Regarding water, Micron tries to reduce and recycle their water usage.

Micron is invested in maximizing the local labor engagements. Micron's goal is to export local talent rather than have to import that talent. He listed Micron's involvement in local labor such as Syracuse Build and First Source Hire (FSH), local outreach and education, removing barriers (CENTRO), forecasts that include steady state construction needs allowing unions and other partners to plan, funding, contractual obligations in construction contracts to use Syracuse Build/FSH. He told a story dating back to 2022 while they were in the middle of site selection that highlighted that at Syracuse Build there were only 20 spots for 500 applicants, which made Micron understand that the number of construction laborers necessary would work. He then went on to explain that Syracuse Build for FSH is for if a company like Gilbane doesn't have enough local workforce, then they can go there first to fill that gap. Currently, the talent pool of the program is 3,000 candidates. There are constraints in the short term, but the talent pipeline is what Micron is excited about. He noted a study that ESD had contracted with McKinsey to do that last estimated that 2,500 people were coming into the trades, which shows that the number is growing based on the 3,000-candidate talent pool.

Deka Eysaman referred to FSH and asked, is it that the unions get the first 48 hours to pull form their bench and if they can't it goes to Syracuse Build?

C. Henry explained that the way the PLA (project labor agreement) is written is that if the unions can't fill it, then Micron could go outside of the union to fill it, and FSH would be one of the first places they go. He confirmed that so far all the work on the rail spur and main site are 100% union.

Deka Eysaman asked how much time does the union have to fill a slot, and then when you say Syracuse Build is one of the options they can go after, what are the other options?

C. Henry answered that they could go to other firms that are not approved, but the obligation is that they have to go to FSH first.

Deka Eysaman also asked if other programs that have come online recently like Mohawk or Oswego Build are included in the FSH, or just Syracuse Build.

C. Henry and K. Birchenough answered that they would follow up with an answer, adding that Micron's definition of local labor is the same as the Agency's 10-county area.

Christina Hollenback asked what the CNY Housing Fund is, asking if it's the CenterState CDC Fund, and asked who's executing it.

K. Birchenough answered that Micron has put up $30 million towards the fund, and ESD and other banking and financial institutions are putting into the fund that ESD will be overseeing.

Randy Wolken asked if this fund is new.

K. Birchenough confirmed that the fund is new.

Randy Wolken told Christina Hollenback that he believes the CenterState CDC fund that she's talking about and the CNY Housing Fund that is being presented might be the same.

Christina Hollenback asked about the 10% affordability associated with the CenterState CDC fund.

K. Birchenough responded to Christina Hollenback that she would follow up with her about the fund.

Christina Hollenback asked to see the demographic breakdown of the 3,000-candidate number that C. Henry was referring to.

C. Henry moved on to the topic of traffic, referring to a chart published in their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He referenced the classification of E and F, which show that a lot of intersections in the area already have heavy congestion. As part of the project, these will be improved, but the issue is that it will take time because NYSDOT has to go through their own EIS, which according to C. Henry, they are doing but won't be done until 2027/2028. In the meantime, Micron is trying to do community outreach, having meetings with NYSDOT as well as the Town of Clay (TOC). He highlighted a complaint made by a resident on Verplank Road regarding dump trucks on Verplank Road, where Micron in response sent someone to Verplank Road to ensure that there weren't any dump trucks on Verplank Road and that they were doing what they were supposed to. In the short term, the South Finger intersection is the only thing they can do to help alleviate traffic in the area. Referring to an image of proposed traffic mitigation in the presentation, C. Henry explained that at point 6, Micron is going to make a driveway that allows employees, dump trucks, and everything else to enter from Rt. 11 to alleviate traffic.

C. Henry stated that Micron would like to advance the South Finger Driveway (Rt. 11 Entrance), explaining that they aren't formally doing that during the current meeting, but wanted to get it in front of the Board to allow them to consider it. Part of the deal to purchase the site was that the purchase price would be used to reinvest in the site, and Micron thinks that this is one of the best ways to reinvest. The way that it would work is that the County would procure and construct the road, using $12.6 million of the $30 million purchase price, and anything above that, Micron would pay for. C. Henry confirmed that the design is complete and scope of work is under development, hopefully allowing the road to be operational in 2027. He moved on to the second consideration that they hope to put in front of the Board, stating that Micron is going to need control of the land on the east side of the property. The purchase agreement from earlier in the year gives Micron access to the property west of Burnet Road. The air permit studied the entire White Pine Commerce Park to ensure the air permit would pass, and due to the prevailing winds, Micron will need access to the east side of the property, so Micron's proposal is to advance that with a lease. Micron has taken risks in trying to reduce the amount of emissions on the site and the air permit by using new technologies and decreasing the number of emergency generators on-site but cannot get rid of all of them due to the safety and codes that are required on the site.

Randy Wolken thanked C. Henry and looks forward to plenty of these styled conversations in the future.

Randy Wolken noted how communicative Micron has been as well as how forward thinking they are, saying that he believes the Board is the best way to have these conversations because things are changing in a positive way, but there will be some things to be focused on.

J. Davis added that the presentation has teed up future actions before the Board. One of those being a lease of Agency-owned land on the east side of Burnet Road as well as the reinvestment of the $12.6 million into the site. He welcomed Board members who have questions outside of the meeting to reach out to staff to set up conversations.

5. **Contract Authorization**

R. Petrovich explained to the Board that with everything occurring on the Micron Campus, the Agency had bought 105+ acres of land to the south to develop into a supply chain campus for critical supply chain partners to Micron that need to be located within close proximity to the fabs. The Agency is advancing the review of this land through SEQR. This is the environmental review process and the Agency has contracted with Barton & Loguidice (B&L) for engineering services, who has started this process and has a goal to have an EIS complete by the end of the year (2026) to prepare for supply chain companies that are prepared to make commitments to Onondaga County. The Agency has an existing contract with B&L with the approximate amount of $273,000. They have spent about $90,000 to $92,000 to complete the Generic EIS. He explained to the Board that the action before them is to increase the contract by $391,860 to finish and complete the work necessary to complete a Generic EIS before the end of the year. This will allow future infrastructure improvements and build-out for the supply chain companies.

Alan Marzullo asked if the contract amendment is enough to complete the Generic EIS.

R. Petrovich answered that according to B&L, it will be enough. He explained that they've done good work for the Agency to date, but the Agency has asked more than they originally expected, hence the contract amendment.

R. Petrovich made it clear that time is not our friend regarding this process because in order for Micron to be making chips come 2029/2030, the supply chain companies need to have the correct approvals and site plans well before Micron becomes operational. He explained that this process is similar to what the Agency did on the main White Pine Campus when a Generic EIS was completed based on the understanding that Intel would be locating in Onondaga County. When Micron announced, the Micron project was going to be larger than the Intel project, so the Agency had to pivot off the Generic EIS and do a supplement and a specific EIS for their project.

Christina Hollenback asked whether the increase is based on the pivot from Intel or something else.

R. Petrovich responded that it's based on a pivot from an initial review of the site for wetlands and other EIS requirements.

J. Davis added that it ties into item six which will follow this action. The Agency went out on a draft scope and received comments on that draft scope, and some of those comments led to modifications of the draft scope, which means the Agency will now look at some things that were not originally going to be looked at. These modifications of the scope also lead to modifications of engineering material such as layouts, designs, and considering housing components as a mixed-use alternative. These modifications flow through as the natural SEQR process.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board authorizing an amendment to the contract with Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C., consisting of an increase to the amount authorized for engineering services related to White Pine Science & Technology Park." Motion was made by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Christina Hollenback. Motion was carried.

6. <u>White Pine Science & Technology Park</u>

J. Davis stated to the Board that the Agency has started an environmental impact process to look at White Pine South and a Draft EIS was developed and put out for public comment where a public hearing was held in the Town of Clay and the window for public comment ended on May 15. In front of the Board are all comments that were received, the Agency's consultant and legal responses to the comments, and how the Draft Scope changed to what is now to be adopted as the Final Scope. The Scope is what is to be studied in order to prepare a Generic EIS. J. Davis called out a few of the normal studies that you typically look at such as traffic, air, impacts to land, and wetlands. He went on to explain that when you're looking at an EIS, you're looking at what are the alternative or how can we mitigate impacts. The largest change in this scope is in response to public comment stating that the Agency should explore a housing component for the site.

J. Davis explained that the action before the Board is one to allow the Agency to start the EIS process, which means adopting the Final Scope that explains what the Agency will review, and then the engineering firm will begin all the proposed studies, then a Draft Generic EIS will come before the Board. After the Board affirms that the Draft Generic EIS is complete, it will be sent out to the public, who can then submit comments. Once the comments are received, a response to comments will then be created. From that, a Final Generic EIS will be created. There will be workshops with the Board to ensure everyone is included. After, the Board will then adopt the Final Generic EIS.

Following the EIS, if a company comes to the Agency and wants to locate on WPSTP, then the Agency will look at their plan on the Final Generic EIS and make a fact finding determination based on the review of their plan on the Final Generic EIS, and then the company will go through the Town of Clay for their zoning permits and approvals. If their site plan differs from what was originally studied, then the Agency might have to complete supplements to the Final Generic EIS. J. Davis reiterated that the action before the Board is one to adopt the Final Scope.

Randy Wolken asked for confirmation that this is one of multiple steps.

J. Davis confirmed that this is the first of many steps, each eliciting more comment and involving the Board with what will ultimately be released to the public.

Alan Marzullo asked what the overall timeframe of something like this takes.

J. Davis answered that six months is certainly doable. The Agency has the benefit that B&L has already started some studies beforehand with their previous work.

R. Petrovich noted that B&L will be able to leverage off of the FEIS that is complete on the Micron campus across the street, just ensuring that the data is still accurate.

J. Davis added that Micron's traffic study included and anticipated development at White Pine South and included a number that will be generated from the site. The Agency will go back in and check what Micron's FEIS concluded to be accurate.

R. Petrovich gave Alan Marzullo a short answer of December (2026).

Christina Hollenback suggested to push to the public a rough outline of dates. She added the Agency is getting a lot of feedback, and as much as the Agency could be upfront and transparent will go a long way for the public.

R. Petrovich added that moving forward with the action today will allow for milestones to be created as well as a timeline.

Randy Wolken added that he likes the idea of socializing the timeline.

J. Davis added that Agency staff will give periodic updates as well to the process.

Mark Muthumbi questioned the housing component to the proposed Final Scope, asking if it's unique to this site.

J. Davis answered that the comments were unique, but good comments. He explained that the idea was that the County needs housing, questioning if there's an opportunity to mix housing into the site plans. He added that another individual, an engineer, went ahead and redesigned the site and made it all housing. He explained that with that being said, the Board needs to look at what the highest and best use of the site will be, keeping in mind what is across the street from this site.

R. Petrovich added that the Agency staff has been doing a lot of research regarding this area. They've looked at places like Arizona with the semiconductor cluster that already exists out there and have found that there are sites where there are residential communities with supply chain companies on the same site, but a key difference is that those sites are typically 1,000-acre sites. The Agency is working with a 100-acre site. He stated that he's not giving a predetermined answer, and it will be looked at, but where it is done successfully is typically done with sites that are much larger than what the Agency currently has.

Randy Wolken read the Agency action requested, "A resolution of the Board adopting the final scoping document pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for the White Pine Science & Technology Park, and authorizing the filing and distribution of the Final Scope pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA." Motion was made by Alan Marzullo, seconded by Mark Muthumbi. Motion was carried.

Motion to adjourn was made by Alan Marzullo and seconded by Sally Santangelo at 10:48 AM.

Alexis Rodriguez

Alexis Rodriguez, Secretary