



GCEDC STAMP Committee Meeting

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

Location: 99 MedTech Drive, Innovation Zone

9:15 a.m.

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members: C. Kemp, M. Gray, C. Yunker

Staff: M. Masse, L. Farrell, L. Casey, P. Heimlich, J. Krencik, C. Suozzi

Guests: R. Crossen (Town of Alabama), K. Fisher (Town of Alabama), M. Fitzgerald (Philips Lytle), L. Mancuso (GCEDC Board Member), M. Landers (Genesee County Manager), S. Hess (CC Environment), K. Hojnacki (CC Environment), M. Masschaele (GHD – Video Conference), E. Wells (E3Communications), B. Beagle (Daily News), S. East (GHD – Video Conference), S. Maier (Harris Beach),

Absent: P. Zeliff

1. Call to Order / Enter Public Session

M. Gray called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. in the Innovation Zone.

1a. Executive Session

C. Kemp made a motion to enter executive session under the Public Officers Law, Article 7, Open Meetings Law Section 105, at 9:16 a.m., for the following reasons:

1. The medical, financial, credit or employment history of a particular person or corporation, or matters leading to the appointment, employment, promotion, demotion, discipline, suspension, dismissal or removal of a particular person or corporation.
2. The proposed acquisition, sale or lease of real property or the proposed acquisition of securities, or sale or exchange of securities held by such a public body, but only when publicity would substantially affect the value thereof.

The motion was seconded by C. Yunker and approved by all members present.

B. Beagle left the meeting at 9:16 a.m. for executive session.

1b. Re-Enter Public Session

C. Yunker made a motion to enter back into public session at 9:43 a.m., seconded by C. Kemp and approved by all.

Guests re-entered the meeting at 9:43 a.m.

2. Chairman's Report & Activities

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

2b. Minutes: May 6, 2026

C. Yunker made a motion to approve the May 6, 2026 minutes; the motion was seconded by C. Kemp. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zelif -	Absent
C. Yunker -	Yes
M. Gray -	Yes
C. Kemp -	Yes

The item was approved as presented.

3. Discussions / Official Recommendations to the Board:

3a. SEQR Update – Review of the application submitted by STREAM US Data Centers continues as part of the SEQR process. Representatives from two consulting firms attended the meeting to provide updates on their ongoing analyses related to noise and environmental impacts.

Representatives from GHD, the consulting firm retained to review the sound study submitted by STREAM US Data Centers, provided an overview of their work to date. They explained that they have been actively engaging with STREAM US Data Centers and Ramble, STREAM's acoustical consultant, regarding all aspects of the project's noise analysis. Their review has included potential impacts from generators, transformers, chillers, tonal noise, and low-frequency sound. As revisions are made to the sound study report and acoustic model, GHD continues to evaluate the updates and provide comments, recommendations, and requests for additional revisions to ensure the final report is technically robust and demonstrates compliance with all applicable criteria. Areas of detailed review have included ground absorption, building surface reflectivity, and ground surface conditions.

M. Masse noted that infrasound has been a recurring topic in public comments and asked whether it had been considered during the review process. S. West confirmed that infrasound had already been incorporated into the low-frequency noise impact assessment.

At M. Masse's request, S. West provided a definition of infrasound, explaining that it generally refers to sound frequencies below 20 hertz, which is considered the lower threshold of human hearing. M. Masschaele added that the review process has involved a highly detailed evaluation of every potential variable related to sound impacts.

M. Fitzgerald stated that numerous public comments concerning noise have been received and that those comments are being provided to GHD for review before being forwarded to STREAM US Data Centers and Ramble for response and consideration.

Representatives from CC Environment, the consulting firm engaged to evaluate potential wildlife impacts associated with the proposed data center project, also presented an overview of their analysis and findings. They explained that their review focused on two primary areas of potential impact: site development and noise. As part of their evaluation, they reviewed studies addressing wildlife impacts from similar commercial developments.

CC Environment noted that certain species, including grassland birds, small mammals, insects, and bats, tend to be more sensitive to development and noise impacts, with grassland birds being among the most sensitive. However, they indicated that the project site currently supports relatively few grassland birds because the area is primarily used for row crop agriculture. They also noted that the presence of short-eared owls and northern harriers at STAMP has already been addressed through the Part 182 Permit,

which includes measures to mitigate potential impacts to those species. CC Environment stated that they intend to review the updated sound study once it becomes available and revise their memo as needed.

K. Hojnacki stated that wildlife impacts related to sound, particularly for species that rely heavily on hearing, are generally not observed until sound levels reach approximately 40 to 45 decibels. Based on the version of the sound study reviewed, noise impacts were expected to remain localized, with a target of 60 decibels at the property line during daytime operations. She noted that the limited propagation of sound beyond the site is expected to minimize impacts on wildlife.

M. Masse commented that, as part of the Part 182 Permit requirements, a grassland mitigation area was established at the STAMP site and that this area has been beneficial in providing suitable habitat for grassland species.

C. Yunker noted that S. Hess has been involved in reviewing and monitoring environmental impacts at the STAMP site since its inception and asked whether there was anything specific about the proposed project that raised concerns.

S. Hess responded that her role has been to assist the GCEDC in evaluating potential environmental impacts as projects are proposed for the site. She stated that the original purpose of STAMP was to identify an appropriate location for industrial development and noted that one of the key mitigation measures implemented has been the creation of the grassland mitigation area to further reduce environmental impacts. She added that, in her opinion, the proposed data center project is not materially different from other commercial or manufacturing developments that could be located at the site and would be expected to have similar types of impacts.

3b. Consulting Contracts for Project Evaluation – The GCEDC has received a SEQR application from Project Double Reed. The GCEDC has to engage with consultants to assist in reviewing and providing comments on that application.

Fund Commitment:

1. CC Environment and Planning \$5,000
2. Philips Lytle \$750,000

These costs will be covered under the agreement for the payment of project evaluation expenses.

Committee Action Request: Recommend approval of the contracts for the consultants to perform the project evaluation to be reimbursed by the applicant.

C. Yunker made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the consultants to perform the project evaluation to be reimbursed by the applicant as presented; the motion was seconded by C. Kemp. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zelif -	Absent
C. Yunker -	Yes
M. Gray -	Yes
C. Kemp -	Yes

The item was approved as presented.

3c. Cost Reimbursement – NYPA – The GCEDC has previously signed a Cost Reimbursement Agreement (CRA) with NYPA for the review of the design and engineering for the substation at the STAMP site.

Fund commitment: Additional \$1,000,000 included in the \$56 million.

Committee action request: Recommend approval to fund the CRA for an additional \$1,000,000.

C. Kemp made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the cost reimbursement with NYPA for an additional \$1,000,000 as presented; the motion was seconded by C. Yunker. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zelif -	Absent
C. Yunker -	Yes
M. Gray -	Yes
C. Kemp -	Yes

The item was approved as presented.

3d. RG&E Letter of Intent – In connection with the second 300 mega watt NYISO study that was done, improvements needed at the RG&E station were identified. Included in the meeting materials was a letter of intent to move forward with these improvements.

M. Masse pointed out the redacted section in the letter was in relation to a second project where the cost would be shared 50/50 but RG&E wanted to keep the confidentiality of that project intact. He also pointed out that the dollar amount reflected in the letter would be the GCEDC's portion of the 50%.

C. Yunker made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the Letter of Intent with RG&E as presented; the motion was seconded by C. Kemp. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zelif -	Absent
C. Yunker -	Yes
M. Gray -	Yes
C. Kemp -	Yes

The item was approved as presented.

4. Adjournment

As there was no further business, C. Kemp made a motion to adjourn at 9:59 a.m., seconded by C. Yunker and passed unanimously.