

Category	Question/comment	Date Received	Response
Zoning/STAMP/TD1 District			
Zoning 1	I still can't figure out STAMP boundaries and set backs. Can anyone help with this especially related to STREAMS potential properties? How does an AI Center meet the Zoning Requirements?	1/11/2026	The proposed STREAM data center is located within the TD-1 Technology District at the STAMP site in the Town of Alabama. This district was specifically established to support large-scale, technology-intensive and advanced manufacturing uses, with zoning and environmental review frameworks designed to accommodate operations requiring substantial land area, energy capacity, and supporting infrastructure. The district standards require a minimum front setback of 100 feet, side and rear setbacks of 50 feet, and a maximum building height of 200 feet.  Further, the STAMP site was designed with buffer zones which limit development between significant landmarks. There is a 400 ft buffer zone which only allows landscaping/access drives/utility infrastructure/berms around the perimeter of the STAMP site to mitigate visual and aesthetic impacts, a 500 ft to 1600ft buffer zone which only allows conservation land/permanent open space/environmental mitigation areas adjacent to the Tonawanda Seneca Nation Lands, a 500 ft buffer zone which only allows vegetation/habitat preservation along the boundary of the John White Wildlife Management Area, and approximately 200 acres of conservation land associated with the Whitney Creek Corridor which only allows habitat or stream preservations/ecological mitigation. Based on the submitted plans, the project complies with these buffers, bulk, and dimensional requirements.  The STAMP site was planned and environmentally reviewed through a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) to support large-scale, technology-intensive
Noise			
Noise 1	In the SEQR Development Application, STREAM claims 'Sound measurement methodology says the equipment associated with this project does not contain unusually high frequencies or contain low frequency tones'. Why are they claiming this and if they are confident there will be no low frequency tones why would they be hesitant to use dBC weighting (instead of dBA weighting) and include octave band noise analysis?	1/11/2026	STREAM has completed an acoustical study for the proposed project, which has been made publicly available on the Genesee County Economic Development Center (GCEDC) website.
Noise 2	When the furnace turned on during the meeting and Mr. Crossen jumped up to try to shut it off because it was so intrusive the decibel level average was 51. For your comparison, this is more than 10db below the acceptable daytime noise level that our board agreed to in the most recent IZA. (And only 6db higher than the night time noise requirement) Does this seem fair to the residents living near the STAMP project that will endure non-stop noise levels?	1/11/2026	The Town of Alabama has retained an independent acoustical consultant to review STREAM's noise analysis, and they will review low-frequency sound. The GCEDC has also retained its own independent acoustical expert. These third-party reviews will evaluate the methodology, assumptions, and conclusions of the applicant's study.
Noise 3	The IZA includes general noise limits, but these standards rely solely on dBA, which measures mid-frequency sound and does not capture the low-frequency noise (LFN) produced by large cooling systems, chillers, axial fans, and generators. As a result, the Town lacks the tools needed to evaluate the most significant noise impact associated with hyperscale data centers.	2/18/2026	No site plan decision will be made until these independent acoustical reviews are complete. Once finalized, the results of these reviews will be made available to the public.
Noise 4	Has the Town requested a low frequency noise analysis, and will the Town require it before any site plan approvals?	2/9/2026	The project will be required to comply with the noise standards established through the original STAMP Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), which are the standards applicable to development within the site.
Noise 5	The SEQR application says STREAM is still working on a study to determine how much noise the data center complex will generate and what that means for building and site plan design. How can the Planning Board consider a site plan application when the data center design has not yet been completed? And how will 24/7 noise from the data center complex comply with our ToA noise ordinance, which prohibits "noxious" levels of noise?	2/4/2026	According to the materials submitted to date, STREAM is proposing mitigation measures such as cooling equipment design, enclosures, and acoustical screening to ensure that sound levels remain within regulated limits. Final determination of compliance will be based on the independent acoustical reviews and the applicable SEQR findings.
Noise 6	I am writing to respectfully but firmly challenge the adequacy of the recently completed noise study associated with the STAMP project. After reviewing the document in detail, I have significant concerns about its methodology, completeness, and compliance with accepted environmental and engineering standards.  First, the study relies exclusively on A-weighted (dBA) measurements. This approach filters out low-frequency noise, which is a primary component of industrial facilities such as data centers, chillers, generators, and large-scale HVAC systems. Without C-weighted measurements or octave-band analysis, the study cannot detect or characterize the low-frequency noise that travels farthest at night and is most likely to impact nearby homes.  Second, the study does not include continuous 24-hour monitoring. Instead, it uses short, intermittent measurement periods. This method does not establish a true baseline for nighttime conditions, which are essential for evaluating potential impacts on sleep, rural quiet, and low-frequency propagation. SEQR requires analysis of worst-case conditions, and nighttime ambient levels are the critical reference point for determining significance.  Third, several measurements were taken during weather conditions that invalidate the data, including wind, drizzle, and heavy rain. Standard practice requires calm, dry conditions with minimal foliage noise. Without adherence to these conditions, the results cannot be considered reliable.  Fourth, the study lacks essential documentation such as instrumentation details, calibration logs, microphone height, ground conditions, and data logging intervals. These omissions make the results non-verifiable and inconsistent with accepted professional standards.  Finally, despite these methodological issues, the study still shows extremely low nighttime readings in the 26-33 dBA range. This confirms that our community is exceptionally quiet at night and that even modest industrial noise sources could have a noticeable impact.	2/22/2026	
Noise 7	The SEQR documents indicate that STREAM is still conducting a noise analysis to determine the sound levels the proposed data center campus would generate and how that would affect the final building and site design. If those studies aren't complete, how can the Planning Board responsibly evaluate or approve a site plan? In addition, the facility is expected to operate around the clock. How will continuous, 24/7 operational noise comply with the Town of Alabama's ordinance prohibiting "noxious" noise levels?	2/18/2026	
Noise 8	Section 808 of the Town Zoning Law outlines the process for reviewing STAMP applications, but it does not contain any performance standards for noise or vibration. The Town's only explicit noise and vibration standard appears in Sections 505 and 507:  "Neighborhood Character – The appearance of the structure shall not be altered and the business shall not be conducted in a manner that would cause the premises to differ from its existing residential/agricultural character, either by colors, material, construction, lighting, signs, or emission of sounds, noises or vibrations."  Questions:  a. Is there a section of the Technology District regulations or Section 808 where these noise and vibration performance standards have been waived or replaced?  b. Without such a waiver, will the applicant be required to complete additional analysis or low-frequency noise assessment to address the Town's prohibition on the emission of "sounds, noises or vibrations"?	2/25/2026	
Noise 9	A previous acoustical baseline was completed more than 5 years ago. A new baseline study needs to be completed now so that the most up to date information can be used in decisions including measurements using dBC weighting and octave band analysis.	1/11/2026	
Noise 10	I am writing to request clarification regarding the noise thresholds of 65 dBA during daytime and 45 dBA during nighttime that have been referenced in recent project reviews and technical memoranda. Specifically, I am asking for confirmation of where, if anywhere, these thresholds have been formally adopted by the Town of Alabama as legally binding standards. I have reviewed the Town Zoning Law (July 2023), the Comprehensive Plan, the IZA documents, and Local Law 2-2018, and I have not been able to locate any section that adopts these or any other noise limits as enforceable town law.  Because these thresholds are being cited in SEQR-related documents as if they represent official town standards, it is important to understand whether the Town Board has ever taken formal action to adopt them, either by local law, resolution, or incorporation into zoning or design standards.  If such an action exists, I would appreciate being directed to the specific law, section, or resolution where these limits were approved. If no such action has been taken, I would appreciate confirmation of that as well, so that the record is clear regarding what noise standards are and are not legally enforceable within the Town of Alabama.	3/12/2026	
Noise 11	I respectfully request a written explanation for how the proposed rooftop "buffers" on the STREAM buildings can provide any meaningful acoustic benefit, given the height relationships described in the Acoustics Technical Summary.  According to the applicant's submission: - Chillers will be installed on platforms 12 feet above the roof level. - The chillers themselves are substantial industrial units, typically 8-10 feet tall. - The proposed rooftop screens extend only 18 feet above the roof level.  This means the top of each chiller will be approximately 20-22 feet above the roof, while the top of the screen is only 18 feet above the roof. In other words, the chillers extend 2-4 feet above the top of the screen.  Given this geometry, please provide:  1. An explanation of how a barrier that is shorter than the noise-generating equipment can provide any acoustic attenuation, particularly for low-frequency noise that diffracts easily over obstacles. 2. Any modeling, calculations, or barrier-insertion-loss data demonstrating that a screen shorter than the source can reduce sound levels at nearby residential receptors. 3. Clarification of whether the rooftop screens are intended as visual elements only, and if so, why they are described in the acoustics document as "buffers" without a clear statement of their limited acoustic function. 4. A description of any alternative or supplemental mitigation considered to address chiller noise, given that the proposed screens do not break line-of-sight to the equipment.  This information is necessary for the public and the Board to understand whether the proposed rooftop screens provide any real noise mitigation, or whether additional measures are required to meet SEQR's mandate to minimize adverse environmental impacts.	3/15/2026	
Noise 12	I respectfully request a written explanation for why the Town is not applying the same SEQR-based noise analysis requirements that were used for the Luther Forest Technology Campus (LFTC), particularly given that the STREAM Acoustics Technical Summary states that its approach is "consistent with other technology manufacturing sites including Luther Forest Technology Campus."  LFTC is the closest New York precedent for a large-scale technology campus with substantial mechanical equipment and nearby rural residences. During its SEQR review, the Towns of Malta and Stillwater required:  Full octave-band noise modeling Low-frequency noise analysis, including C-weighted evaluation Tonal noise assessment Limits on increases above ambient sound levels Barrier height sensitivity analysis Post-construction compliance monitoring  These requirements were imposed through SEQR Findings and the LFTC Planned Development District (PDD), not through a general noise ordinance. They were required because SEQR obligates the Lead Agency to identify, evaluate, and mitigate all reasonably foreseeable noise impacts, including low-frequency and tonal components.  The STREAM submission for the STAMP site does not include any of these analyses, despite citing LFTC as a comparable project and despite proposing:  Nearly 200 rooftop chillers Multiple large diesel generators Continuous 24/7 mechanical operation Proximity to existing homes  To support the Board's SEQR findings and ensure consistency with established New York precedent, please provide:  1. An explanation of why the Town is not requiring the same SEQR-based noise analyses used at LFTC, including octave-band modeling, low-frequency evaluation, and tonal assessment. 2. A clarification of how STREAM's noise study can be considered "consistent with" LFTC when it omits the analyses that LFTC was required to perform. 3. Whether the Board has determined that these analyses are unnecessary for the STREAM project, and if so, the technical basis for that determination. 4. Whether the Board intends to require supplemental noise analysis to address low-frequency noise, tonal components, or increases above ambient sound levels. 5. How the Board will ensure that noise impacts are fully identified and mitigated, as required by SEQR, if these analyses are not performed.	3/15/2026	
Noise 13	I respectfully request a written explanation and supporting documentation for the statement in the STREAM Acoustics Technical Summary that: "The equipment associated with this project does not typically exhibit unusually high frequencies or contain low-frequency tones." This assertion appears inconsistent with the types of equipment proposed for the project and with standard industry knowledge regarding their acoustic characteristics. The project includes: Approximately 198 air-cooled rooftop chillers operating continuously Multiple large diesel generators Numerous large-diameter condenser fans and mechanical systems These categories of equipment are widely recognized to produce significant low-frequency energy, including fan blade-pass frequencies, motor hum, compressor tones, and diesel engine harmonics. The Acoustics Technical Summary does not provide octave-band or 1/3-octave-band data, tonal analysis, or C-weighted modeling to substantiate the claim. To support the Board's SEQR findings and ensure that noise impacts are accurately characterized, please provide: The technical basis for concluding that the chillers, generators, and associated mechanical equipment do not exhibit low-frequency tones, including any manufacturer data, octave-band spectra, or tonal analyses used to support this statement. Any C-weighted or unweighted sound power data for the chillers and generators, given that A-weighting alone does not reliably represent low-frequency noise. An explanation of how the conclusion was reached in the absence of octave-band data in the submitted materials, and whether any additional data or analyses were performed but not included in the public document. Confirmation that the Board has evaluated low-frequency impacts in accordance with SEQR's requirement to identify and mitigate all reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects, including those not fully captured by A-weighted metrics. This information is necessary to determine whether the noise characterization is complete and whether the conclusions in the Acoustics Technical Summary are supported by adequate technical evidence.  Thank you for your attention to this request.	3/15/2026	
Noise 14	I respectfully request a clear, written explanation for the decision to specify 20-foot generator noise barriers on the North Campus, while 30-foot barriers are proposed for the South Campus, as described in the Acoustics Technical Summary for the STREAM project. The North Campus is the portion of the site closest to existing residential property, with the nearest home located approximately 450 feet from the northern boundary. Given this proximity, it is not apparent why the North Campus would receive the shorter noise barrier. To support the Board's SEQR findings and ensure compliance with the Town's noise-related performance standards, please provide: The technical basis for selecting a 20-foot barrier height for the North Campus generator yards, including any modeling, sensitivity analyses, or design constraints that justify a lower barrier adjacent to residential receptors. A comparison of predicted noise levels at northern residential receptors using 20-foot versus 30-foot barriers, including both A-weighted and C-weighted results, given the low-frequency characteristics of generator noise. An explanation of why the South Campus requires a 30-foot barrier despite having fewer nearby residences and greater buffer distance, while the North Campus—closest to homes—does not. Confirmation that the proposed barrier heights meet SEQR's requirement to minimize noise impacts, not merely to meet modeled thresholds under a single weighting metric. This information is necessary for the public and the Board to understand whether the proposed mitigation is adequate and whether barrier heights have been optimized for the most sensitive receptors.	3/15/2026	
Noise 15	I am writing regarding the STREAM US Data Centers SEQR application currently under review. I understand that the GCEDC is serving as Lead Agency, and that your office is providing technical review and advisory input to the Town of Alabama.  Because noise is a central issue in this project, I want to respectfully highlight several important points about the NYSDEC noise guidance (Program Policy DEP-00-1) that are often misunderstood, and which are directly relevant to your technical evaluation.  1. DEP-00-1 is guidance, not regulation. It has never been adopted as enforceable law by New York State or by the Town of Alabama. The 65 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime thresholds are not binding standards unless a municipality formally adopts them.  2. The DEC thresholds were developed from suburban noise studies. DEP-00-1 relies heavily on older EPA and HUD research that assumed suburban ambient sound levels (typically 35-45 dBA at night). These assumptions do not reflect the rural conditions documented in the STAMP ambient study.  3. The actual nighttime background in Alabama is far lower. The STAMP ambient noise memo shows nighttime L90 values of 18-22 dBA. Using a 45 dBA nighttime threshold in an environment this quiet allows a 25-27 dB increase over existing conditions — a change that DEC itself classifies as a significant adverse impact.  4. DEP-00-1 explicitly states that its thresholds may not be appropriate for all settings. The policy instructs reviewers to adjust their analysis based on site-specific ambient conditions, which in this case are substantially quieter than the suburban environments the guidance was built around.  5. SEQR requires evaluating impacts relative to existing conditions. Even though GCEDC is the Lead Agency, all reviewing entities — including the Town — have a responsibility to ensure that the environmental record accurately reflects the actual baseline conditions and the scale of potential impacts.  My intention is simply to ensure that the technical review reflects the true rural sound environment documented in the STAMP ambient study, and that the limitations of DEC's generic guidance are fully understood as part of the SEQR process.	3/13/2026	

Noise 16	<p>Question 1. What is the projected db level of the site at on the roof top before the sound reaches the sound barriers?</p> <p>Question 2. Do the sound studies reflect that there will be three buildings emitting sound?</p> <p>Question 3. Do the sound studies reflect that the sound source is 50 feet high?</p> <p>Question 4. What is the height the sound barriers and do they function as deflectors or are they for absorption? What are the materials used in the barriers? Will they create a sound shadow at the property line but allow sound to be elevated at a farther distance? Could it be that the property line be the quietest point?</p> <p>Question 5. How's does temperature inversions and wind direction affect the noise heard in the community? Weather plays a major role in how sound will be transmitted into the neighboring community. Temperature inversions significantly affect sound transmission. Temperature inversions often occur at 40% of the time in our area. This coupled with prevailing wind placing the majority of residence downwind from the data source make the Stream sound study suspect as it doesn't reference variations in temperature inversions, or wind direction. Temperature inversions reflect sound downward. Thereby often defeating the 10 foot high sound barriers: As the sound goes up over the barriers, it will then be reflected downward, and downwind, toward the community. This, even if the barriers are made to absorb sound.</p> <p>These conditions typically increase noise levels by 5dB to 10dB and have been known to increase levels by as much as 20dB. Temperature inversions occur within the lowest 50m to 100m of the atmosphere, hence can affect noise level measurements on local ground level. Temperature inversions are most commonly caused by radiative cooling of the ground at night, leading to the cooling of the air in contact with the ground; this is especially prevalent on cloudless nights with little wind."</p> <p>https://www.acoustics.org.nz/</p> <p>Comment: We need to know the actual db level of each rooftop, and how, when multiplied by the number of massive buildings, what will be noise heard at the residents homes within two miles. These data centers will be as loud as the thruway, and while the db levels at over a mile may fall within the town's regulation, the roar will be heard. It may be background but it will be distinguishable and be heard. It will not subside; it is 24 hours, 7 days a week, even if Stream says it will be downsized at night, that is when sound travels the loudest, and it will be heard. I believe it is best to think of the Data Center, in terms of sound, as a 24 hour thruway placed in our community. It will degrade the quality of life within its considerable earshot, and therefore needs to be rejected.</p>	3/11/2026	
Noise 17	What efforts are going to made to mitigate noise pollution on the community during the construction phase. Hours of operation, noise free days, noise free hours, electric vs diesel construction equipment.	3/19/2026	
Noise 18	<p>Converted text from submitted PDF: "Steady noise between 40 dBA and 60 dBA is generally considered safe for your hearing, as it falls below the 70-85 dBA threshold where physical ear damage typically begins.</p> <p>However, while it won't cause hearing loss, daily exposure at the higher end of this range (above 55 dBA) can lead to non-auditory health issues over a year.</p> <p>Cardiovascular Stress: Chronic exposure to average daily levels above 55 dBA has been linked to increased risks of hypertension, heart disease, and stroke due to the body's persistent stress response.</p> <p>Cognitive &amp; Mental Health: Noise in the 50-60 dBA range can cause irritability, headaches, and impaired concentration. In children, long-term exposure to this range has been shown to reduce reading comprehension and memory.</p> <p>Physiological Impact: Persistent noise can trigger the amygdala (the brain's stress center), leading to elevated stress hormones, increased heart rate, and even stomach contractions.</p> <p>Common Reference Levels: 40 dBA: Quiet library or a refrigerator hum 50 dBA: Average office or soft radio music 60 dBA: Normal conversation or a dishwasher</p> <p>While the physical structure of your ears is safe at these levels, the constant "background hum" can still take a toll on overall well-being if there are no periods of true quiet. Is this noise occurring at night while you sleep, or is it a workplace environment?</p> <p>This is for informational purposes only. For medical advice or diagnosis, consult a professional. AI responses may include mistake. Learn More.</p>	3/25/2026	
Noise 19	<p>I am writing to respectfully request that the Town of Alabama formally adopt the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's Program Policy DEP-00-1 (Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts) **in its entirety**, rather than relying solely on the 45 dBA nighttime and 55 dBA daytime guideline values.</p> <p>While the 45/55dB limits were incorporated into the STAMP GEIS and Findings Statement and therefore became legally binding for STAMP projects, the remainder of DEP-00-1 contains essential analytical requirements that are equally important for protecting rural communities. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluating increases of +6 dB ("noticeable and intrusive") and +10 dB ("very noticeable and likely objectionable")</li> <li>Assessing low-frequency noise and tonal noise</li> <li>Using L90 measurements to establish true ambient background levels</li> <li>Considering nighttime sensitivity and rural quiet-zone conditions</li> <li>Evaluating community character impacts</li> <li>Requiring octave-band or 1/3-octave analysis when appropriate</li> </ul> <p>These components are not optional technical suggestions—they are the framework DEC requires agencies to use when determining whether a project causes a significant adverse noise impact under SEQR. Without adopting the full DEP-00-1 policy, the Town is left with only the numerical limits, but not the analytical tools needed to evaluate whether a project meaningfully affects residents, rural soundscapes, or the Tonawanda Seneca Nation's lands. Given the extremely quiet nighttime ambient levels in our area, and the scale of current and future STAMP projects, adopting the full DEP-00-1 policy would provide the Town with a clear, defensible, and science-based standard for evaluating noise impacts. It would also ensure consistency, transparency, and protection for all residents and neighboring communities.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Board to place this matter on an upcoming agenda and consider adopting DEP-00-1 in full as the Town's official noise assessment standard.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this important issue.</p>	3/23/2026	
Noise 20	When will detailed professional acoustical studies and modeling be conducted as mentioned in the SEQR Development Application? This information should be available now when important decisions are being made to continue forward with this project.	1/11/2026	
<b>Energy Consumption</b>			
EC 1	The proposed project would require 500 megawatts of electricity — an amount comparable to the energy consumption of nearly every household in the GLOW region. What kind of energy pricing agreements would be offered to this facility, and why should a project creating only about 100 jobs receive such a substantial allocation of power? It appears that the Town of Alabama would bear the burdens — increased noise, water usage, traffic, visual impact, and potentially higher electricity costs — while the corporation reaps the primary benefits.	2/18/2026	The STAMP site was specifically planned and environmentally reviewed to accommodate large-scale industrial and technology users that require substantial power and infrastructure. As part of this planning process, the site was designed to support high-energy-demand facilities, including semiconductor manufacturing and similar advanced technology operations. The level of electrical capacity associated with the proposed STREAM project is consistent with the types of uses the site was intended to support.
EC 2	I am worried about the power and strain from the Data Center, who is responsible for the upgrade to the grid?	2/9/2026	Electrical supply and pricing are not determined by the Town of Alabama. Power arrangements are negotiated between the project developer and the relevant utility providers, such as the New York Power Authority and National Grid. Any agreements related to energy sourcing or pricing are outside of the Town's control.
EC 3	1. If there is a request by grid operators to reduce power consumption due to a stressed grid, what will the Data Centers obligation and response? How long will it take for the Center to reduce consumption? 2. What are kWh per hour breakdown of the electronic infrastructure? The chillers? during peak operating? Nighttime? Summer vs. winter?	3/19/2026	Infrastructure required to serve the project, including electrical infrastructure, is the responsibility of the developer. Any upgrades needed to support the project would be coordinated with the appropriate utility providers and funded by the developer, not the Town.
EC 4	4) If this goes through, everyone's cost of electricity will become more expensive, due to the huge demands placed by the data centers. Is that fair to NYS taxpayers? This would affect all kinds of businesses, like restaurants, shops, factories, medical offices, and grocery stores. Hospitals and government buildings, as well.	3/24/2026	The STAMP site has already been developed with infrastructure intended to accommodate high energy users. Based on this planning framework, the project is not expected to place unanticipated strain on the electrical grid. If additional infrastructure is required, the associated costs would be borne by the project.
EC 5	This facility would use 500MW of power, enough to power nearly all the homes in the GLOW region. What kinds of sweetheart deals would the data center get for this power, and why would we allow a facility that only produces 100 jobs to get so much of it? It seems like Town of Alabama will pay all the costs — the noise, water, traffic, aesthetics, rising electricity costs, etc. — and this corporation will get all the benefits.	2/4/2026	From a local review perspective, the Town's role is to evaluate the project through zoning, site plan review, and environmental review processes to ensure that potential impacts are appropriately addressed in accordance with the standards established through the STAMP Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) and applicable zoning regulations. Based on our current reviews, the proposal is in conformance with the energy requirements set in the GEIS.
<b>Environmental Study/SEQR</b>			
SEQR 1	Will the Town require a supplemental SEQR review before any approvals related to a roundabout move forward?	2/9/2026	The proposed STREAM data center is undergoing a coordinated environmental review under the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) process. For projects at the STAMP site, the Genesee County Economic Development Center (GCEDC) serves as Lead Agency, meaning it is responsible for coordinating the environmental review and issuing the initial environmental determination.
SEQR 2	The SEQR application says 20,000 gallons per day of municipal water will be used and 20,000 gallons of wastewater generated, but the sketch plan says 10,000 gallons per day of each. Which will it be and why would we give 10,000-20,000 gallons per day of our municipal water to a data center?	2/4/2026	As part of this process, multiple agencies have roles:
SEQR 3	Will the Town commit that no site plan approvals will be granted until the full environmental review is completed and available to the public?	2/9/2026	- The GCEDC (Lead Agency) conducts the primary SEQR review and issues findings. - The Town of Alabama Planning Board conducts its own zoning and site plan review and issues findings based on local concerns. - The Genesee County Planning Board provides recommendations as an involved agency.
SEQR 4	Has the Town directly confirmed with DEC whether the items in their letter are requirements that must be completed before any approvals?	2/9/2026	Each agency evaluates the project based on its own jurisdiction and environmental areas of concern before any approvals can be granted.
SEQR 5	I am opposed to the huge data center proposed for the STAMP site in Genesee County, for a variety of reasons: I live on Lake Alice, an impoundment lake formed by damming the Oak Orchard River. I do NOT want additional pollutants entering this watershed or my lake. I do not think it appropriate to place this polluting, noise-generating monstrosity near the Iroquois Wildlife Refuge, which I use for recreation. I do NOT want my electric bill to go higher; it has already almost doubled in the past 2 months primarily due to National Grid rate hikes. Take your data center and put it near the home of the CEO of Apollo Global Management	3/4/2026	The project is currently in the review phase. No final decisions will be made until all technical materials have been reviewed and the SEQR process is complete. The Planning Board has not yet scheduled a public hearing, but one will be held before any site plan decision is made.
SEQR 6	This plan is outrageous in every way, primarily in its impact on the environment. Who, in their right minds, which install such a monstrosity adjacent to a wildlife refuge? Two-story buildings, background noise 24/7, water and air quality compromised - you know that I could go on and on about what's wrong with this and furthermore, I believe that you KNOW in your own hearts that what you're proposing in all about money and nothing whatsoever about what's right and good for this region. Shame on you. I/we will resist this degradation to our beautiful land for as long as it takes to turn this away.	3/5/2026	Key environmental topics being reviewed include: - Water Use and Discharge: The facility is designed to use primarily air-based cooling systems. Estimated water use is relatively low and comparable to small commercial uses. The closed-loop cooling system does not discharge process wastewater. The stormwater management system is designed to maintain site hydrology and comply with NYS SPDES permitting requirements. The project does not withdraw groundwater and does not discharge industrial wastewater. The development is located outside Whitney Creek buffers and does not impact regulated wetlands or designated preservation areas.
SEQR 7	I am asking you, The Town of Alabama Planning Board Members to just say NO. Ask for the DEC report, ask for a new survey about whether the GLOW region really wants this monster data plant in their back yard. Take time to really think this. Do you want to saddle your kids, my kids, our grandkids with this terrible data center. Which is a noise making, and land destroying behemoth, with tax break going to out of state, companies for less than at most maybe 25 jobs? That probably is going out of business in less than 5-7 years??  This plant project is not good for The Iroquois Indians, or the wild life surrounding the area and the very poor water design both in and discharge, and most importantly remember NO FARM EQUALS NO FOOD. Just think of all the farm land being destroyed by this terrible idea.	3/7/2026	- Stormwater and Water Quality: A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) has been submitted and is under review by the Town's engineering consultants to ensure runoff is properly managed and does not impact surrounding water resources. The applicant has indicated that up to a 50/50 water/glycol mix will be used in the closed loop cooling system. The cooling system is a closed system meaning that none of this mixture is discharged to the sanitary sewer system through the course of operation. Minimal make up water (less than 5-10 gallons) is used over the lifetime of the cooling system. PFAS is generally an additive or contaminant, not part of the glycol liquid.  - Groundwater and Spill Prevention: Fuel storage for backup generators is required to meet New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) standards, including double-walled containment systems.
SEQR 8	There are significant environmental and public health issues that warrant careful consideration, including the risk of PFAS and other contaminants in our water, as well as noise levels that research shows can adversely affect human health. Additionally, the scale of resource consumption — particularly water and electricity — raises important questions about long-term sustainability and environmental stewardship. Once vital resources such as clean water, air, wildlife habitats, and open land are compromised, they cannot simply be restored.	2/18/2026	- Ecological Resources: Impacts to wildlife, including nearby sensitive resources such as the Iroquois National Wildlife Refuge, are being evaluated. State and federal agencies may require mitigation measures where necessary.
SEQR 9	Could you please clarify Whether the County Planning Board reviewed any of the updated environmental materials — including noise, air emissions, cooling load, generator requirements, and other equipment-related impacts — before making this statement; and Whether the County Planning Board intended this language to be interpreted as a SEQR determination.	3/16/2026	- Lighting, Noise, and Visual Impacts: These are being reviewed through technical studies and will be evaluated against applicable standards and SEQR findings.  The STAMP site itself was previously subject to a comprehensive Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), which established baseline environmental conditions and mitigation requirements for the site. Each new project, including STREAM, must demonstrate consistency with that framework and address any project-specific impacts through additional review.
SEQR 10	Hello, I live in Lockport and am a frequent visitor to the state and federally protected Tonawanda Wildlife Management Area, and Iroquois National Wildlife Refuge. I hike around with my dog, kids, grandkids and friends, and Stand Up Paddleboard on Oak Orchard Creek and Alabama Swamp.  As a NOAA certified environmental educator, and marine mammal rescuer /rehabber in the Hawaiian Islands, I have seen firsthand how an unchecked, unnatural environment effects our delicate ecosystem of land and waterways, so I take a special interest in the preservation of this area with its vast and diverse wildlife population. The continued construction of STAMP would destroy nearly 700 acres of occupied habitats for these vulnerable creatures, impacting local and regional diversity.  I will note that at the March 5 meeting with the heads of this project, I was completely shocked when one of the speakers quickly skimmed over the fact that humans also live near the proposed site, stating this monster would be built near marsh land "and a few residences" as if they are of no consequence. And their so called "closed system of chillers" is a farce. There will be leaks, runoff, noise, and total disruption to ALL the residents. We cannot believe a word they say, it's all about money and control.  What about the estimated 20,000 gallons of water per day - WHERE does that come from?? We are in the midst of a worldwide water crisis! Living beings need clean water!  At this moment, many towns all over this country are being made sick by data centers they weren't even told about in advance, and hundreds more are fighting to stop this madness.  It's no coincidence that all this chaos is being thrown at US citizens at once. Corporate greed has designed this - we are being assaulted on all fronts so we don't know which way to turn or which battle to fight first so these things can be built without our knowledge or input. Corporate greed, specifically Apollo Global Mgt and Leon Black, the billionaire financier associated with Epstein, will only make more billions as we struggle to survive. No pedo projects in Alabama!  We are not saying to take your garbage elsewhere, we are telling you to STOP.	3/17/2026	Public input is an important part of this process. All comments submitted by residents are documented and considered as part of the review. A public hearing will be held prior to any site plan decision, and additional opportunities for comment will be provided.  No approvals will be granted until the SEQR process is complete, all agency findings have been issued, and the project is determined to meet applicable environmental standards and regulatory requirements.
SEQR 11	Purpose: This submission documents several issues raised during the 2011–2012 GEIS public comment process — including themes reflected in our own earlier submissions and in Comment Summaries (CS) 95–121 of the Final GEIS ("pages 55–68 at this link) — that remain unresolved today and are directly relevant to the Planning Board's SEQR responsibilities for the STREAM site plan application.  Summary of 2011–2012 GEIS Comment Themes (with references): The following concerns appear repeatedly across the GEIS public comment record: - Noise impacts were inadequately analyzed, with insufficient data, no mitigation triggers, and no long-term monitoring plan (e.g., CS 113). - Traffic routing and intersection impacts on Crosby, Judge, and Lewiston were underestimated, with concerns about residential impacts and reservation traffic (e.g., CS 108, 114). - Buffer zone adequacy and visibility were questioned, including reductions from earlier commitments and unclear configurations (e.g., CS 104–105, 114). - Community character and induced growth impacts were significantly understated (e.g., CS 116, 118–120). - Emergency services impacts lacked meaningful detail and required facility-specific studies (e.g., CS 117). - Property value protections and buyout mechanisms were requested but not provided (e.g., CS 99–101, 107).  Corresponding 2026 Issues: These same issues remain active concerns today: - STREAM's noise submission includes only one piece of equipment and does not address cumulative site-wide limits, low-frequency noise, nighttime propagation, or the GEIS's boundary-based 65/45 dBA limits. - Traffic diagrams and assumptions remain inconsistent with GEIS expectations, and updated modeling has not been provided. - Buffer distances and visual impacts remain unclear in current materials. - Induced growth, housing pressure, and community character impacts have not been updated since 2012. - Emergency services impacts have not been evaluated for a 24/7 data-center use. - No property value protections or mitigation mechanisms have been proposed.  Relevance to SEQR: Under Section 11.2 of the GEIS, the Planning Board must determine whether a proposed project is adequately addressed in the GEIS or whether new information, greater impacts than anticipated, or unresolved issues require supplemental review. The continuity between the 2011–2012 GEIS comment themes and the 2026 project-specific concerns indicates that several issues were deferred for future analysis and remain unaddressed. This documentation is provided to support the Board's independent SEQR determination.	3/12/2026	
SEQR 12	The spotted owl stopped woods being taken down, do we have any other endangered species?	2/9/2026	
SEQR 13	Forever chemicals will be spilled on the land from the data center. Data Centers only last 10 years.	2/9/2026	
SEQR 14	I am writing you with concerns about the data center. I do not have emails for the planning board of Alabama. My brother lives in Texas and the neighboring town has a data center. There is always problems with water shortages and brown outs. I have read online what WNY STAMP and GCEDC have recently posted. In the project details it states the water usage will range between 20,000-200,000 gallons a day. This is not what has been being stated. Can we even sustain 200,000 gpd day? Mark Masse as recently as Monday March 16th posted facts about the data center stating that it would be using 20,000 gallons a day. Stating it is less than the average farm in the community uses. Is this all of Genesee County Farms or Alabama Center farms? Either way this range of water usage is alarming. Data centers are known to cause water shortages and brown outs. This needs to be considered. That is a wide range of water usage. Please take this into consideration. If you have the emails for the planning board could you give them to me or tell me where to find them?	3/17/2026	
SEQR 15	I spent the day, as I do many at the Iroquois National Wildlife Refuge yesterday. I am very concerned about the migrating birds coming through the refuge now & in the future. The Data Center & the consumption of water & chance of well water being contaminated, the electricity usage, the noise & lights, especially during migration have me very worried. My heart goes out to the people who live closer than us to the site, especially the people of the Tonawanda Seneca Indian nation. Please share this with the town & planning board members	3/17/2026	

SEQR 16	1. What is the embodied carbon footprint of the proposed data center? i.e. concrete, electronic hardware, the chillers, wiring, parking lot, construction operation, etc. 2. What toxic chemicals will be onsite, and how much, either in storage or embedded in the infrastructure. i.e. PFAS, PFOS, mercury, oils, fuels, nitrogen oxide, formaldehydes, glycol, corrosion inhibitors, fire retardants, bromides, benzenes, others. 3. What pollution and emissions will be released during the testing of the diesel backup system? How often will tests be made? What are the emissions per hour when being used as backup to the Center. 4. How much heat will be transferred into the environment from the cooling operation, How hot will the air on the roof top get? and will "Heat Islands" be created, and wildlife affected.?	3/18/2026	
SEQR 17	Please provide plans for the sanitation requirements during the construction of the center, including projected gallons of waste, where the sanitation waste will be processed, and the number of sanitation trucks that will servicing the site per week.	3/24/2026	
SEQR 18	The operation of the data center will require tapping into 500 megawatts of the NYS power grid with estimates of producing some 400,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions annually. Please provide an estimate of the annual tons of CO2 emissions the center will produce once the operations are underway, per year through completion. Please provide carbon emission equivalents embodied in the completed center, including but not limited to, such items as concrete, construction operation, transportation, and electrical/server components. Please provide any attempts to purchase or provide services that would mitigate carbon emissions. i.e. carbon offsets, forestation efforts, carbon sequestering, etc.. I would propose \$10,000,000 annually be given to urban tree planting programs in NYS, as well as wildlife and wetland protection programs.	3/24/2026	
SEQR 19	1) The western half of this land should be returned to nature, as it is part of the plan to make a natural corridor from Maine to Mexico. You should offer it for sale to either the Western NY Land Conservancy or to the Senecas, since it abuts directly to their Big Woods. The Big Woods and surrounding area has served the local Senecas and Seneca people from all around the area to hunt and pick medicinal herbs, since the 1800's. 3) This should not be approved until 3 years has been allowed for a full environmental impact study has been performed. Isn't that legally required? There has already been a reduction of the rare short eared owl, since the existing concrete was placed. But what about the need to remove sewage vis pipes under the Iroquois Wildlife Refuge? That's where we go birdwatching. What other ecological and safety disasters is the state risking, to make money for a few people who are already wealthy and do not need NYS to subsidize their business ventures?	3/24/2026	
SEQR 20	Company materials state that the data center would rely on a "closed-loop cooling system." The Planning Board should require detailed information about how this system operates, including a full disclosure of any chemical additives used to prevent corrosion or scaling. Specifically, there should be transparency about whether PFAS chemicals are present and, if so, in what quantities. Clear plans must also be provided for how wastewater from the system would be handled and disposed of to ensure environmental safety.	2/18/2026	
<b>Ownership</b>			
Ownership 1	The Town Board and GCEDC needs to comment on the ownership of Stream Data as described in the attached article. <a href="https://truthout.org/articles/new-york-residents-are-fighting-a-data-center-backed-by-a-billionaire-trump-ally/">https://truthout.org/articles/new-york-residents-are-fighting-a-data-center-backed-by-a-billionaire-trump-ally/</a>	3/15/2026	The proposed STREAM data center is a privately financed development. The project is being advanced by the applicant, with financial backing from private investment sources. Public reporting has identified Apollo Global Management as an institutional investor associated with the project. Apollo is a large, global asset management firm that invests in a wide range of infrastructure and technology projects.
Ownership 2	Does the Town know the identity of the Data Center Operator?	2/9/2026	Land within the STAMP site is managed and conveyed through the Genesee County Economic Development Center (GCEDC). Project developers typically purchase or secure specific parcels through GCEDC in order to advance development. The Town of Alabama does not fund private development projects at STAMP. Any infrastructure improvements required to serve the project, including electrical infrastructure, are the responsibility of the developer and are coordinated with the appropriate utility providers. These costs are not borne by the Town. From a regulatory standpoint, the Town's review is based on the project itself, specifically its compliance with zoning, site plan, and environmental review requirements under SEQR. This includes evaluating impacts such as power use, water use, traffic, and noise, regardless of the specific investors involved.
<b>Approval Process</b>			
AP 1	I demand that the Planning Board hold its legally required public hearing after the Planning Board deems the plan complete but before making a decision on the site plan. The public hearing must also take place after STREAM finalizes its design and conducts all necessary studies. Will the Planning Board agree to this? Please ensure that this submission is made available to all Planning Board members and that it is incorporated into the record for any decision relating to the application for site plan approval.	2/18/2026	The proposed STREAM data center is undergoing a multi-step review process according to the Town of Alabama Law that includes both site plan review by the Town of Alabama Planning Board and environmental review under SEQR. No final decisions will be made until all steps in this process are completed.
AP 2	I urge you to ensure there is sufficient time between when the Board deems that the site plan application complete and the date of the hearing for the public to fully review the materials and prepare comments and questions. Additionally, following the public hearing, I urge the Planning Board to take any time needed to consider any issues raised at the hearing. While the Town law requires that a final decision be made within sixty-two days of the hearing, it also allows that period to be extended by agreement between the Board and the applicant. If the Board requires more than 62 days after the hearing to reach a decision, it should request agreement for such an extension from STREAM, and make clear that it cannot approve the application without additional time. Will the Planning Board agree to this? Please ensure that this submission is made available to all Planning Board members and that it is incorporated into the record for any decision relating to the application for site plan approval.	3/16/2026	1. Sketch Plan Review (Completed) This is the first step under the Town's zoning law. The applicant presents an initial concept so the Planning Board can understand the project and identify what additional information, studies, or revisions are needed. No approvals are made at this stage. 2. Detailed Site Plan Submission and Review (Current Phase) The applicant submits detailed plans, including engineering drawings and technical reports. The Planning Board and its consultants review these materials and request additional information as needed. The Board will continue this process until they are satisfied that they have sufficient information to evaluate the project. 3. SEQR Environmental Review (Concurrent Process) At the same time, the project is reviewed under SEQR. For STAMP projects, this involves evaluating the proposal against the previously adopted GEIS findings, along with project-specific studies. This review addresses topics such as noise, traffic, stormwater, lighting, and compatibility with surrounding land uses. SEQR must be completed before any final decision can be made. 4. Public Hearing (Not Yet Scheduled) A public hearing will be scheduled once the Planning Board determines that the application is complete and ready for public review. Notice of the hearing will be provided through standard Town procedures. At that time, residents will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments for the official record.
AP 3	Why couldn't the Sketch Review have waited until after the lead agency 30 day waiting period? There seems to be quite a rush to arrive at some critical decisions about the impacts of STREAM on our community. With such a large project it seems that there should be very deliberate, transparent, and unhurried decisions made.	1/11/2026	5. Planning Board Decision After SEQR is complete and the public hearing has been held, the Planning Board may approve the site plan, approve it with conditions, or deny it. The Board will not make a decision until they are satisfied with the information, studies, and reviews provided.
AP 4	General Comments re: the process to date	1/20/2026	6. Building Permits If approved, the applicant must obtain building permits from the Town prior to construction. This ensures compliance with building codes and any conditions of approval.
AP 5	What is STREAM planning to do to manage light pollution from such an enormous and expansive facility? How does this relate to our "rural character"?	1/11/2026	Throughout this process, project materials are being made available on the GCEDC website, and additional public information sessions have been held by the applicant.
AP 6	Has the facility visit been done yet?	2/9/2026	
AP 7	To Whom It May Concern: I appreciate the Planning Board's decision not to schedule a public hearing at this time. The Planning Board should not schedule the legally required public hearing on the site plan until after it deems STREAM's site plan application complete. I understand that STREAM is preparing an additional submission to the Planning Board and is conducting additional studies. The Board should continue to evaluate STREAM's site plan application and request additional and revised materials until it deems STREAM's application complete. I urge you to ensure there is sufficient time between when the Board deems that the site plan application complete and the date of the hearing for the public to fully review the materials and prepare comments and questions. Additionally, following the public hearing, I urge the Planning Board to take any time needed to consider any issues raised at the hearing. While the Town law requires that a final decision be made within sixty-two days of the hearing, it also allows that period to be extended by agreement between the Board and the applicant. If the Board requires more than 62 days after the hearing to reach a decision, it should request agreement for such an extension from STREAM, and make clear that it cannot approve the application without additional time. Will the Planning Board agree to this? Please ensure that this submission is made available to all Planning Board members and that it is incorporated into the record for any decision relating to the application for site plan approval.	3/17/2026	
AP 8	I appreciate the Planning Board's decision not to schedule a public hearing at this time. The Planning Board should not schedule the legally required public hearing on the site plan until after it deems STREAM's site plan application complete. I understand that STREAM is preparing an additional submission to the Planning Board and is conducting additional studies. The Board should continue to evaluate STREAM's site plan application and request additional and revised materials until it deems STREAM's application complete. I urge you to ensure there is sufficient time between when the Board deems that the site plan application complete and the date of the hearing for the public to fully review the materials and prepare comments and questions. Additionally, following the public hearing, I urge the Planning Board to take any time needed to consider any issues raised at the hearing. While the Town law requires that a final decision be made within sixty-two days of the hearing, it also allows that period to be extended by agreement between the Board and the applicant. If the Board requires more than 62 days after the hearing to reach a decision, it should request agreement for such an extension from STREAM, and make clear that it cannot approve the application without additional time. Will the Planning Board agree to this? Please ensure that this submission is made available to all Planning Board members and that it is incorporated into the record for any decision relating to the application for site plan approval.	3/18/2026	
AP 9	What are the plans for decommissioning of the center and the associated costs? Will the owner be bonded for the Center's decommissioning?	3/19/2026	
AP 10	I demand that the sketch and site plans for the data center be publicly posted and that the Planning Board allow time for public comment and Q+A with the Board and STREAM reps. Will the Planning Board agree to this?	2/4/2026	
<b>Taxes/Costs/Community Benefit Packages</b>			
TCC 1	What is driving the increase from \$11.8B to nearly \$19B if the project footprint and number of buildings haven't changed? Has Stream provided updated documents or estimates to the Town or GCEDC that explain the new number? Does this change affect the incentive package or the cost-benefit analysis that was originally presented? And finally, does this kind of change require any additional public review or updated filings?	3/6/2026	Tax incentives, benefit packages, and financial agreements associated with the project are not determined by the Town of Alabama. These types of arrangements are typically handled through separate entities, such as county-level economic development agencies and Industrial Development Agencies (IDAs), including the Genesee County Economic Development Center (GCEDC). The Town's role in this project is limited to reviewing the application through zoning, site plan review, and the SEQR environmental review process. This includes evaluating land use compliance and potential impacts such as traffic, noise, lighting, and environmental considerations. Any tax agreements, PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) arrangements, or other financial incentives are negotiated outside of the Town's review process and are subject to separate approval processes by the appropriate agencies.
TCC 2	I asked GCEDC: Why the increase in the financial incentive from \$900 thousand dollars to 1.4 billion dollars? Did GCEDC ever explain the 8 billion-dollar increase in the cost of the Data Center? It is clearly a money grab by Stream Data. The first incentive only included a sales tax abatement for the first 7 billion dollars in servers. Stream data realizing that since they would need to upgrade the servers 6 years later, decided why not try for an addition sales tax break. So, They came back to GCEDC and cried Please, another 500-million-dollar sales tax gift is needed. And they gave it to them. And GCEDC did not even try to explain this to the residents. Just gave it them shamefully. I urge the Town of Alabama to reject the GCEDC financial assistance package for misrepresentation and giving away tax revenues without honest explanation. Stream Data and its fortune 50 AI company, need no help. Pay taxes like the rest of us.	3/24/2026	Information regarding this will be available on the GCEDC's website as it's determined.
TCC 3	2) Spending over a Billion dollars to create a small number of jobs in a remote area makes no sense. Water, sewer and electricity would be required for possible 150 jobs. Furthermore, several large hydrogen generators will be needed as electricity back up, making noise and possible danger for the Seneca, the wildlife, the rare birds and so on. Would this benefit a few rich landowners and entrepreneurs at the cost of a billion dollars of money made from your taxes and mine? Couldn't a billion dollars be put to better use, for low-cost housing, hospitals, roads and bridge repair, newer water infrastructure to eliminate lead, public transportation and other things that benefit a larger swath of society? This is public money being misused for a few people.	3/24/2026	
TCC 4	can you provide an example of a community that has experienced clear, measurable long-term benefits and broad public support after hosting a similar large-scale data center?	2/18/2026	
<b>Chillers</b>			
Chillers 1	STREAM's SEQR application says 110 feet while the sketch plan shows just 56 feet plus some unspecified amount. What is the actual height and why would 110 foot buildings be acceptable in our rural community?	2/4/2026	The applicant has indicated that the proposed facility will utilize a closed mechanical cooling system within the buildings, rather than water-intensive cooling towers. Based on the most recent information provided, the design relies on roof-mounted air conditioning equipment to manage heat generated by the servers.
Chillers 2	1. Describe the maintenance procedures for the rooftop chillers; coolants and lubricants? The chemical nature of the coolant? How often the coolant is exchanged? What happens to the used coolants? 2. What are the plans for recycling or reclaiming of the electronic equipment, including the chillers, as they become retired?	3/19/2026	Because this system does not rely on water-based cooling, the facility is not expected to use water as part of its cooling process. Water demand for the site is anticipated to be limited to typical building uses such as restrooms and general facility needs. Based on current information, overall water use is expected to be 20,000 gallons a day. This amount is relatively low and comparable to that of a small commercial building. The projected water demand can be supported by the existing municipal water and wastewater infrastructure serving the STAMP site. No new water sources are currently anticipated. If any infrastructure improvements were required, those would be the responsibility of the developer.
<b>Generators</b>			
Generators 1	1. What pollution and emissions will be released during the testing of the diesel backup system? How often will tests be made? What are the emissions per hour when being used as backup to the Center.	3/19/2026	The proposed facility includes 6 backup generators (2 at each building) that are intended to provide emergency power in the event of a utility outage. These generators are not designed for continuous operation and would only be used during power interruptions or for periodic testing and maintenance.
Generators 2	During the meeting Mr. Reilly stated that the generators would be on for only an hour after a power outage in order to make sure everything was suitably backed up. However, one of the stream representatives stated that the generators would go on and stay on for the duration of any outage to take care of minimum infrastructure requirements. Both stated that the generators would not be on for long, but I can tell you that I have been left without power at my house for more than 5 days in the past. Why was this discrepancy not addressed? Please clarify when and how long the generators will be expected to be used in a power outage.	1/11/2026	Fuel storage associated with the generators will be required to meet all applicable New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) regulations. This includes measures such as double-walled tanks and secondary containment systems to prevent spills and protect soil and groundwater. The location and design of the generator equipment are being reviewed as part of the site plan and SEQR process. Based on materials submitted to date, generators are proposed to be located within designated equipment areas on the site, rather than along public-facing frontage, and may include enclosures or screening to minimize visual and noise impacts. Noise from generator operation, including testing, is being evaluated through the project's acoustical analysis and will be subject to applicable standards established through the STAMP GEIS and local regulations. Final determinations regarding compliance will be made following independent review of the noise studies.
<b>Traffic Impacts</b>			
Traffic Impacts 1	I'm following up on our earlier correspondence regarding the Crosby/Lewiston intersection. In our August 2024 exchange, you noted that GCEDC was still reviewing aspects of the roundabout and that additional analysis was needed. I've since reviewed the GEIS, the 2012 Findings Statement, the 2016 amendment, and the August 1, 2024 Negative Declaration. As you know, GCEDC has been considering changes to the Crosby/Lewiston intersection since at least 2012, and in 2015 you indicated that the reroute was still conceptual and not yet designed or analyzed. With that history in mind, I want to clarify the SEQR basis for the current design. While the GEIS contemplated improvements at the Crosby/Lewiston intersection, it did not analyze a roundabout, a relocation of the intersection, or a 3.5-acre construction footprint, or a 150'-200' eastward shift of the roadway toward different residential properties. These elements appear for the first time in the 2024 Modifications, for which GCEDC re-established itself as SEQR Lead Agency. Given that, can you confirm where in the Environmental Information referenced in the August 2024 Negative Declaration GCEDC evaluated: the change from a signalized intersection to a roundabout, the relocation of the intersection, the expanded disturbance area, and the shift of the roadway toward different residential properties? If this analysis was not completed prior to issuing the Negative Declaration, can you clarify whether GCEDC intends to undertake supplemental SEQR review for these impacts, or whether GCEDC is expecting the Town to do so?	2/18/2026	The roundabout was analyzed as an option for the future if the traffic demand at the STAMP site ever grew to need traffic solutions. A round about is not being considered as part of this project. If it ever were to be proposed, a full environmental review and traffic analysis would be completed.
<b>Agriculture/Rural Character/Community Character</b>			

Ag 1	How are these buildings complimenting the rural character of our town?	1/11/2026	<p>The Town of Alabama includes areas with a strong rural and agricultural character. However, the STAMP site was specifically planned, zoned, and environmentally reviewed as a Technology District intended to accommodate large-scale technology and advanced manufacturing uses.</p> <p>Because of this, development within the STAMP site is evaluated based on the zoning standards and design framework established for that district, rather than the rural development patterns found elsewhere in the Town. The proposed project is being reviewed for compliance with those standards, including requirements related to setbacks, buffering, and site design.</p> <p>The STAMP site itself encompasses approximately 1,250 acres, with over 500 acres identified as buildable for development. The remaining land is not intended for development and functions as open space, infrastructure corridors, and environmental buffers.</p> <p>As part of the original planning and environmental review process, development at STAMP was structured to occur within designated areas while preserving substantial portions of the site as open space and buffer areas.</p>
Ag 2	Some of the drawings presented beautiful facades of the STREAM proposed buildings. However, a majority of the proposed buildings will be constructed of profabricated cement walls with a rather unattractive 10' noise buffer on top. Would you please ask for more renderings that include views from many different vantage points?	1/11/2026	<p>While buildings of this scale differ from traditional rural development, the STAMP site was designated for this type of use as part of a long-term planning and environmental review process.</p> <p>The Planning Board has also requested additional visualizations from the applicant to better understand the project's appearance and potential visual impacts. Once received, those</p>
<b>General Comments</b>			
GC 1	I strongly oppose the development of the STAMP area in any way. It will not only affect human life in many ways but also the wildlife and overall environment!	3/5/2026	<p>We understand that residents have concerns about potential impacts to the environment and surrounding communities.</p> <p>The STAMP site was previously planned and environmentally reviewed for large scale technology and industrial development. The proposed project is currently undergoing review through the Town's zoning, site plan, and environmental review processes to evaluate potential impacts and ensure the project complies with applicable regulations.</p>
GC 2	I do not want a STAMP center in Genesee county!!!	3/5/2026	Public comments such as yours are being documented and considered as part of the ongoing review process.
GC 3	I am also troubled by the financial implications for New York State taxpayers. Subsidies and infrastructure support for highly profitable corporations deserve thorough scrutiny, especially if local residents may ultimately bear increased electricity costs or other economic burdens.	2/18/2026	
GC 4	\$6.4 million dollars of our taxes to create 125 jobs. I don't want this monster data center in my families backyard. I don't want this data center coming and consuming all of our resources and spiking electric bills. STAMP PLANT is and always will be a WASTE and a JOKE. It has been filled with lawsuits and riddled with problems. I would rather have GCEDC create public transit options with that money. It is disgusting that STREAM is asking for 500 MW of power. That is completely absurd. I don't want my families electric and utilities bills increase because of this. 40,000 gallons of water each day, is a complete waste.	3/6/2026	
GC 5	I live in Monroe County and work in Genesee County and I vehemently oppose the data center. Huge public investment, terrible environmental impact, higher utility costs, and minimal job creation. Don't do it.	3/8/2026	
GC 6	Do not approve this data center! It is a huge waste of taxpayer dollars to create minimal jobs, on top of the detrimental effects this center will have on the area surrounding it. Noise, water pollution, and extremely high energy use are good for NONE OF US. We don't need or want to bankroll AI development in western NY. Tell them no and send them packing!	3/11/2026	
GC 7	We don't want data centers wasting and polluting our natural resources and environment.	3/11/2026	
GC 8	I am writing you this email today to plead that you listen to us residents. I raised my 3 boys here and have become woven into the fabric of this beautiful area. But, my electric bill has already become so high that I have to choose between filling all of my medications or paying my bill each month. A data center would push me out. I am disabled and on a fixed income so with my rent and everything else I won't be able to afford to stay and I won't be able to afford to move! I'm incredibly upset to possibly have to leave the community I love. Also our natural treasures are so important to the character of this area. My family eats the deer from here. And my dear friends on the Tonawanda Seneca nation (many of them elderly) have already been through so much throughout history- it would be an affront to decency to put this monster abutting their home. They can't move or just leave because their identity is connected to their land and woods. Giving all of what we all hold so dear away for MONEY would be a crime I cannot bear and so I refuse to agree to go along quietly. I must speak out and will continue to do so. I am putting faith in the board to make decisions for the constituents ONLY. We do not OWE Stream OR the GCEDC any of this natural beauty. And the \$1.44 request is an immoral and DISGUSTING move by the GCEDC so they can make their fee. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING. ALLOWING A DATA CENTER HERE WILL END IN DISASTER. WHAT WILL YOUR LEGACY BE?	3/11/2026	
GC 9	Data centers drive up electric bills for local residents, pollute the local environment, and put people out of jobs. Data centers have no place in Genesee county.	3/11/2026	
GC 10	I do not support the proposed data center. The number of jobs created as a result of the project does not produce sufficient local benefit to justify the resources (electricity, water, fuel) required to operate the facility.	3/11/2026	
GC 11	I don't want a data center in Genesee County.	3/11/2026	
GC 12	To the members of the town of Alabama planning board, I am writing to you on behalf of my family of 8 with deep concern for the proposed data center in Alabama, and beg you to oppose it. In every scenario in which a data center is built, the surrounding community suffers. Unless you can show one single example in which the community surrounding a data center thrives, why should any of us believe that this one will be different? Unless you can promise me that this proposed data center will not harm one single blade of grass, I will not believe that it will not harm children, adults, wildlife, pets, farmland, or our water supply. I keep reading that this data center will thrive for 30 years. A project of this expense to the tax payer should last for eternity and be beneficial immediately to 100% of the community, 30 years is an extremely short life span for any structure. What happens when the technology becomes obsolete, which all technology does. What becomes of the structure? The only thing I trust that will last my lifetime is the damage done to our community and the planet. I will also raise your awareness that our community does not like AI. We prefer human art made by calloused hands. I understand this will bring very few jobs to the area. One thing I find frustrating is a proposal that not only brings so much damage to the community but also ignores our every need. We need a community center. We need clean air. We need a place for kids to play safely. We need parks. We need non-toxic farmland. Why don't you put in a park? It is very clear to every member of Genesee County that this project benefits nobody except the out of state billionaires proposing it. We also demand to know who is trying to build this. The only name I've heard so far is Epstein--an association like that is obviously not welcome here. We demand that this project is cancelled for the safety of our children, our crops, our land, our families. Again, there is zero evidence on planet earth that a data center is a good thing for community or land. You have so much power to say no. Please, have a conscience, a heart, a moral compass, a thoughtful reflection. This will destroy all of Genesee county and the surrounding areas.	3/24/2026	
GC 13	Please see that Towb Board and planning board see this. Thanks Due diligence. They are bad news. Developer is also on Epstein docs : <a href="https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/2026/03/04/the-top-10-reasons-data-centers-must-be-stopped/">https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/2026/03/04/the-top-10-reasons-data-centers-must-be-stopped/</a> <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbZbaxg7hsM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbZbaxg7hsM</a>	Carole Thoms	
GC 14	I am writing to express my concern for the proposed data center at the STAMP site in Alabama. First, who does this benefit? Absolutely no one in the county or surrounding areas. Not the tax payers, not the children who live and play in these communities. No one. Additionally the Tonawanda Seneca's sovereignty must be respected. The supposed financial benefits mean nothing if our local environment is completely decimated. It affects not only the local water supply, but the air we breathe and the quiet stillness of rural western New York that we love. At minimum, there must be a moratorium on these types of awful projects. They are simply NOT NEEDED. There is NO COMMUNITY BENEFIT. None. No one wants this here. Absolutely no one.	3/23/2026	
GC 15	Why was the Planning Board meeting on January 5th instead of the usual 3rd Monday of the month?	1/11/2026	