



GCEDC STAMP Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 14, 2025
Location: 99 MedTech Drive, Innovation Zone
10:00 a.m.

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members: C. Yunker (Video Conference*), C. Kemp, P. Zelif, M. Clattenburg
Staff: M. Masse, L. Farrell, E. Finch, C. Suozzi, J. Krencik, P. Kennett, L. Casey
Guests: R. Ball (ESD), R. Crossen (Town of Alabama Supervisor), M. Fitzgerald (Phillips Lytle), K. Fisher (Town of Alabama Board Member)
Absent:

*Attending from a physical location identified in the meeting notice as open to the public.

1. Call to Order / Enter Public Session

P. Zelif called the meeting to order at 10:00 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 10:00 a.m., for the following reasons:

1. Discussions regarding proposed, pending, or current litigation.
2. 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.
3. 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 M. Clattenburg and approved by all members present.

1b. Re-Enter Public Session

C. Kemp made a motion to enter back into public session at 11:01 a.m., seconded by M. Clattenburg and approved by all.

2. Chairman's Report & Activities

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

2b. Minutes: December 4, 2024

C. Yunker made a motion to approve December 4, 2024, minutes; the motion was seconded by C. Kemp. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zeff - Yes
C. Yunker - Yes (Video Conference*)
M. Clattenburg – Yes
C. Kemp - Yes

The item was approved as presented.

3. Discussions / Official Recommendations to the Board:

3a. Payment to Village of Oakfield - The GCEDC, STAMP Sewer Works Corp. and the Village of Oakfield are working together on the design, construction and operation of a new force main sewer line from the STAMP Site to the Village of Oakfield Wastewater Treatment Facility (“Oakfield WWTF”) to provide wastewater treatment services to STAMP. In May of 2024, these three entities entered into an MOU whereby the GCEDC would pay the Village of Oakfield for engineering costs incurred to review the design plans for the force main and potential upgrades to the existing WWTF.

Fund Commitment: \$12,532.50 to be covered under the \$8 million grant.

Committee Action request: Recommend approval of paying the Village of Oakfield engineering costs that are covered under the MOU.

C. Kemp made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of the Payment to the Village of Oakfield for engineering costs that are covered under the MOU not to exceed \$12,532.50 as presented; the motion was seconded by M. Clattenburg. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zeff - Yes
C. Yunker - Yes (Video Conference*)
M. Clattenburg – Yes
C. Kemp - Yes

The item was approved as presented.

3b. Escrow Agreement – Expenses – The GCEDC board has required three data center projects that are looking at overlapping acreage to enter into agreements to cover the costs incurred by the GCEDC regarding their projects. The GCEDC Board approved the draft Escrow Agreement at the 10/31/24 Board Meeting. \$25,000 deposits have been received from each of the companies. Funds are to be replenished as necessary.

Included with the meeting materials were three proposed engagement letters with Phillips Lytle engaging them to do the required work related to reviewing these projects. The escrow agreements state that the “Applicant shall reimburse the GCEDC for its documented, invoiced out of pocket Consultant fees incurred in connection with the review of the Project”.

Fund Commitment: The total amount is to be determined. Total expenses would not exceed the total funds received from these companies under the Escrow Agreements.

Board Action Request: Recommend authorization to pay expenses related to the executed Escrow Agreements in place with three data center projects.

The Committee has recommended that the payment of invoices should not exceed the deposit amounts received per data center company.

M. Clattenburg made a motion to recommend to the full Board the approval of payment of invoices to Phillips Lytle related to the data centers not to exceed \$25,000 per company which will be paid from deposits received; the motion was seconded by C. Kemp. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zeff - Yes
C. Yunker - Yes (Video Conference*)
M. Clattenburg – Yes
C. Kemp - Yes

The motion was approved.

3c. Onsite Water Storage Tank Bids – The GCEDC went out to bid for an onsite water storage tank that would connect to the potable water system at STAMP and the Town of Alabama. The bid was put out as one project but with three base bids as follows:

- A. 500,000-gallon storage tank.
- B. 1,000,000-gallon storage tank.
- C. 2,000,000-gallon storage tank.

The bid documents stated that the Owner reserves the right to award the Base Bids individually or the combination of the Base Bids to the lowest, responsive, responsible bidder based on which Bid combination best fits the project budget and priorities, including MWBE participation amounts.

Clark Patterson Lee provided a recommendation for an award letter, which was included in the Board materials.

Fund commitment: \$4.2 million from the NYS \$56 million and any excess would be paid out of the land sale proceeds from Apple Tree Acres Park.

Committee action request: Committee to discuss which tank size and bid to award.

C. Kemp made a motion to approve the base bid of .5 million gallons for the Onsite Water Storage Tank to DN Tanks; the motion was seconded by M. Clattenburg. Roll call resulted as follows:

P. Zeff - Yes
C. Yunker - Yes (Video Conference*)
M. Clattenburg – Yes
C. Kemp - Yes

The motion was approved.

4. Adjournment

As there was no further business, M. Clattenburg made a motion to adjourn at 11:10 a.m., seconded by C. Kemp and passed unanimously.