



ACCEPTED BY BOARD
MEMBERS 1/29/26

MINUTES
IDA REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 11, 2025

Present: Sarah Lansdale, Chair
Kevin Harvey, Vice Chair
Cris Damianos, Secretary
Gregory Casamento, Member
Brian Beedenbender, Member

Excused Absence: Sondra Cochran, Treasurer
Josh Slaughter, Member

Also Present: K. Kelly Murphy, Executive Director/CEO
Joseph Rastello, Deputy Executive Director
Peter Ganley, Administrative Director
Daryl Leonette, Executive Assistant
William Wexler, Esq., Agency Counsel
Andrew Komaromi, Esq., Harris Beach Murtha PLLC, Transaction Counsel
Melissa Bennett, Esq., Barclay Damon LLP, Transaction Counsel
Carolyn Trespasz, Esq., Barclay Damon LLP, Transaction Counsel
William Dudine, Esq., Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP, Transaction Counsel
Barry Carrigan, Esq., Nixon Peabody LLP, Transaction Counsel
James Madore, NEWSDAY
Lane Filler, Todd Shapiro & Associates
Caitlin Curry, Legislative Aide to Legislator Bontempi
Rachel Selsky, CEO, Camoin Associates
Bailey McConnell, Analyst, Camoin Associates

Ms. Sarah Lansdale, Chair who is presiding over the Meeting today indicated that the documents for this meeting can be accessed and are posted to the IDA's website at <https://www.suffolkida.org/resources/> under the Board Meetings tab.

The Regular Meeting of the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency held in Media Room #184 located in the lower level of the H. Lee Dennison Building, 100 Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, NY was called to order at 10:57 a.m. by Ms. Lansdale, Chair of the IDA.

This is the December 11, 2025 Regular Board Meeting of the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency. Members of the public may attend the Meeting or listen and view the Meeting via the Agency's website www.suffolkida.org. Select the Watch Meeting menu option tab at the top of the home page and you will be linked to the Agency's YouTube Channel. Members of the public can also participate and provide public comment during that portion of the Meeting by attending in-person.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Lansdale said she would like to entertain a motion to move the public comment after the presentation under other business if that is acceptable to the board.

Upon a motion by Mr. Harvey, seconded by Mr. Damianos, it was:

RESOLVED, to have the public comment portion of the meeting after the presentation by Camoin

Associates.

Unanimously carried 5/0.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Lansdale noted there is no new business.

OLD BUSINESS:

Canon U.S.A., Inc.: Status; Report from Executive Director

Ms. Murphy said she spoke with a representative that she has been working with on a consistent basis and there is nothing new to report. There has been no conversations with Langone that they are aware of which have been reported in the past and no change to employment to report at this time. Ms. Murphy said she did note with her and noted with the Board that the next reporting period is February for the fourth quarter of 2025.

OTHER BUSINESS

Impact of Multifamily Development on Public Schools Report: Presentation by Rachel Selsky, Executive Director, Camoin Associates.

Ms. Murphy presented Exhibit A. Ms. Murphy indicated that the Agency has been working with Camoin Associates with Rachel Selsky, who is the Executive Director/CEO for this project. We are here today to make a presentation and report on the status and have accepted some great feedback from Board Members. We have some areas where we need more information before we can complete the report. We thought it would be a good opportunity to visit this with the Board in person so that if there are additional areas that the Board would like to see us widen that scope or investigate further or explain the methodology we are at we thought this would be a good time to do so. Today we have Rachel Selsky and Bailey McConnell, Analysts with Camoin Associates to make a power point presentation to Board Members.

Ms. Selsky said Bailey and herself enjoyed working on this project with Kelly, Peter and the team as well as Terri from HIA and we are pleased to present the preliminary findings. As Kelly mentioned we have done a lot of work and set a lot of the groundwork and appreciate the comments we have received so far from the Board and others. We wanted to take this opportunity to share with you what we have learned so far and continue to receive feedback so that we can make sure we provide you a final report that you all feel comfortable with so it can be useful moving into the future. Ms. Selsky gave a Power Point presentation to Board Members.

Ms. Lansdale thanked Ms. Selsky for her presentation and opened it up to Board Members for any questions. Mr. Beedenbender said he sent Ms. Selsky a long email already and understands the philosophy you took by using the census data I am not sure that I agree. The reason for saying that is only two of the properties gave us actual numbers, one of them is the project in Selden. The school district reported back that there were 30 students. On page 20, in your fiscal impact you use an expectation of 39 students, that is 9 more than there currently are and at \$10,000 dollars a student the 9 extra is about \$90,000 and that makes up 90% of the expected loss that is on page 22. Mr. Beedenbender said he is not questioning math, the actual number is what really matters in my opinion. This is one of two that is showing a negative and is much closer to even at this time he agrees that this is a snapshot in time. The rest of them might be the other way, this is one of the ones that we have and the expected versus the actual is 30% more expected is more than actual. That's why he thinks it is really important even if this body had to fund this study every year. Mr. Beedenbender thinks the actual numbers are important because this conversation is largely emotional. In addition to regional and all the other things, he thinks that just points out why the real numbers are true and he's sure when you get them some of the real numbers they will be higher than you expected as well. It will go in both directions, but there's a count of people, it is what it is and the numbers will be what they will be and those are the ones that I want to see. Understanding that it may be that everything is amazing this year and then there's a change of population and

next year the numbers look different. It's important that we get those from those school districts to evaluate that way. Ms. Selsky replied absolutely and we'd be happy to do maybe two scenarios like an expected, using our assumptions and then doing a real if we can get those numbers we would be happy to run it both ways, I respect your opinion. I see both sides this was the approach that we felt we could accomplish in the time and information that we had. Mr. Beedenbender said he has heard twice in the conversation about times, is there any reason we need to have this by a specific date. Ms. Lansdale said she believes there was communication that this would be done at the end of this year. I think that given the challenges with securing the data from the school district, I think it makes sense to get it right. Ms. Murphy said at this point what we're looking to do is not only extend the time but potentially extend the scope of the project based on the methodology and the recommendations from the Board. Mr. Beedenbender said he understands that this information is difficult to get but the information is being requested from public entities that don't really have a right not to provide it. If we just need time, I can't speak for the rest of the Board but I would be inclined to provide that time to get it. Mr. Beedenbender said he would like to note that the school district he went to was the only one that responded. Mr. Casamento said we wanted it by the end of the year. Ms. Murphy said now that we're faced with the challenges of obtaining some of this data, we know that we need more time and that's why we decided today to just make a presentation and update the Board and again, get additional feedback so that we can incorporate that so noted. Ms. Lansdale said I just wanted to know when the initial data was requested in the first instance of school districts. Ms. Murphy said I don't know that I have all of that Rachel might. Ms. Selsky said she believes it was October 2025. Ms. Murphy said the Huntington School District requested an extension; we're onto the third extension that they've requested. We sent them correspondence yesterday, reducing the amount of data and just really simplifying it down to just the number of students to take some of the burden off the staff with the hopes that we might be able to obtain that information. Huntington obviously being the most important, because the majority of the projects are in Huntington. We are waiting to hear back from the superintendent regarding that request that we made in addition to the 3 responses to the Freedom of Information (FOIL) request. Mr. Casamento said I think we should get the full data and not let them off the hook and Mr. Beedenbender agreed. Mr. Wexler said we can FOIL it and Ms. Murphy said we have, and Mr. Wexler asked if they have complied. Ms. Murphy said they have they sent letters that said they need more time to put the information together and that they gave us another deadline when they would either fulfill or deny the request. Ms. Murphy asked what is the next date that we are waiting for. Mr. Wexler said we are the applicant, we give them the deadline they don't give us the deadline. Ms. Murphy said to Mr. Wexler she will supply all that information to you and you can help us crafting. Mr. Wexler said everyone except for Mr. Beedenbender's school. Ms. Selsky said I would be happy to send over what we originally requested and then I know your saying let's ask them for all the data and then I can indicate which is the specific most important piece of data. Mr. Damianos said wasn't there some creative language at the bottom of that letter, if I remember right that kind of left open the possibility that they don't have to reply at all. Ms. Murphy said there was a statement that said they could potentially deny our request. Mr. Damianos said we're not creating reports on a new part. Mr. Beedenbender said they could tell us all the reasons they can't do that. Mr. Wexler said I am unaware of that language but let me review it and we'll get on it. Mr. Harvey said as an additional comment to what Mr. Beedenbender said I am in total support and I don't speak for all the Board Members but you know we make educated assumptions on some of the data we have regarding these projects and we think that the summation of the information we've received before we make the decision is pretty solid. However, to go the next step to satisfy the public's interest regarding whether or not we are making the right decisions. To get more accurate information is pivotal moving forward especially if we can create some type of baseline data point year in year out. More information is better it helps us make more informed decisions and I think that's really important especially considering that in these PILOT programs we're spending a taxpayer's dollar to encourage economic development I am in full support of what Mr. Beedenbender suggested. Mr. Casamento said we are being criticized, providing benefits that result in additional burdens on the school district. Mr. Harvey said we need to protect ourselves against that criticism.

Ms. Lansdale asked if there are any other comments from the Board and she would like to move to the public comment if that's okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Lansdale asked if we have any members of public that would like to be heard. Ms. Lansdale said Legislator

Caracappa is with us today. Legislator Caracappa said good morning, ladies and gentlemen thank you for letting me have the opportunity to speak today. I am Suffolk County Legislator Nick Caracappa representing the 4th Legislative District. Everyone who knows me knows that I support the IDA, I support development, growing businesses within our communities that create sustainability and jobs. However, I have a problem with your allotment of IDA benefits with school districts. They negatively impact communities which basically all of them are. I received this draft just a couple days ago I didn't have the proper amount of time to fully go through it. I was able to come to a conclusion that I am not encouraged by this report, matter of fact quite the opposite. This is made up primarily as it's pointed out here due to a lack of responses based on census data that does not help me, does not help my residents and does not paint an accurate picture. Another problem I have is I've been involved with these types of presentations and pictures can be painted anyway the person who's paying for it wants it to be painted. When you paint the picture in this summary that on the cover page of this one says the average fiscal impact per project and year over a 15-year pilot is plus \$7,410 annually. When the price is per student, according to this, which is inaccurate as well is \$8,725, that's a net loss. Then compound that by 40 students over a 15-year period, I think that's about \$800,000. That burden is placed upon the residents of my district who are struggling to make ends meet every day. You're giving these incentives to these developers and passing on that financial burden to us, the residents. I've made a bunch of notes, and with the time allotment I've had, this is a very busy time of year for the legislature, myself, and all of you, I'm sure. This information request was made in October 2025; I met with Ms. Murphy in April or June of 2024 requesting this information. I have been very patient, and made several phone calls to Ms. Murphy, regarding the data. To receive this very inaccurate data, based on census data using Camoin's data that is subject to multiple errors, if you can read up on it. It doesn't accurately give you a sense of what's happening in these districts, these residents by allowing school tax exemptions to these developments. Just to outline some of them, student enrollment, I sat on the Middle Country School Board for 7 ½ years the Middle Country School Board is the third largest school district in the state. Enrollment for students generally is a rollercoaster cycle of 7 to 8 years. You cannot get any data in a 1-to 2 year cycle of data. You have to go back and see what it is, the current trends. Most people can't afford to have kids right now, most people are struggling within my district the Middle Country Central School District I am here representing those individuals today. I can say I've spoken to some of my colleagues, a couple of them have been before you before and they are facing the same challenges. So, when some of the elements were transplanting students in a district, they basically came from former single-family homes that were paying school taxes, and they moved into these multi-family developments for any number of reasons. But when you ask people, like I do, because I'm at these civic meetings, I'm at these chamber meetings, there is a large array of circumstances why this happens. Most of them are fiscal impacted on their households, whether it be divorce which is common or loss of income from two income families down to one. They can no longer maintain the cost of living because of the always rising cost of living and they are not receiving raises, they're challenged. They must make decisions about putting food on the table for the kids or paying the electric bill. That is the reality folks, that's what is going on. Please forgive me because I want to make the most of my time here. Mr. Beedenbender some of the comments that you made were spot on. This data is inconclusive based on its numbers and where the information came from. The fiscal impact review report on page 21, the PILOT agreement works by establishing a predetermined schedule of things that gradually increases as the project matures which is true. Rather than immediately subjecting a newly created building to full property tax burden based upon its improved value PILOT phases in these obligations over the agreed-upon period, typically 10 to 20 years. We do not have 10 to 20 years to wait for that positive impact. Our communities are losing families; folks are fleeing Suffolk County because they cannot afford the cost of living. You are placing an increased burden on them. Our school taxes are the highest taxes we pay here in Suffolk County. The cost per student rises annually, largely in part from unfunded and underfunded and mandates passed down by New York State. Those burdens are passed on to the residents and then there is the cost of doing business, you have to pay electric the Middle Country School District is one the largest electric consumers. There are all the utilities, payroll and teacher salaries and we have 11 units in Middle Country. Everyone from janitors, building and grounds, 11 units that are hoped to be at the end of contract negotiations you hope to be at the cost-of-living increases. Most are well below, again struggling to make ends meet they lose their homes, or they're forced to sell them. They counter that, whatever they have in equity, when they sell those homes, they pay off debt, and move into these facilities, so they still have money in their pocket they can put food on the table. They're not paying the school taxes anymore the school district loses that revenue and that again, I'll say it over and over again, that burden is placed upon our residents they can no longer afford it. Again, third paragraph, this means that schools,

municipalities, and other taxing entities never receive less revenue than they did prior to the development while benefiting from phase increases in tax receipts as pilot schedule progresses 10, 20 years. Once the PILOT concludes, the property returns to standing tax roll, again, this makes absolutely zero sense. This means that schools, municipalities, and other tax entities never receive less revenue than they did prior to. Yet the increase for a student who is no longer paying the taxes, we cannot sustain this, ladies and gentlemen. Simply put, we cannot sustain these financial burdens any longer. I know it sounds like we're doing the right thing, and I've supported the IDA and their notion of bringing development, because we need affordable housing. That's why I came before you to ask if you're going to give subsidies make sure there's for IDB, ADA, veterans, 80% or lower, true affordable housing, you know we're making an investment. We need a return on that investment and it's all true. In summation, I don't want to spend all day here, and I'll come back when we have more accurate data, that we can have this conversation. The facts are the facts, and it's written right here in this report. Depends on what colored glasses you got on you want to put your rosy-colored glasses on and read this report and think that this is somehow a positive in our community. Well, pass those glasses over here, because I need to read this report through those glasses, these glasses tell a different story. My job is to improve the quality of life for my residents in the 4th. legislative district. My job is to increase the quality of life for the residents of Suffolk County in a whole, that's the oath I took. That's the job I'm doing, I come to you to ask you, to beg you, to reconsider. Think of other ways we can bring businesses in without adversely affecting the living, the quality of life for our residents. Again, choosing between food on the table, paying electric bill, never mind vacations, never mind what's going to be around the Christmas tree. This December go on Middle Country Moms website look at the families crying in despair because they can't afford gifts. We distributed over 1,000 meals collectively through our food pantries in our district for Thanksgiving. You don't need rose colored glasses you don't need green glasses to know that that is a negative. It is a problem when families are going hungry, not just for the holidays but all year round because they cannot make ends meet ladies and gentlemen. What sounds good 15 to 20 years from now, based on this report is devastating, today, tomorrow and yesterday devastating. For a complex that came before our community came before our citizens, developed a promise of no more than 11 children, I think it was 11, maybe less. That number rose to 44 at one point. Right now, it's down to about 39 at \$8,000 to \$10,000 per student per year, you can do the math, you can figure it out. The only way to right this wrong is to one that I am not a fan of; come to an agreement that's binding with these developers. You make an agreement no more than a certain number, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, whatever it is, whatever the community and the school district can agree to in these meetings that's a binding agreement. Counsel, you know what that is anything over that is on the developer. We'll hold up our end of the agreement, we agree to 3, 4, 5, 11 students, school-age kids, and we'll live up to that, that's because we agreed to it. We see the benefits that could possibly be created by having this housing complex for those who can't afford individual residence anymore. We want to keep them here in Suffolk County that's the idea, that's the bottom line. Or option two, no longer give school tax exemptions to these developers that solves the problem in a whole I don't think it's prevented building at all. They may wait a little longer to get their profit margins where they want them to be, let them wait 15 years not us. Don't put the burden on us for 15 years, don't chase us out of our homes, out of Suffolk County. Please, I'm asking you to consider all of this. This is not enough accurate data at all this is incomplete and shouldn't be paid for. I would like a third independent outside party to do this. Maybe we could fund it through the county, I don't know. I don't want a bias report, and in my eyes, this is a bias report. If you could paint the rosy color outcome based on this report, then there's something the matter, there's something wrong with the process. I don't want to take any more of your time. I do appreciate what you do, the time you guys take in the IDA and for our communities. I don't want this to reflect the positive feelings I have for you all. I don't want it, but this is something that needs to be addressed immediately. Thank you for your time, and if you have any questions I am here if not, thank you again for your time and I wish you all a Merry Christmas and a very happy holiday.

Mr. Beedenbender said to Ms. Lansdale as we go through this, we have a draft and we may have another draft and it will eventually become final. Does it make sense at all to have a working group with a couple of the legislators or other folks that work through this as we look at it. In the end the legislature has a lot of comments and concerns. The data should be the data, and then the result is the result. I think, right now we're all concerned about the result, and we haven't gotten to the data yet. So, if you want, we could put together a working group or something like that, Legislator, and continue to have those conversations as we're preparing this, because it is a draft, it's not done. Ms. Lansdale said great idea, Brian. Any objections to that, Mr. Casamento said I don't have any objections to that, but I have no stake in the outcome of this report. I don't think any of the board

members do. I don't think any of the board members have given direction to the consultants who were hired. Come out from the report with any position good, bad or indifferent. I thank the board for having been critical of the draft report because of the lack of information that was obtained in the report that's our job. Maybe this draft was issued too early before the information was obtained. I don't disagree with the comments that you made, but I also don't have any rose-colored glasses on, and I'm not looking at this report through that lens. I'm looking at this report through we don't have accurate data, go back and get the accurate data. We didn't request the proper information, go get the proper information. We don't have any need, as we just discussed, for this report to come out a year, so if it takes another 3 to 6 months to do it right, then we're going to do it right. But we are going to do it right, I can tell you that. Legislator Caracappa said that's encouraging.

MINUTES

The Minutes of November 20, 2025 and December 1, 2025 were accepted by Board Members.

Mr. Wexler said that he understands that the Board would like to go into Executive Session as it relates to Public Office of Law 105 we are going to be discussing employment-related issues.

Upon a motion by Mr. Beedenbender, seconded by Mr. Damianos, it was:

RESOLVED, to go into Executive Session at 11:45 a.m.

Unanimously carried 5/0.

At 11:45 a.m. all individuals left the Meeting except Board Members and William Wexler, Esq., Agency Counsel.

At 12:39 p.m. all individuals re-entered the Meeting.

Upon a motion by Ms. Lansdale, seconded by Mr. Casamento, it was:

RESOLVED, to end Executive Session at 12:39 p.m. and reconvene the Regular Meeting.

Unanimously carried 5/0.

Mr. Wexler stated during Executive Session no action was taken.

After further discussion and;

Upon a motion by Mr. Beedenbender, seconded by Mr. Harvey, it was:

RESOLVED, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency.

Unanimously carried 5/0.

The Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

The next IDA Meeting is scheduled for January 29, 2026.