

Author Full Name : Sarah Means**Received Date :** 07/12/2024 07:15 PM**Comments Received :**

1. We respectfully suggest the agency include a character field to provide additional context for each multiple choice answer. Several answers do not lend themselves to providing the agency with a fully picture of the ecosystem via singular tick box. For instance, selecting "1" 1-million square-foot facility may appear less weighty than "10" 100,000 square-foot facilities based on the multiple choice answer. Furthermore, the picture may be further refined by providing information such as wafer starts, etc.
2. Please consider allowing for attachments to be included in the RFI, even with a limit to the number of attachments that could be provided.
3. We respectfully suggest the agency include a character field to provide overall context regarding the state's ecosystem and plans.
4. Please consider defining what constitutes as "announced" for a project. We have a number of projects that have been "announced" but are in various stages of the development process. Understanding clearly what you mean by announced will be helpful.
5. We respectfully request the agency provide confidentiality protections to survey responses. Nearly all of the questions will implicate planned but not yet public projects that are subject to non-disclosure agreements.
6. In reference to question 2 of the draft questionnaire, the state collects employment level data, but have confidentiality restrictions with disclosure of that data. For example, my state economist has the ability to tell me the top 5 semiconductor employers (by employment) in the state but reporting that to me for the purposes of completing this questionnaire would violate a confidentiality agreement. We can make an educated guess as to who the top 5 employers are (employment numbers are very fluid), but it would be just that, an educated guess.