



Onondaga County Legislature

HASSINA K. ADAMS
Clerk

NICOLE WATTS
Chairwoman

SPENCER BERG
Deputy Clerk

PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES – JUNE 17, 2026 ELAINE DENTON, CHAIR

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Denton, Mr. Knapp, Mr. Brown, Mr. Meaker, Mr. Eriksen

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Watts, Mr. Romeo; also see attached list

Chair Denton called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m., and previous meeting's minutes were approved.

1. DIVISION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Martin C. Skahen, Director

a. Authorizing the Onondaga County Executive to File the 2026 Action Plan for the Community Development Block Grant, HOME Grant, and Emergency Solutions Grant Programs

(Attachment No. 1: 2026 Community Development Budget-Final; Attachment No. 2: 2026 Community Development Capital Projects-Final)

- Requesting the Legislature's approval of the spending plans for CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding received from HUD for 2026
- These are entitlement grants, awarded without competition, unlike the LEAD grant, where the County has to apply and wait to see if it wins or loses; they are determined by HUD based on a formula assessing need
- A steering committee meets twice during the process: the first meeting presents all the proposed applications, and the second answers questions from the first meeting and votes on awarding the projects and funding
- For the CDBG program, applications are sent to every municipality with a timeframe to apply, and the applications are reviewed when they come in
- HOME funding is used for internal programs that HUD sponsors, such as the Shape Up program
- Emergency Solutions Grant, applications are sent to agencies that work with the homeless population, and funding is awarded based on what is received back; the department compiles all the applications to present to the committee
- Funding was relatively flat for this cycle: the block grant went up \$65,000, the HOME grant went up \$53,000, and the ESG grant came down \$322
- Every municipality that applied was awarded a project; no one was turned away, and no one had anything reduced from what they applied for; everybody who applied got the funding they requested for the project they wanted to do
- The County is required to spend a portion of its CDBG funding on fair housing initiatives; funding is provided every year to ARISE and CNY Fair Housing
- Municipalities requested \$837,500 in funding, which they matched with \$530,207 in matching funds; the total impact from the HUD funds will be just under \$1.4 million

Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Denton: I know the action plan goes from 2025 to 2029; does that get updated annually, or is it more like this is the general plan and then each year we're funding different projects?
- Mr. Skahen: It gets updated annually. The steering committee meets in May and determines what they want to do; then I come to the Legislature and ask for approval
 - All municipalities, before they submit their applications, have to do a public hearing, and their boards have to vote on submitting the application, so that's the process to screen it through the community. Then when we get it, we have to come to the Legislature and have it vote to hopefully approve what we want to do, and that allows us to file the action plan with HUD
 - The action plan gets filed every year, usually approved sometime in the fall, around October; we then submit our consolidated plan, of which the action plan is a portion
- Ms. Watts: Do you receive a number of applications that were not approved and not included? How does that typically look in a given year?
- Mr. Skahen: We were able to fund everybody who applied; everyone was funded at the full amount they applied for
- Mr. Knapp
- : Did they go through and relook at some of the census grids? I noticed a lot of areas in my neck of the woods that used to be eligible aren't eligible this year
- Mr. Skahen: Correct. So the way the process works for a community development block grant, there are different things you can use it for; most municipalities use it for either infrastructure, or parks, redoing parks, and other things
 - The way it works is that the entire county is divided into census tracts, and for money to be eligible to spend in a census tract, 51% of the people who live there have to be at 80% average median income or lower; Onondaga County is considered an exception grantee because it does not have enough census tracts that would otherwise qualify, so HUD applies an exception grantee percentage to the County, which makes census tracts eligible
 - For many years, HUD used the American Community Survey from 2006 to 2015 as the determinant of the County's exception grantee percentage, which was 38.59% of the people in a tract were under 80% AMI, money could be spent in that tract for a project
 - HUD started using the 2016 to 2020 American Community Survey two years ago, which raised the County's percentage to 44.5%; a number of municipalities that had eligible census tracts before are no longer eligible
 - That does not mean a municipality can't get a project; if a playground is not in an eligible census tract, implementing inclusive playground equipment is still an allowable expense regardless of the census tract's income level, and senior centers are considered gathering spaces for lower-income people, so a senior center is eligible regardless of what its census tract's percentage is
- Mr. Knapp: But they recently updated that, obviously
- Mr. Skahen: They actually did it two years ago and didn't tell us, and luckily we funded everybody who was still eligible; but this year we got the information, and we were able to readjust all the maps
 - When applications are sent to municipalities, the County sends them a map of their municipality showing all the eligible census tracts, since a lot of people don't understand how it functions

A motion was made by Mr. Knapp, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve this item; MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. **DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING:** Troy W. Waffner, Director of Planning; Megan Costa, Deputy Director of Planning

a. **INFORMATIONAL:** Discussion with County Planning Board on Research, Processes, and Referrals for Data Centers

(Attachment No. 3: Onondaga County Planning Board PowerPoint Presentation)

- The Onondaga County Planning Board operates under New York State General Municipal Law; the board is established to advise local boards on the potential intermunicipal or countywide impacts of land use decisions
- Other functions of the county planning board:
 - Board reviews the County's Capital Improvement Plan once a year prior to it going to the Legislature for approval
 - Reviews street name changes that go through the 911 system and the Planning Department
 - If someone is requesting a change to an established street name, it needs to go through the board, which holds a public hearing to approve those changes
 - New street names do not need to go to the board level and are instead coordinated with a street names review committee of 911 and Planning Department staff

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Meaker: Is that street names that are county-owned roads?
- Ms. Costa: Any roads
- Mr. Meaker: Any road within the county
- Ms. Costa: 911 function, coordination with post offices and to ensure good addressing throughout the county
- Mr. Meaker: It's not only up to the town; the county does have to be involved, and the planning board has to be involved if the town chooses to make a change
- Ms. Costa: Correct

Presentation continued:

- The planning board has seven members, five of whom are appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the Legislature, plus two ex officio members: the County DOT and the County Comptroller; the County Department of Planning provides staff services to support the board's activities
 - Staff support includes receiving and reviewing all of the referrals, called cases, from the municipalities
 - Coordinating every cycle with a number of state and county agencies and departments
 - Incorporating guidance and recommendations from county and municipal planning documents into the board reports for consideration
- Functions quite differently from a typical local planning board; board's resolutions are non-binding, functioning as a power of suggestion only, a recommendation as to what the county planning board thinks the municipality should do with a project
 - It takes a supermajority to override a disapproval or a modification recommendation; otherwise, municipalities can act as they wish
- Board does not hold public hearings; its applicants are the municipalities themselves, referring cases to the board; interaction is with municipal staff, not with the direct applicant presentations
- The board does not see every case that goes to a municipality; a case has to meet two separate criteria in order to need to be referred to the county planning board

- The board sees up to 500 cases a year from over 100 local boards; across the county's 36 municipalities, each generally has a municipal board, a planning board, and a zoning board of appeals, and the board sees cases from all three
- The board has a limited number of hours to spend on each case; the board typically has about two to three hours per case to spend reviewing it
- The board is on roughly a three-week board meeting cycle; most cases get referred on the deadline date; typically returning cases within 10 to 15 days

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Brown: On the non-binding recommendations, is it ever that the municipality goes against the recommendation, and what happens?
- Ms. Costa: Yes; they need a supermajority vote to override our recommendations if they disagree with something in a disapproval or modification recommendation
 - If they have a difference of opinion on whether they need to abide by something we say, they just need a simple majority vote of their board to override that; they have to provide their reasoning back to us after the fact and tell us why they disagreed with us and overrode our recommendation. That happens very rarely
 - It's pretty atypical; we do not offer a lot of disapprovals, somewhat because of the threshold of intermunicipal, countywide impacts, since we're not just looking at the same impacts localities are
 - A small parking issue or access thing, we're not going to disapprove based on that; it needs to be sort of a fatal flaw kind of thing
 - Typically they agree with our recommendations; sometimes they'll override it, or say this has already been addressed and proceed on their way, but that's more rare than you would think
- Mr. Knapp: A lot of times it's not just a yes or no, it's here's how you might do it better

Presentation continued:

- Municipalities rely on our feedback, especially coordinating agencies
- Coordinating agencies flag permitting requirements upfront (wastewater capacity, driveway access issues)
 - Cases come early in local review process
 - Details not hashed out yet, site plans evolve
 - Municipalities use us early to flag issues
 - We're sometimes the heavy for modifications/disapprovals
- Two criteria for referral to county planning board
- Criteria 1: type of action (zoning/subdivision matters), comprehensive plans, zoning/subdivision changes, site plans, special permits, variances, subdivisions, other authorizations
 - Criteria 2: locational, within 500ft of municipal boundary, state/county park, state/county road (most common trigger), county-owned stream/drainage channel, county/state land with public building or county institution, active farm in NYS ag districts program
 - Board doesn't track exact percentage breakdown; sees a lot via highway trigger
 - Bigger cases more likely triggered; smaller local projects fall off
- Board determines type of review per case; three types now
 - First: administrative review
 - Certain actions (e.g., variances) delegated to staff review, no strong intermunicipal/countywide concerns
 - Staff memo back to municipality within days, sometimes same day
 - Formal exemption agreements on file per municipality

- As of a couple months ago: every municipality now has intermunicipal agreement with county, signed by County Executive, authorized by Legislature
 - Agreement lists exempt actions; purely local concern
 - Less than 20% of caseload removed from docket
- All 36 municipalities have updated exemption agreements
- Board review standard set by General Municipal Law
- Five recommendation types, full resolution for full board reviews: approval, no position, no position with comment, modification, disapproval
 - Approval: mainly comprehensive plans/zoning updates; used sparingly
 - No position: no intermunicipal/countywide impact found; municipality proceeds as it wants
 - No position with comment: no impact, but suggestions offered for improvement
 - Modification: okay with project contingent on change (site plan, zoning ordinance); often ties to permits
 - Disapproval: fatal flaw only
- 30 days to review a project, start to finish; referrals often land near deadline, shrinks to about 2 weeks
 - Referral received, completeness check, staff report prepared
 - Coordination meeting every 3 weeks with coordinating agencies
 - Board vote for cases requiring one
 - Resolution sent back to municipality with recommendation
 - Simple majority to proceed on some cases; supermajority on others
 - GML requires report of final action; municipality reports back agree/disagree and why
 - Coordinated review meetings: service for bigger, more complicated cases; convenes regular stakeholders
 - Brings them to municipality; sits with applicant + coordinating agencies early
 - Keeps everyone aligned ahead of board review
 - Some municipalities use this; department finds it valuable
- Guide to planning board referrals available on department website, along with agendas/other materials

Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Denton: Do you have any examples of ones that have been coordinated, or how many you get in a year?
- Ms. Costa: We only get a couple a year; most recently, we've worked with the Town of Clay on some larger projects
- Ms. Denton: For the coordinated review, is there any documentation that's produced from that, or is it more just helping them with the process?
- Ms. Costa: We usually put together some meeting minutes and share them with the attendees of the meeting, and they typically get attached to resolutions
- Mr. Romeo: What's the relationship with the City? Is it any different with all of this, or is it all the same process?
- Ms. Costa: They are one of the 36 municipalities; we used to be a joint agency, so we'd coordinate even closer than others at times, but yes, otherwise it's the same process

Presentation by Troy W. Waffner, Director of Planning Relative to Data Centers:

- Data centers are causing a lot of consternation
- Concern is rising as they continue to make their first appearance in Onondaga County and upstate New York

- A lot of the energy component is controlled by the State; has to approve the energy needed for data centers
- Data centers are large, physical, highly secure structures that house thousands, tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands of computers, networks, and servers
- Large in scale, modular, highly efficient, automated, globally connected, evolving as a facility
- Used for cloud services, search engines, social media, video streaming, e-commerce, enterprise software, AI
- Town of Clay has proposed a moratorium
- DeWitt, Lysander, Manlius, Salina, Van Buren have passed moratoriums
- Town of Skaneateles has outright banned data centers

Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Denton: When municipalities take on these moratoriums, that's kind of to pause and to study them; how does that work normally? Is it more on the municipality to do those studies on their own, or is there collaboration?
- Mr. Waffner: There's probably a little bit of both. With an issue like data centers, it's going to be tough for any municipality in Onondaga County, or any county in upstate New York, to really take on the breadth and depth of understanding data centers and their impact, from wastewater, to the load of water needed and the environmental impacts and considerations; most municipalities up in upstate New York aren't going to be able to take that on by themselves
 - A lot of moratoriums that get passed in municipalities are just to allow time to come up with some new zoning; the breadth and depth of a data center is much greater than what municipalities would usually see
- Ms. Costa: Just like when we started seeing a lot of solar and wind projects coming through, we would try to put our research in place so we could provide a service to municipalities, giving them some best practices
 - Typically, we leave those kinds of issues and regulation to the local municipalities and let them regulate themselves, but we try to provide a service and information sharing, some of the research and best practices we're finding, to try to help them along where they need help
- Mr. Brown: Have we, the county, been consulted with any of these moratoriums? Are they happening with our involvement?
- Ms. Costa: They've all come to the planning board; they've offered no position?
- Mr. Knapp: I think it makes sense for, as far as the moratorium phase, step one, but having every town do their own study would be an incredible duplication of effort and waste of money

Presentation continued:

- County Executive announced comprehensive data center development study
- Seeks to proactively establish planning and evaluation framework
- Balances economic opportunity, environmental stewardship, quality of life considerations
- Task force overseeing the study includes: Office of Economic Development, Office of the Environment, WEP, OCWA, Department of Health, Department of Planning
- Timeline – less than six months
- RFP for consultant currently being prepared, expected out next week
- Purpose: comprehensive understanding of impacts/opportunities of data centers
 - Establish best policies, recommendations for evaluating future proposals
 - Create consistent standards, evaluation criteria usable countywide
 - Support municipalities in review via technical, engineering, planning assistance
 - Of the \$500,000 figure: not all for the study

- Maybe \$250,000 or \$300,000 to pay for the study itself; another couple hundred thousand to assist municipalities who need help with technical engineering, those types of activities
- Five essential tasks:
 - Existing conditions assessment; evaluate current conditions/infrastructure countywide, data-center-specific
 - Impact analysis – water/wastewater capacity, noise, aesthetics, air quality, environmental, quality of life
 - Regulatory and best practices review – comprehensive review of data center planning/regulatory approaches, mainly northeast, markets, locations, cities, counties
 - Site suitability analysis – former industrial sites, brownfields; agnostic study, compiling information only, not advocacy
 - Policy and development framework – model zoning provisions, site design standards, noise mitigation, environmental performance standards
 - Effort to gather, evaluate, synthesize information objectively for local government decision-making
 - Not every municipality can undertake a study like this given the cost
 - Does not provide funding for data center infrastructure or development
- Purpose: comprehensive review of available research, industry practices, historical data
- Goal: thorough understanding of opportunities/challenges, identify best practices, establish consistent review criteria, provide reliable planning tools
 - Municipalities on the front line; county does not make these decisions
 - New York is a home rule state; local government/board determines what they do with data centers
- County's role is to give municipalities tools, information, analysis
- Fair amount of public outreach effort planned; will be advertised; legislators asked to help spread word
- County wants to hear from public, address and mitigate concerns

Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Brown: Thank you for doing this; I want to officially thank the County Executive for taking the lead on this, because having the municipalities deal with such an issue is a recipe for disaster, since they don't have the resources the county has. Once the study is completed, will it be made public, or will it just be given to the municipalities?
- Mr. Waffner: It will be public
- Ms. Denton: I know this is pretty new, but can you talk a little bit more about the task force and the vision for the task force?
- Mr. Waffner: The task force includes everybody who's really going to be involved in the ultimate decision-making process, water and wastewater being the biggest, so OCWA, WEP, and the Office of the Environment to take into consideration a lot of the environmental concerns, and Planning; the idea is for the task force to guide the study, work with the consultant, and work on public outreach efforts, among other things
- Ms. Denton: Is there any way we could put more of a public or resident representative on the task force, or even specifically the Town of Lysander, since I know they're dealing with this in a very real way? I don't know if they could have representation, and I understand they're also looking at creating their own task force
- Mr. Waffner: The Planning Department is represented on the task force, as is the County Executive's office, I believe; but yes, we can certainly take a look at expanding, whether it's truly part of the task force or an advisory capacity to the task force

- Mr. Knapp: I think as part of the state's moratorium, did they say they're going to do a study as well? How do we coordinate with that, or copy shamelessly?
- Mr. Waffner: We're assuming we'll be going on a more rapid pace than the state, but the goal certainly is to coordinate; I think DEC is going to head up that, so we can talk to Dereth and folks at DEC to make sure we're on top of what they're encompassing in that
 - They're going to have to take a more global approach to New York State as a whole, so they're not going to break it down to each municipality, or really down to a more minute level, the way we want to; but we'll definitely coordinate with DEC
- Ms. Denton: And with that moratorium, we still need to wait to see if the Governor signs it
- Mr. Waffner: Very true
- Mr. Eriksen: Since we don't have a consultant yet, I'm probably getting ahead of this, but will there be an opportunity to make sure the consultant is fully aware of the scope of growth we're anticipating over the next eight or so years, specifically ensuring they know exactly how much water Micron is going to need when it comes online, so that we know what, if anything, may be left over for data centers?
- Mr. Waffner: Short answer, yes; to really do a comprehensive planning study, you need to provide them with all the information, historically and going into the future, that you're aware of, so yes, we will give them everything we can
- Mr. Knapp: Good to have OCWA at the table
- Mr. Waffner: Absolutely
- Mr. May: I applaud the County Executive for committing to doing this and bringing all the stakeholders together to get our arms around this as a community, because the reality, as Legislator Brown put it, local municipalities are not equipped and not funded; the scope of what's being talked about here, in just the case of Lysander, and it won't be the only one, is so big that I think it's great the county is taking the point
 - This also leads toward where Legislator Knapp was going a minute ago with the state study; I'm glad to hear we're intending to move on a more rapid pace. My personal experience with emerging technologies, especially in the farmland protection area, where we're trying to keep good soils in production, is that local municipalities are fighting the good fight but are ill-prepared from a planning and zoning standpoint to control what's happening, and more importantly, to ensure that the intent of what was supposed to happen actually occurs, meaning connecting these things to the grid and making sure they're compatible with the local community
 - Private landowners have the right to do what they wish with their land, provided it's compatible with the community, which is the county and municipality's role; my biggest concern is that the overarching state regulation isn't going to keep up with us. So the question is: what do you envision the state's focus and priorities to be? Downstate and in certain parts of New York there are already a lot of data centers, but they're small and unobtrusive, and in many cases you wouldn't know they're there, which is not what we're talking about in this county right now; do you think it's going to be a state priority, and do you think they're thinking globally?
- Mr. Waffner: Let me preface this by saying I'm going to give a somewhat cynical answer; I spent 13 years working for the New York State Legislature and another 13 years working for the state, mainly at the State Fair, and we undertook a lot of studies
 - I don't have a lot of expectation from the state; they're going to do a study, get somebody on board, and it's going to take time, and I've never found anything at the state that moves quickly. I hope their priorities are where our priorities are, but on a more global level looking at New York State as a whole; I think we'll try to coordinate with them, but we're going to move at our own level, because our concern, on a very parochial level, is Onondaga County and the Town of Lysander and the other towns that could or would or may face pressure from data

centers. So I don't hold out a lot of hope for the study at the state level, though I hope it becomes something

- Mr. Brown: I want to ask this on the record to get a clear answer. We are Onondaga County first and foremost, that's us; however, data centers, the scale goes beyond us. If the Town of Fulton or the Town of Cazenovia reached out, would we be able to give them information, or at least consult with them, given the scale of these projects?
- Mr. Waffner: I don't think we'd hang up on them; yes, I think we would take the call
- Ms. Denton: And the more we put out there, the more other people can look at it?
- Mr. Waffner: Yes; there's a great report from Prince George's County, Maryland that was completed and is online, and it would be a great resource to read over and look at; they did a fantastic public outreach effort, and did the study based on the reality that they were facing, so they had to deal with taking into account all the environmental and quality of life considerations, and got a massive amount of public comment
 - So, our hope is that we'd also be used as a resource by others
- Ms. Denton: Just to circle back on the state law, too, I wanted to add that the legislation they did pass would require utilities to establish an independent classification for service for the large data centers, set energy efficiency goals for data centers, and provide benefits for host communities; that's kind of what that law entails, but again we need to wait to see if the Governor will sign that bill
- Mr. Meaker: What was the name of the study out of Maryland?
- Mr. Waffner: The Prince George's County Qualified Data Center Study, I think it's called; I can send a copy of it
- Mr. Knapp: I've always thought for years that we're blessed with water, and that's kind of our ace up our sleeve; with all the other challenges we have, we have that, so we're going to be a target for these down the road. Any thoughts on including battery storage centers in the study? That's another thing a lot of our communities are being approached about, and it can have environmental impacts
- Ms. Denton: The state has studied battery storage a little and taken a pretty proactive look at it, and has updated the fire code based on those projects as well; I think this would be two different things in this instance
 - I have a question on the funding for your current budget in 2026 looking at 2027; I know the County Executive mentioned this would already be in your current budget, but I wanted to make sure where that funding is coming from
- Mr. Waffner: It is going to come through the money that was allocated for planning grants, like the comprehensive plans; we still have over a million dollars in that grant fund
- Ms. Denton: I think again, making sure that the public is involved, I don't know if the RFP can include that the consultant's study should say there should be a public process for the public to give comment or be involved
- Mr. Waffner: Generally, the RFP requires a proposal to include a look at how they're going to engage the public, what the schedule is for community engagement, and what tools they're going to use
- Ms. Denton: The RFP going out next week; will that be posted?
- Mr. Waffner: Yes
- Ms. Denton: Many residents are also concerned with incentives; I know this is more of an economic development purview, but would that be considered as part of the study or this task force for these large projects?
- Mr. Petrovich: Each project is going to have to go through SEQR, so there will be an environmental review done with respect to the requirements of SEQR for each and every project that comes forward; I think this process and this conversation about the RFP is about understanding what data centers are, how they work, how they affect communities, and basically deriving some factual information about the pros and cons of data center experiences across the state and beyond

- With respect to the IDA and incentives, every project, if they're inclined to do an application for incentives, will be brought forward and looked at; the IDA will, like any other project it's ever done, look at it and discuss whether there are merits to the project, and whether the project would happen but for the incentives, which is a critical question as part of that conversation
- Ms. Denton: And there's definitely a public comment component already built into that process?
- Mr. Petrovich: Yes; with every project, there is a public hearing process, and there would actually be two public hearings: there's a SEQR component, and then the IDA has a public hearing relative to incentives that are being contemplated for a project, so the public gets to weigh in on that as well
- Ms. Denton offered a wrap-up, wanting to make sure people know that the county cannot pass a moratorium to prevent these projects; that is up to cities, towns, and villages
 - As she understands it, a moratorium is a temporary action, and local municipalities can only pass moratoriums for so much time; the purpose of a moratorium is to take that time to study and address impacts, and municipalities will need to decide what their community would like to do
 - In this case, these projects are not just a small impact given the resources they use; there is a regional impact, and with local municipalities' budgets and resources already tight, the county is taking a good step by providing a countywide study to look at the impacts and whether the area could even handle projects like these, especially with Micron coming, which will have a very big impact on resources already, with respect to county, municipal, and public involvement
 - Ms. Denton said she will be following the process very closely and looks forward to the county providing the tools to local municipalities that they will need when considering any of these projects in the future
- Ms. Watts: Just to clarify, if any of the public wants to make suggestions or comments related to this study, where should we be gathering those? Should we direct them to legislature@ongov.net so we can share with you, or would you like them to come directly to you?
- Mr. Waffner: I would prefer if they came directly to me: TroyWaffner@onondaga.gov

3. **COUNTY LEGISLATURE:** Nicole Watts, Chairwoman

a. **INFORMATIONAL:** Discussion of Budget Schedule and Responsibilities

- County Executive's branch currently working on pro forma budget, departmental level
- Official budget season launches September 15, per charter
- County Executive presents budget to Legislature; Legislature then goes into departmental reviews
- This year: set-aside time for joint committee meeting, Planning & Economic Development and Ways and Means
 - To hear budget presentations from departments under this committee's purview
 - Partially grounded in members already hearing department updates; more intimate understanding of needs, more informed questions
 - Presentations on a half day, scheduled with Ways and Means, joint committee meeting
 - September, one of two weeks of presentations/meetings right after the 15th
- After that: regular Planning & Economic Development Committee meeting for business from County Executive's office
- Budget discussion for departments under this committee's purview as one agenda item
 - Each committee member matched with certain departments' budgets, per committee
 - Idea: each legislator as point person, delving deeper into matched departments, not just when budget comes out but in advance
 - Budget season comes in rapid fire, lots of information; hope is members familiarize themselves so others can come to them with questions

- Intended to help committee run point, work together on due diligence needed for budget season
- After committee discusses budget: committee chair, Legislator Denton, equipped to bring suggested amendments, cuts, or contingencies for related departments to Ways and Means
 - Informs Ways and Means process
 - Then goes the traditional way: Ways and Means takes thoughts from different committees, own sentiments/perspectives, puts together Ways and Means report sent to County Executive
- Draft schedule exists, going out by email by end of week to everyone
- To finalize, get everyone organized, verify department matches per committee assignments

A motion was made by Mr. Knapp, seconded by Mr. Eriksen, to adjourn the meeting; MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.



Respectfully submitted,
HASSINA ADAMS, Clerk
Onondaga County Legislature

ATTENDANCE

COMMITTEE: PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATE: JUNE 17, 2026

NAME (Please Print)	DEPT/AGENCY/ORGANIZATION
Martin Skalen	Community Development