

Chemung County Industrial Development Agency
Minutes of the Public Hearing
Riedman Edger HB I, LLC
June 10, 2026

Present: Kathy Johnston, Theresa Golthrait, Richard Smith, Jason Crane, Colton Hillman, Greg Goldblat, Betsey Gornam, Jenny Dean, Herman Fowler, Jodi Edger, Matthew Freeman, Carm Copola, Ann Hayes, Brad Little?, Patricia Hartigan-Huten, Lisa McKee Burdick, Lee Giamichele, Turner Kirk, Michael Saglibene, Coleen Chisholm, and other members of the public

Staff Present: Joseph Roman, Jill Koski

The Public Hearing was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Jill Koski representing the Chemung County Industrial Development Agency located at 400 East Church Street, Elmira, New York. The Public Hearing was held at the Town of Big Flats Town Hall, 476 Maple Street, Big Flats, New York 14814.

The purpose of the Public Hearing was to hear comments on the Riedman Edger, HB I, LLC project.

RIEDMAN EDGER HB I, LLC, for itself and/or for an entity or entities to be formed (collectively, the "Company"), has submitted an application to the Agency requesting the Agency's assistance with a certain project (the "Project") consisting of: (i) the acquisition by the Agency of a leasehold or other interest in approximately 55.70 acres of real property located at 138 Hibbard Road, Hibbard Road and 300 Daniel Zenker Drive, each in the Town of Big Flats, New York (the "Land", being more particularly described tax parcel Nos. 57.03-1-39.11, 67.01-1-2 and 67.01-1-58.1, as may be merged); (ii) the planning, design, construction, operation and leasing by the Company of a multi-tenanted development project that will include a total of approximately 247,000 square feet of building spaces, including (a) eight (8) market rate apartment buildings containing twenty-four (24) units each, (b) fifty (50) garage units and (c) related tenant amenity spaces, lobbies, common areas, site improvements, roadway improvements, access and egress improvements, storm water improvements, utility and infrastructure improvements, signage, curbage, sidewalks, and landscaping improvements (collectively, the "Improvements") and (iii) the acquisition of an installation in and around the Land and Improvements by the Company of machinery, equipment, fixtures and other items of tangible personal property (the "Equipment"; and, collectively with the Land and the Improvements, the "Facility").

The Agency will acquire title to, or a leasehold interest in, the Facility and lease the Facility back to the Company. The Company will operate the Facility during the term of the lease. At the end of the lease term, the Company will purchase the Facility from the Agency, or if the Agency holds a leasehold interest, the leasehold interest will be terminated. The Agency contemplates that it will provide financial assistance (the "Financial Assistance") to the Company in the form of sales and

use tax exemptions, a mortgage recording tax exemption as authorized by the laws of New York State, and a partial real property tax abatement, the proposed terms of which contain a deviation from the Agency's Uniform Tax Exemption Policy.

Theresa Golthwait: Resident of Big Flats, struggling to understand why a financially successful developer requires assistance from the IDA, including what appears to be a substantial 30-year tax incentive for a project consisting of primarily of high end townhouses and apartments. Many residents may reasonably ask whether this could become another situation where public support is provided without a clear and rational public benefit. The primary beneficiary appears to be the developer rather than the broader community. Economic development incentives should be carefully targeted toward projects that generate significant public value through job creation, workforce development, infrastructure improvements, or other measurable community benefits. extensive portfolio and involvement in major projects, including the development associated with the Amazon site here in Big Flats, it is fair to question whether these incentives are truly necessary for this project to proceed. At a time when public resources are limited, the IDA should prioritize projects that deliver the greatest benefit to the largest number of residents. Before approving substantial tax reductions, the public deserves a clear explanation of why this assistance is needed and how the community will benefit in return. I just feel it's just the rich getting richer.

Betsy Gorman: Asked to see the application. Thinks the IDA is holding the property and leasing to the developer. Wants to know what the lease payments will be, if any. Wanted to know why the developer isn't buying the property. How long is the lease? Doesn't understand the ownership and wants to know why the IDA owns the property and will lease back to the developer.

Kathy Johnson: Questioned whether or not the fire district taxes would be abated. Joe Roman explained that special district taxes can not be abated by law. She is supportive of growth but thinks the PILOT is a burden to tax payers and that there should be full tax payment to help with town improvements, and hiring law enforcement officers.

Patricia Hartigan-Huten: Wants to make it clear that the PILOT application approval is the responsibility of the CCIDA and not the town or the zoning board, which was confirmed by staff. Concerned about the burden the PILOT places on tax payers. Wants to know who makes the decision. 60% of the payment goes to the school district, and doesn't believe many children will be residents of the new development. The county receives 30% and the rest goes to the town and she doesn't understand why.

Lee Giamichelle: Town Supervisor, met with the developers and express concerns even though he is fully supportive of the project. The developers do amazing work. He believes the 30 year PILOT is too generous. Also believes that the PILOT payment split between the taxing jurisdictions is unfair. The school district will receive more than the town, but the project won't result in more student residents. The town will take the brunt of the increase in population and development, yet receives

the lowest share of the PILOT payment with this proposed agreement. He is also disappointed that the CCIDA board did not attend the public hearing. Would like the CCIDA board to reconsider the formula for PILOT payments to the three taxing jurisdictions.

Greg Goldblatt: Asked how many people sit on the CCIDA board. Joe Roman responded with six. Disappointed only two people representing the organization were present. Concerned because the site work has started and the town has approved the site plan but now the developer is requesting financial assistance from the CCIDA and there was only one application provided for review. He is a past commissioner of the fire district, which is suffering due to lack of membership and resources. Concerned that 300 more residents will be a burden and the 30 year PILOT will be a burden on his grandchildren when they become adults.

Lisa McKee Burdick: Lifelong resident and small business owner. Doesn't understand why the PILOT is being considered. They have a family farm. Believes this is a done deal and the IDA didn't ask for input from residents.

Lee Giamichelle then explained that the developer owns the property, and Jill Koski explained that the language in the public hearing announcement can be confusing because the lease leaseback is the mechanism for PILOT transactions. Joe Roman explained that there may be a press conference to answer questions.

Colleen Chisholm: The Arnot Mall is in disrepair and who would have thought it would look like that after 20 years. Concerned about the condition of this property in 30 years. Thirty years is too long.

There was informal discussion about the burden on emergency services, and lack of volunteers. There are four other housing projects in development that are going to need emergency services.

John Hunter: It has always been his impression that PIOT programs were designed to bring economic development benefits for the county, meaning manufacturing jobs or anything like that. He is in favor of the project but without more manufacturing jobs there is just going to be a shift of residents from other towns into Big Flats which doesn't benefit anyone. Also concerned that the CCIDA board is not represented by a resident of Big Flats and decisions are being made that impact residents.

Informal discussion about the timing of how the public was informed. The town was not aware until recently.

Michael Saglibene: Supportive of the developer and the project. Does not agree with the 30 year PILOT. Would like it to be re-evaluated. Thinks there should be impact payments to the town. Said that the CCIDA meetings are open to the public as well, let your voice be heard.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jill Koski