

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2006  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** COUNCIL MEMBERS: PAOLOETTO, McCARTHY,  
MULLIGAN, DePARA VALLE, DYE (6:50 p.m.)

**ABSENT:** COUNCIL MEMBER: HOLLOWAY

**OTHER(s) PRESENT:** COUNCIL MEMBERS: BAKER, CURRAN, WALSH  
ALANA KABEL, MIKE NIDOH, ED LAVERNOICH

Council member Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:14 p.m.

Approval of Committee Minutes of October 17, 2006

\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES**

\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED**

\*\* **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**291-05** PY 31 & 32 Community Development Block Grant Program  
consolidated Plan Amendment Requests.

Ms. Kabel stated they had three minor amendments to the PY32 Community Development Block Grant Program. She said all the changes constituted a major amendment, noting it was published in the newspaper, and there were no comments from the public. She also noted they held a citizens meeting and voted to approve the top two programs CDEF and ABCD. A majority recommended approval of the Dept. on Aging Program. She gave details of the programs as follows:

- **Community Economic Fund** – year 32, \$82,500.00 was awarded for neighborhood plans that have begun. But they found the plan would be more efficient to have OPED (Office of Planning and Economic Development) complete the process. So they were asking to return \$10,000.00 to OPED and CDEF will be funded at \$72,500.00
- **The City of Bridgeport Department on Aging** – year 32, \$36,000.00 was appropriated to the senior aide program. At the end of the first quarter, they moved the program to the WorkPlace Inc. leaving a balance

of \$25k. Subsequently, the Department on Aging requested to keep the \$25k to complete the following items:

- Food pantry
- To offer other services to seniors in areas of fair housing, technical assistance and exercise equipment

It was found that there is one senior center downtown where seniors don't have easy access to the facility by bus, so they would like to see the \$25k utilized for staff and \$5k for other services.

- **ABCD program** - this matter involved a technical error in year 31; wherein they applied for energy assistance so people don't get their utilities shut off. They also applied for CDBG for counseling and maintenance for people in their current living residence. But they never applied for energy assistance under CDBG. The contract showed the work program was related to homeless prevention, but it wasn't what the budget indicated. So they would like to square away the budget with this budget activity.

Council member Paoletto asked about the ABCD Program and if the matter just involved an error to correct. Ms. Kabel said that was correct.

Council member Paoletto asked what the amounts were for the Dept. on Aging Program. Ms. Kabel stated they were \$20,000 for salary and \$5,500 for services and equipment.

Council member Paoletto asked the actual amounts the Dept. on Aging was asking for. Ms. Kabel said the request was for \$22,000 for salary and \$3,000 for services and equipment.

Council member Paoletto asked what the status was now as far as costs. Ms. Kabel said that would depend on how the committee voted.

Council member Valle stated she had a concern about the decrease in the PY32 allocation and the matter of decreasing \$25k from the Dept. on Aging to the senior services. Ms. Kabel explained the decrease in CDEF for \$10k was to take the monies and give it to OPED for the same activity. She pointed out this matter referred to the east side NRZ. She further noted that once the grant was awarded, it was felt that it would be less expensive for OPED to operate that piece of the program. So they will be completing the same task.

Council member Valle asked who OPED operated under. Ms. Kabel said that department came under Nancy Hadley. She reiterated they were not changing the actual task, only the department.

Council member Valle said she still had a concern about this, emphasizing that nothing has been done pertaining to NRZ for the east side, pointing out that other areas in the city were moving forward, so she was reluctant to give away \$10k when the east side hasn't been completed yet. Ms. Kabel said if the requests were approved by the city council, the contract will restrict the use of the money to complete the east side plan.

Mr. Tom Korso, the Project Manager stated that the east side plan started, they had a charette (community meeting) and then it stopped. Then they asked CDEF to complete the plan, so they thought that finishing something the city already started would be more efficient, rather than spending money for a new plan. But CDEF will implement recommendations to the plan, but it is more efficient to keep the \$10k to the city.

Council member Paoletto clarified that the \$10k was not being lost, it goes from one entity to another to finish the east side plan. He asked if that caveat was in writing somewhere. Ms. Kabel noted that it could be inserted into the contract.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO AMEND THE  
RESOLUTION TO READ THE ALLOCATION OF \$10K TO CITY OF  
BRIDGEPORT OPED FOR THE EAST SIDE NRZ PLANNING  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**

Council member Walsh recalled that under a larger umbrella, there was a limit to the amount the block grant money that could go to administration. He questioned why what was proposed wasn't in violation. Ms. Kabel said that the entire \$82,500 was under the administrative cap and approved as such.

Council member DePara commented that OPED was understaffed, so he questioned the addition of the NRZ plan creation. Ms. Kabel said that Ms. Hadley recommended the change. She felt that with assistance, the plan could be accomplished. Council member DePara said he understood that, but he further questioned who would actually be involved to strategically plan and carry it out. Mr. Korso stated that OPED would go out for a consultant to complete the plan. Council member DePara said he had a problem with that since they already had an in-house consultant to do it, he said that seemed like a duplication of efforts. Mr. Korso said they had the option to do it in-house or subcontract it out. Ms. Kabel said she didn't talk to Ms. Hadley in detail yet about this, but she will find out exactly what the plan was.

Council member DePara repeated his concern of using an in-house consultant for efficiency purposes, but then maybe subcontracting back out. He emphasized that they need to know the process will be completed and not slowed down.

Ms. Kabel stated that CDEF was going to manage the process, but Ms. Hadley's concern was that since the process was so far along, any further delay would be a detriment.

Council member DePara stated that he would want assurance that the process would be carried out expeditiously and on budget, with ample community input.

Council member Valle stated that they had a charette and the people that attended brought things to the table, but some where along the line, someone brought other boundaries into the NRZ plan. Ms. Kabel said she could put a time completion in the contract that it be completed sooner than June 30; or she could incorporate a completion schedule.

Council member Valle felt the process proposed would put them behind in the plan. She stressed there was an issue to address the boundaries and she felt that some things would be taken away from the east side.

Council member Paoletto stated there were a lot of questions. He suggested that they hear answers to some of those questions tonight or opt to table the matter until they heard from Ms. Hadley.

Council member Walsh mentioned the \$10k issue recalling what Council member DePara said. He said he thought the plan would also be done in-house. He surmised that something may not be quite right with doing it in-house, but then going out to subcontract; he thought this could raise suspicion. Ms. Kabel said that as far as the WorkPlace taking over the senior aide program, they received another grant outside of CDBG to fund the senior aide program. So the WorkPlace Inc. was now operating that program.

Ms. Rosa Lee explained they had to do a match from Linda's salary to accommodate the program. She pointed out that it's become a common practice for other agencies not to operate the program themselves.

Council member Walsh stated that he heard complaints about the ceramics program. Ms. Lee explained that some departments were depleted and services had to be cut; so they were looking to bring the services back up. She added that they will keep the following services Kings Pantry, ceramics class, computer class, senior van, dial-a-ride, shopping trips and IMAX and Barnum Museum trips. Council member Walsh asked if all this could be done for \$20k. Ms. Lee said yes, they need more help, otherwise they will have to cut services.

Council member Valle questioned if they were decreasing the money from senior aide and going to another senior program. She asked who they were taking the \$25k from. Ms. Kabel once again explained the senior aide program was taken over by the WorkPlace Inc., because they received a federal grant to do it, so the staff and program relocated to the WorkPlace Inc. and the Dept. on Aging is requiring additional money to provide services.

Council member Mulligan asked the number of meetings they had regarding the matter. Ms. Kabel said they had three meetings on October 12, 19 and 27, there were eight people at the meeting and five of them voted to award \$25k for staff and \$5,500 for services.

Council member Mulligan asked if the recommendation was made by the Citizens Union. Ms. Kabel said yes and she was also making the recommendations.

Council member McCarthy said he was in favor of all three changes, but he asked Council member Valle what her thoughts were on it. Council member Valle said that since the matter would go before a full council that would be good, but she still wanted some issues resolved. Again, she questioned why they were sent back to point one. Ms. Kabel indicated that she would arrange a meeting with Ms. Hadley and Council member Valle. Ms. Valle acknowledged that would be acceptable.

Council member Paoletto commented that he didn't want an argument between the city council and Citizens Union to ensue. He asked to hear from staff on whether the differences in the amounts will hurt either way.

---

Council member Mulligan requested to address item **302-05 Sale of City Owned Property to Genshane, LLC (d.b.a. The Blackrock Castle)**. He noted that he had to leave for another important meeting. He said that Council member Curran would add her comments to the item later in the meeting. The committee agreed to the request.

Council member Mulligan stated this item involved a parking lot next to Black Rock Castle. They were asking for a sliver of property along the westerly and southerly sides of the building and they will pay for the property as it was appraised. The city of Bridgeport lot will retain the number of spaces they have now, so he endorsed the request. He further commented that it was good to encourage businesses in the city and he thought the request would help them become more successful. Again, they will pay for the property at the appraised price.

Council member Paoletto returned to item 291-05; he asked if the \$20k and \$5,500 amounts were feasible. Ms. Lee said yes.

*\*Due to Council member Mulligan leaving the meeting, Council member McCarthy stated the motion again.*

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THE  
RESOLUTION AMEND TO READ THE ALLOCATION OF \$10K TO  
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT OPED FOR THE EAST SIDE NRZ PLANNING  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE  
RESOLUTION AS AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DYE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**302-05** Sale of City Owned Property to Genshane, LLC (d.b.a. The Blackrock Castle)

Mr. Mike Nidoh stated that this item involved the sale of two parcels of land (*as he indicated on the map displayed*). He explained that the back and front sections were recommended to sale to Genshane LLC, *the representative was present*. He explained that Bridgeport acquired three parcels that were cleared and turned into a community parking lot, but Black Rock CDC has gone defunct. And because of the problem of the building being on a wall, it's a Building Department issue. There is also an issue with the easement and setback. He stated that the vision was to improve the aesthetics coming down Fairfield Avenue. The appraisal price will be the sale price. He went on to say the parking lot is lined and doesn't require any loss of spaces and the ground is not paved. He stated that Genshane LLC has maintained the property for two years as part of the agreement and it's open to everyone. The property sale issue was approved by the Bridgeport Redevelopment Agency and it has gone through both commissions. So now they are at the last step of the process, but it's a simple sale of two pieces of land.

Council member McCarthy stated that he was proud to push getting the property for Black Rock Castle. He pointed out it has been a great business and they have been good neighbors. And the fact that they were willing to spend and invest in the city and maintain the property was a good idea. So he was 100% in support.

Council member DePara asked the current appraisal value. Mr. Nidoh said he didn't have a current appraisal yet. But they will get three independent bids and when they come back in, it will be based on square footage.

Council member DePara concurred that Black Rock Castle have been good neighbors; even when it wasn't popular. But as far as the issue with the appraisals, he said he hoped they could have had them beforehand for review. Mr. Nidoh said that the process began two years ago and it was a lengthy process. But if they got the appraisals first, it would have resulted in a staled appraisal. Council member DePara said he understood this, but he asked that information such as this be submitted for reference in the future.

Council member Valle asked what would happen to the rest of the space. Mr. Nidoh said it will remain as parking.

Council member Valle asked why they needed the space. Mr. Nidoh said the back wall needed to be corrected, but they need setback approval from zoning. He pointed out there was a fire door on the property but it was blocking access.

Council member Baker asked how the property was obtained. Mr. Nidoh said it was obtained through the Bridgeport Regional Community Development Corporation that was formed five years ago. The vision was to develop the area and enhance it, so bond money was secured to help out Black Rock. And the \$900k was to implement the first two projects that consisted of the aforementioned properties. They acquired the property as part of the CDC action plan that has now gone defunct. Mr. Lavernoich added that the neighborhood development organization developed a plan and they asked the city to adopt and implement the plan that included acquiring the parcels.

Council member Baker asked if any other parties were interested in the parcels. Mr. Nidoh said they didn't advocate the sale of the other two parcels and they would be maintained for parking.

Council member Baker asked if the property would be open to anyone. Mr. Nidoh said yes, he pointed out on the map they were just acquiring the property denoted in yellow. Council member McCarthy added the parking lot will be required to be open property for anyone's use.

Council member Walsh said he fully supported the proposal, although he would have liked to see the appraisal. He noted that if the proceeds of the sale could further help enhance other businesses in Black Rock, he would support that endeavor also. Mr. Nidoh stated he would need to find out if the bond needs to go back to reduce the debt, but he said he would be open to entertaining Council member Walsh's idea.

Council member Curran said she was in support of the resolution. She said it was an honor to do, noting that she met the owner's years ago. She agreed they started the business when it wasn't popular and it added to the growth of the area. She said they need the space to upgrade their facility to keep in line with other establishments in the area.

Mr. Nidoh asked if the committee wanted to amend the resolution to take the proceeds and put them back into other area businesses enhancements.

Council member DePara stated he should find out if there were any restrictions on the sale first. Mr. Nidoh said he would do that and he suggested making that request a part of the resolution.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION THAT THE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE PROPERTY GO BACK INTO IMPROVEMENTS AND ENHANCEMENTS OF THE ADJOINING PROPERTY KNOWN AS THE CITY MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT, SUBJECT TO THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT'S USE OF THE FUNDS**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AS AMENDED  
\*\* DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**305-05** Amending 267-05 Approved on October 2, 2006 State Funding for Steel Point Infrastructure Improvement and Acquisition Project.

Mr. Ed Lavernoich stated that earlier this fall, they approve a resolution and authorized the Mayor to take all steps to approve the Steel Point acquisition. The Bond Committee authorized an additional \$4.6 million, so they were looking to wrap up with the same budget, contract and documentation. Overall, they were looking to consolidate the resolution.

Council member Dye asked about the second amount authorized. Mr. Lavernoich said the amount was \$4.6 million. Council member Dye asked why it

was added. Mr. Lavernoich said it was added by the governor to take the \$4.3 million and bring it up to \$4.9 million to finish the acquisition of Steel Point.

Council member Curran asked if they would have the financial structure of the deal prior to the Miami trip to visit Midtown Equities. She stressed that she had a concern for the taxpayers and if they default, the issue of whether the taxpayer could be at risk. Mr. Lavernoich said there wouldn't be a vote on December 4, but they will see the LDA (Land Development Agreement) on December 13.

Mr. Lavernoich said as far as bonding, the state authorized through legislation that they could issue up to \$190 million in bonds, but if the project is not developed good enough, the developer will be held accountable.

Council member Walsh asked if this was strictly for the acquisition of the United Illuminating property. Mr. Lavernoich said yes, he explained they will get the deed from UI when they receive the \$10.3 million, but this involves all acquisition related expenses.

Council member Walsh asked if they would need more money from the state. Mr. Lavernoich said yes for the Tallmadge and the Yacht Club.

Council member Walsh asked if the city will be at risk if the project doesn't go forward, i.e., will they have to pay back the state. Mr. Lavernoich said if that happened, the state will then have the right to control who they sell the property to. So if the project doesn't go forward, they will have the say as to how they solicit for another developer.

Council member Walsh stressed that he wanted to make sure the city wasn't at risk if the Conroy case should prevail. Mr. Lavernoich said the restraint the state put on the grants were not tied to the Conroy lawsuit, he saw no connection between Conroy and the city.

Council member McCarthy asked if in combining the two, were there any fundamental changes. Mr. Lavernoich said no, this was just the authorization approval to apply for a bigger grant. He noted they will request an additional \$30 to \$40 million in funding in the future.

Council member Baker asked if the \$14.9 million was for the acquisition of United Illuminating. Mr. Lavernoich said he understood there was an inquiry from Midtown Equities about off site properties and if this is the case, it had to do with their own resources.

Council member Baker asked about the status of the historical house on the property. Mr. Lavernoich said there were no resources set aside to preserve the

O'Rourke house, but there has been talk of dedicating a plaque, but no plans to preserve it.

Dr. Ford who was present at the meeting stated he was there to speak about the result of the acquisition action. He noted that combining the land acquisitions was supported to develop the peninsula, especially for the east end community, but he had a concern about what will happen after. Such as the issue of Midtown Equities refusal to include an affordable housing component in the project. He said that from a taxpayer's point of view, he felt this was flat out wrong, due to the fact that the area has always been a working class community. He expressed that to use public dollars and give it to the developer and not have them provide affordable housing, again was wrong. He strongly suggested that they make sure that point was considered, noting that as housing costs rise, seniors will not be able to afford higher end living residences. And if the city continues to develop where it's not affordable, they will see the impact as it has occurred in other communities. Overall, he felt there needs to be a percentage of affordable housing units included in the project.

Secondly, any developer should address the minority contracting goals and provide contracts for people who work and live in the city. Once again, he asked that they take all this into account and for consideration, with the end result being a project that they can all be proud of.

State Representative Clemons stated he was a proponent of economic development. He expressed that he was still serving in the state house of representatives as Bridgeport moved ahead. He noted that he has worked with Ed Lavernoch in the past on financing for certain projects. At any rate, he had the concerns as Dr. Ford, in that during discussions with the developer, they verbally said that displaced people would have an opportunity for homeownership. However, that's one thing being said and it being actually documented. He emphasized that they want to do all they can to make this a viable place for everyone to live. He stated that he would advocate helping Bridgeport, but it was imperative as legislators to look at what's going to happen and to peruse the contracts. He agreed with Dr. Ford's sentiment that the community has been made up of diverse people for years and they want to be a part of the new development. He questioned if there would be any language inserted in the contract to safeguard a fair percentage for hiring minority contractors. Overall, he said he would like to see a comprehensive approach to this issue. He asked that the city council do their due diligence when it comes to the concerns that have been raised by him and Dr. Ford. With that, he thought they would work together to move the city forward.

Council member Dye recapped that they approved the authorization on October 2, 2006. He asked about the affordable housing component. He recalled that the

contractor did agree to build affordable units, but not on this site. Mr. Lavernoich said that was correct. Council member Dye stated that he thought he heard there would be affordable housing on this site, noting there will be 3,000 units built of upscale housing. Mr. Lavernoich said that in the agreements they will read, there are a lot of inclusionary practices that are inclusive of affirmative action plans for improvements on the site. And there will be requirement that they have to adhere to those practices.

Council member Dye said that may be true, but again, he questioned if there will be affordable housing on this site. Mr. Lavernoich explained that to achieve that kind of density and service the debt, there would have to be a lot of density. He noted that a 1500 sq. ft unit will cost \$450k to construct, so to include an affordability component, the units would have to cost \$175k to build or less. He further stated that they were pushing to include a small amount of affordable units on site, with a lot of comparable units in the surrounding area.

Council member Paoletto stated that he didn't want to stray from the topic at hand. He stressed that these concerns and questions would most likely surface again to be addressed.

Council member Valle stated that she was in support of affordable housing on this site due to the displacements that took place. She stressed that the dollar amount for the condominiums was troublesome to her. She questioned what would happen to people that live in lower-scaled housing, pointing out there is a risk of those people being pushed out. She further emphasized that it's her side of town and district and the concerns have been stated. And it's time to demand!

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DYE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### ADJOURNMENT

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

City of Bridgeport  
Economic and Community Development  
and Environment Committee  
November 21, 2006  
Page 11

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
and ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 17, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council Members: Mulligan, Paoletto, McCarthy, DePara, Valle

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Council Members: Curran, Pivrotto  
Associate City Attorney Trachtenburg.

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

**278-05** Proposed Resolution Pertaining to the Adoption of East Side  
Neighborhood Revitalization Zone Boundaries.

Ms. Angie Staltaro stated she would speak as the representative for the NRZ. She distributed a map showing the boundaries of the east side, noting the resolution stayed the same. They eliminated the part that was included before for the Mill Hill Avenue area and upper Boston Avenue. The area is covered on three sides by water to Steel Point, East Main Street to the Pequonnock River to Yellow Mill Pond to Boston Avenue and Williams Street.

Council member Paoletto relayed that he received a couple of calls regarding this matter and he was asked to ensure where the boundaries were in the old document. Ms. Staltaro clarified that matter pertained to the east side plan only. She explained they cut out the entire area north of Seaview Avenue.

Council member Valle asked for the language that was drafted. Ms. Staltaro said it would be forwarded, noting that the language followed the map exactly.

Council member Paoletto updated that a report was requested prior to the meeting. Ms. Staltaro said she had the description of the east side boundaries. Council member Paoletto stated that he had an issue with those in charge. He stressed that they should have received a brand new resolution. Ms. Staltaro said she was told she didn't need to do that because it was noted that the resolution was attached to the boundary map. Council member Paoletto repeated that they should have had an entirely new resolution. Ms. Staltaro thought there was some communication problem regarding that, but she said it could be done.

Council member Valle emphasized that she would have liked to see something in writing too. She said that she wouldn't vote to table the matter and would encourage it to move forward, but again, they must see something in writing before the next meeting. Ms. Staltaro promised that she would submit the information to the committee members tomorrow.

Council member Paoletto said he would place a call to address the issue tomorrow and to stress the point of what was requested, but not done. He expressed that Ms. Staltaro did a great job, but he expected to see Tom Coble attend the meeting tonight. Again, he was displeased with the paperwork that was submitted through no fault of Ms. Staltaro.

Council member Mulligan stated that he didn't have a copy of the resolution. Council member Paoletto said his copy read 9/15/06; noting it was worked on for months. He recalled the item was tabled before to allow Mr. Coble more time to finalize it.

Council member Mulligan questioned what they had in writing to turn over to the city clerk's office. Council member Paoletto said they already had the entire resolution and they only needed to substitute the map to reflect the correct wording. *A break was called at 6:52 p.m. to allow Ms. Staltaro to check her car for a copy of the entire resolution with the correct language. The meeting reconvened at 6:59 p.m.* Ms. Staltaro stated that she didn't have a copy available.

Council member Paoletto said he was advised by Attorney Trachtenburg that they could mark the map as exhibit-A and pass it contingent upon the wording being specific to the map – *to be submitted to the city clerk's office.*

Council member Paoletto reiterated that his comments weren't directed at Ms. Staltaro, but to the office she was representing. He repeated that he would contact Mr. Coble about the dissatisfactory way the matter was presented.

Council member Mulligan recommended that they identify the northerly boundary on exhibit-A. *Council member Paoletto marked his copy that was attached to the city clerk's office book.*

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION PROPOSED RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE ADOPTION OF EAST SIDE NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ZONE BOUNDARIES AND TO STRIKE THE DESCRIPTION ON PAGE 1 OF THE RESOLUTION THAT BEGINS "AT CORNER OF BOSTON AVENUE AND ENDS WITH 11 WILLIAMS STREET" AND SUBSTITUTE IN ITS PLACE EXHIBIT-A**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE AS AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**06-06** Grant Application with *National Fish and Wildlife Foundation* to Implement a habitat restoration project along Ash Creek (\$96,316).

Ms. Kelly McDermott, Central Grants Office stated there were two grants listed *and* (07-06) and they both have the same project scope. The project is a partnership between the Aquaculture School, Bridgeport Public Facilities and the Black Rock Community Council. They are proposing to implement a restoration habitat project to grow and nurture spartaneous seedlings. Once the seedlings grow, they will be planted along the area of Ash Creek. There are approximately 2,000 to 4,000 plugs that will be planted between Davidson St. and Polan St., and once the plants are in the ground, the purpose is to restore the actual tributaries and coastal. She further noted there has been deterioration over the course of 20 years, so the plantings will help foster many types of marine life. Once planted, the school will go into the second phase to monitor the growth that is expected to be at 100% over a two-year period and will double in size after two years. The third component is community education with the BR Community Council that will explore ways to conduct environmental preservation in their own homes and maintain the habitat.

Ms. McDermott broke down the costs as follows: \$96,316.00 > in-kind match of \$41,316.00. She noted this covers salaries for the teachers who will track all the program requirements to completion. They will also provide the BR Community Council a stipend of \$5,000.00.

**07-06** Grant Application with *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration* Habitat Restoration Grant Program along Ash Creek (\$100,000).

Ms. McDermott stated that this item is for a \$100,000 grant with in-kind match of \$50,000; the project scope is the same as (06-06). She expected that the grants would be approved in April and the program will start around that time.

Mr. Curtis of the Aquaculture School stated that Ms. McDermott covered most of the details. He affirmed that this was a project for the students to involve them in real life environmental issues. He noted the person that implemented the program was also present. He further expressed that the program has been successful. He explained that spartana was a varied species that thrives to provide habitat to reproduce other species that have disappeared. The project will help begin to restore the habitat and will result in restoring species that have disappeared along the coast line. He concurred that they partnered with the BR Community Council.

Council member McCarthy asked about the in-kind match of \$41,316 and if that applied to both programs. Ms. McDermott repeated that the grant projects were the same in scope and if both are funded, they will be achieved in the same way. However, the both projects total the same amount.

Mr. Curtis added that they had a history with Noah when the project was presented on a larger scale, but they were declined for various reasons. So the grant to Noah was based on that history. But they went to another funding source and they will address the issue if they are funded by both funding sources. Overall, they paired the project down and made it more precise to implement during the winter months.

Council member McCarthy asked Ms. McDermott to explain the match in terms of the funds requested. He questioned where the \$5,000 in-kind match came from. Ms. McDermott said that supplies were what the students needed for collecting and planting the seeds.

Council member McCarthy questioned then under the supplies column, the request for \$40k. Ms. McDermott stated they had \$5k in the budget to apply to the match, so they will request \$2,500 for printing expenses and \$5k for the BR Community Council.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE**

Council member Mulligan asked if the maximum cash that would come from the city budget would be \$10k. Ms. McDermott said the amount would be \$5k; the \$5,000 match would be for the students to complete the project, but she wasn't sure if the funds came out of the Public Facilities or Aquaculture School budget.

Council member Mulligan asked if there was a good chance that the grants would be awarded. Mr. Curtis said they modified the grant to address all the issues, per the previous feedback they received. He felt they would get one or both of the fundings.

Council member Curran asked about the grant and the kits that would cost \$650.00 for each student. She questioned if they get both grants, would there be doubling of work. She further questioned whether they really needed \$10k for the outreach component and if \$650.00 allocated to each student was necessary. She noted that it seemed a little expensive. Ms. McDermott stated the cost would be \$60.00 per student. And if they get both grants, they have to meet the objectives and goals of both grants. For example: if they get twice as many students, they would be required to plant 8,000 plants instead of 4,000.

Mr. Curtis stated that if they received both grants, they could do two separate projects; one on one side of Ash Creek and one on the other.

Council member Curran stated that the Black Rock train station remediation would start in April to point out that project might disrupt the restoration projects. Mr. Curtis said the project would be closer to the new condominium area. Council member Curran stated there was a concern of doing the work and then having it disrupted. She cautioned that they should be mindful of safety issues.

Council member Mulligan for clarification if the amount that would come from the city treasury would only be \$5k. Ms. McDermott verified that was the amount. Council member Mulligan mentioned that the city council passed the lobster agreement yesterday, noting that the Aquaculture School does a great job. He thought they would be open to hearing from all community groups and listening to their comments. Overall, he felt that from an aesthetic standpoint, this would be a good project.

Council member Pivrotto stated that with the lobster program, there was no city contribution required. She pointed out that it gets expensive for the city and in this case, a valuable person will be unavailable. She wondered why the city had to provide the support and not have it come from the Board of Education. Ms. McDermott replied that the city decided they wanted to be a lead city under George Estrada, so they worked with them from the onset, but the request was city directed.

Council member Pivrotto stressed that when it's budget time, there will be claims of the BOE being understaffed. And although it's a nice project, she hoped they wouldn't hear about having to hire more staff at budget time.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 06-06**

Council member Curran clarified that in the wildlife application, the pod kits were \$750.00 each. Council member Mulligan commented that if they cost that much, it's coming from the federal government. And if the city can get it, he rather that be the case, noting he would rely on Mr. Curtis to oversee it.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 07-06**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

Council member Paoletto thanked Mr. Curtis and the chemist present for attending the meeting.

**24-06** Grant Application with US Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance,  
To develop a plan that will improve access to mental health and substance abuse  
Services.

Ms. McDermott stated that this was a very interesting project that came through the National Recovery month program. She explained there were 50 to 60 non-profit recovery treatment centers in Bridgeport, so they identified what they felt were upcoming issues surrounding drug abuse. Suggestions were posed on how to help the matter and one suggestion was to establish a Mayor's task force around it. So no later than two months later, a grant came out and what was proposed was to begin the task force and develop a community access map and e-mail list to enable communication so they can communicate outside of the task force. They also developed a strategic plan, wherein they take information from the access map to increase availability of services in Bridgeport and move the plan. The grant total was \$62,500 with an in-kind match from the city and health department for \$12,500; they will also hire a consultant to help develop the plan.

Council member Mulligan asked if she could foresee any involvement with the school system or was it a program just for adults. Ms. McDermott said it wasn't singular to adults only; she thought that school based health centers would be active on the task force.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**25-06** Disposition of City-Owned Property (Auction and Sale).

Mr. Brian Williams of the Mayor's office stated he was present on behalf of Attorney Liskov to discuss (27) property, (13) of them to be auctioned and offered to abutters.

*The first packet of properties for Disposition of City-Owned Property (Auction) was reviewed. It was noted that all the properties were recommended for auction.*

- 7 Armstrong Place
- 6 Armstrong Place
- 291 Harriett Street
- 43 Baldwin Street – building lot
- 128 Holly Street – lot
- 544 Union Avenue
- 207 Harriett Street – row house with (4 to 6) attached units
- 233 Jane Street
- 308 Beach Street – building lot
- 728 Arctic Street

Council member Valle requested removal of 728 Arctic St. she thought this property was planned for the new community garden. Mr. Halsted who was present clarified the property for the community garden was at 509 Arctic St., he pointed out this property was on the corner of Brooks St. Council member Valle withdrew her request to remove 728 Arctic St.

- 192 Exeter Street – large interior lot

Council member Mulligan asked about this property and if it was land locked. Mr. Williams said the city attorney recommended the property be auctioned because it wasn't bringing in any tax dollars, it's just sitting idle. The idea is to make the property active and viable again.

Council member Valle asked if and when the properties are put out to auction was there some type of clause to indicate the time individuals had to clean up a property. Mr. Williams said there was no clause, but they have 30-days and if the owner doesn't take action he defaults on the property.

Council member Paoletto thought they should consider putting a clause in place to address Council member Valle's question.

Council member Valle relayed that there was a prior problem with properties being sold that were meant to be community gardens, so that's why she suggested the clause. Mr. Williams said he would bring the issue to the city attorney's attention.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA MOVED TO APPROVE THE DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (AUCTION)**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

City of Bridgeport  
ECDE Committee  
January 17, 2007  
Page 6

*The second packet of properties for Disposition of City-Owned Property (Sale) was reviewed.*

- 390 Bunnell Street – sold to the abutter

Council member Paoletto asked if all these were all lots. Mr. Williams said yes. Council member Paoletto asked if there was any particular property anyone had an issue with.

Council member Valle requested that **122-126 Arctic St.** be removed from the list to be recommended for a community garden.

It was noted that **65 Whittier Street** was previously listed as a community garden, but it was found to be a dysfunctional property and rated zero. However, there was interest by the abutter to buy it.

Council member Paoletto read the remaining properties into the record:

Council member Valle requested that **28 Stillman Street** be removed to be considered for a community garden.

Council member Valle questioned the property on Stillman Street and what the correct address was. Mr. Williams corrected that the address should be 760 Stillman St. and not 790 Stillman St.

Council member Mulligan asked about 65 Whittier St., noting that property wasn't clear on the map. Mr. Williams explained it was a small sliver pie shaped lot and not buildable. He said he saw it himself.

Council member Paoletto interjected to request that more detail be included on the maps in the future per the new GIS system.

Council member Mulligan asked if the city could come into title for the sliver of property at 65 Whittier Street. Mr. Halsted said that years ago, it was a foreclosure property and approved to sell to the neighboring property, but in the interest of revitalizing the area, there was too much shade to grow anything. Council member Mulligan commented that it just seemed odd that these sliver pieces of property were owned by separate people. Mr. Williams stated there were may like these in the city.

Council member DePara asked about the status of 28 Stillman Street. Council member Valle said she requested removal of that property. Council member DePara said he didn't think it would make a good community garden because most of the area was industrial. He didn't feel there would be any benefit to the community putting a garden there. Council member Valle explained that on that block there were some beautiful houses and there was another house being renovated. So she didn't want that piece of property taken and used just as a parking lot that would end up affecting the quality of life. Council member DePara said he thought it might be a good piece of property to sell to the abutter.

Council member Paoletto felt that the onus would be on Council member Valle to encourage the community garden if that was her wish.

Council member Valle requested that she be copied on any letters sent to abutters in her district. Mr. Williams acknowledged the request.

Council member Mulligan asked about **40 Cottage Place**, noting there were all little houses. He questioned why they wouldn't be buildable. Mr. Williams said Attorney Liskov thought some of them could be, but he didn't have a chance to review them thoroughly. But he did have a letter from the neighbor who was interested in buying it. Mr. Williams said if the committee wanted to request that it be added to the auction list, he would bring it back to the city attorney. The committee members agreed to remove 40 Cottage Place from the list for sale and add it to the auction list per Council member Mulligan's request.

Council member Valle asked about Shelton Street and Ogden Street properties. Mr. Halsted said it was an area where the houses have deteriorated. He noted the houses were formerly crammed in and they really weren't building lots according to today's zoning standards.

Council member Valle asked if there were any lots appropriate for community gardens. Mr. Halsted said he thought that 40 Cottage Place would be, but he couldn't be sure unless he checked it out thoroughly.

Council member Valle stated that she was aware that the city needed the tax money from these sales, but she thought that saving one or two lots wouldn't make a difference. She further expressed that the east side could use all the help it could get.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THAT 40 COTTAGE PLACE BE REMOVED FROM THE DISPOSITION OF OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (SALE) LIST AND ADDED TO THE DISPOSITION OF OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (AUCTION) LIST**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (SALE) LIST AS AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE 25-06 DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (AUCTION AND SALE) AS AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**29-06** West End/West Side Neighborhood Revitalization Zone.

Council member Mulligan stated this proposal referenced the west end/west side boundaries, but there needs to be a determination whether it's within the NRZ. There is a Black Rock Community Council meeting scheduled on January 29; but there hasn't been any opportunity for BR Community Council and the NRZ to have any discussion with the west end/west side, to discuss where the boundaries should be. He thought it was crucial that they come to an agreement on that.

Council member Paoletto commented that he respected the request, but again, he thought there needed to be more continuity in discussions. Council member Mulligan updated that Mr. Coble did call him to alert him about the possible problem, so he didn't think it was his fault in this case. He stressed there were boundaries to clarify and it was important for them to be in agreement.

Council member Pivrotto commended Council member Mulligan for suggesting they table the item until all involved can sort it out.

Ms. Staltaro said that the Planning Department based all the information on the census track, but in the west end, they asked for volunteers to meet on the committee; so they met with west end representatives to resolve what boundaries they wanted. They also went to the BR Community Council to select volunteers. She thought that upon the January 29 meeting, the matter could be resolved shortly thereafter. Council member Mulligan thought it might take a little longer to resolve. He added that the south end should also be involved, noting there were many issues concerning the whole NRZ process. He further noted there have been many pitfalls as well as many opportunities. Overall, he hoped there would be a good cross section of input from all walks of life.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO TABLE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **ADJOURNED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 22, 2007  
6:30 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: Rodgerson, Mojica, Vizzo-Paniccia, Walsh

**ABSENT:** Council members: Baker, Blunt, Paoletto

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Council members: Mulligan, Pivrotto, Valle, Ayala

**CITY ATTORNEY:** Mark Anastasi,  
**ASSOCIATE CITY ATTORNEY:** Melanie Howlett

Co-chair Rodgerson called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m.

Approval of committee meeting minutes: December 26, 2007

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**16-06** Reappointment of Charlton P. Hamer (U) to the Bridgeport Redevelopment Agency

Council member Rodgerson asked Mr. Hamer if he was currently serving on the board. Mr. Hamer said yes.

Mr. Hamer said that he moved to Bridgeport eight years ago. His background and education was in urban planning where he served municipalities in Chicago. He explained that since he now lives here, he had a vested interest to serve on the board. He further noted that Bridgeport was a great opportunity for encouraging land use issues.

Council member Mojica asked if this was a reappointment. Mr. Hamer said yes, noting he served on the board for three or four years.

Council member Mojica asked the types of things the agency was involved in. Mr. Hamer said they were active in construction, site assembly and the approval process. He pointed out that they have been involved in the hearings for the new schools and the Steel Point site assembly; as well as the city's disposition of property to various developers.

Council member Mojica asked as far as redevelopment was concerned, what his opinion was regarding the development Steel Point will bring to Bridgeport. Mr. Hamer said he thought it would bring significant revenue to the city. He expressed that if they looked at development revenue that

would come, it might help offset issues that might be burdensome to the city. He said if you looked at the development aspect and the multipliers that might result, such as an increase in property values in the area, there might be an opportunity to create more affordable housing. But the whole issue is timeliness that he hoped would come to fruition.

Council member Mojica asked him as a taxpayer and serving on the board, if he felt that Steel Point would be good for Bridgeport. Mr. Hamer said yes, from a taxpayer's perspective and from an economic perspective.

Council member Walsh asked about his prior work with Coastal and if he thought affordable housing was a deterrent to economic development. Mr. Hamer said no, he saw it as an enhancement to economic development, because they would be building for the affordable population. He pointed out it could only be profitable if a not-for-profit entity took on the task, noting the project needs to be feasible from a construction standpoint.

Council member Walsh asked how involved Mr. Hamer was with the Town of Stamford's development. Mr. Hamer said he never worked in the Stamford municipality, but as far as set-asides, he said he wasn't sure what was involved to finance that. He stated that it does become an issue when a developer comes in to determine the number of affordable units that can be constructed and this is sometimes based on buildable square footage allowed to him; that determined how many affordable units would be feasible.

Mr. Hamer went on to say that when they look at affordable housing, he looks at incentive, realizing that it might become a disincentive for a developer based on any number of factors.

Council member Rodgerson stated that he was glad to see a resident of Bridgeport acknowledged in the trade and where the city was going.

Council member Mulligan asked what Mr. Hamer's present employment was. Mr. Hamer stated he worked for a large general contractor in Brooklyn. He manages real estate assets and he's currently working on a 500-unit condominium in Brooklyn.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER WALSH SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**17-06** Appointment of John Kenyhercz (R) to the Planning & Zoning Commission

Mr. Kenyhercz approached the committee.

Council member Rodgerson asked Mr. Kenyhercz why he was looking to serve on the P&Z Commission. Mr. Kenyhercz stated that he has always lived in the city and has been involved in what goes on here in the background. He expressed that he has supported candidates in the past, such as Rick Torres who ran for mayor. The Republican Town Committee then let him know that

Mr. Torres would be speaking to the city council, so he started attending meetings regularly as a representative from the town committee. Eventually, Mayor Fabrizi noticed him at all the meetings and told him that if he had any questions, to speak to him. Subsequently, conversations began with him and Mayor Fabrizi suggested that he serve on the commission. Then Commissioner Dorgan of the P&Z Commission told him she submitted his name to serve on the commission.

Council member Rodgerson asked if he actually served on the commission at any of the meetings. Mr. Kenyhercz said yes, he served on the commission as an alternate. He further noted that although it is time consuming, it's good to have some input in what goes on in the city.

Council member Mojica asked if this was a reappointment or a new appointment. Mr. Kenyhercz said it was a new appointment. He expressed there wouldn't be any time conflicts with attending the meetings. He stated serving was a learning process and while it's a lot of work, he found it very rewarding.

Council member Mojica mentioned the practice of some commissioners visiting sites in the city to get a feel of what's involved for an application and to make informed decisions. He asked if when he saw buildings that might be out of character with neighborhood, what is his take on the situation. Mr. Kenyhercz mentioned a Kossuth Street project, wherein there is an application to put a business in the area where the dog track is. He said he questioned whether this was the right location to put it, noting it could be a quality of life issue.

Council member Walsh asked about two e-mails submitted. One was from Aretha Foster dated July 22, 2006 regarding 2005 tax bills for a house and vehicle. He pointed out that the Acting Tax Collector Ms. Lenz responded back a couple days later indicating that Mr. Kenyhercz was current on his taxes. Council member Walsh questioned what occurred in between the time the taxes were owed and then subsequently paid. Council member Rodgerson said he would follow up with the Tax Collector to assure there were no outstanding taxes due. Mr. Kenyhercz stated that he thought there was some confusion due to the fact that his application was submitted on July 10, 2006, which would explain the gap in the time the taxes were paid.

Council member Walsh asked who Mr. Kenyhercz was replacing. He pointed out that information was required by city ordinance. Mr. Kenyhercz responded that he thought he replaced Dorothy Guman; he was approached after she resigned.

Council member Walsh commented there were three other commissioners that were no longer serving on the P&Z Commission, they were; Dorothy Guman, Andre Baker and Richard Womic.

Council member Walsh questioned whether or not they could move forward on the appointment. He emphasized that they needed to know who Mr. Kenyhercz was replacing. He noted that the charter language outlines that appointments should reflect the diversity of Bridgeport, so if Mr. Kenyhercz was replacing a female and all the other candidates were male, then he thought this should be clarified.

Council member Walsh stated that full time members that serve on the commissioner are generally required to take a training course from the State of Connecticut. Mr. Kenyhercz said he attended a session held by the state. He added that there was another session held by a law firm, but that wasn't counted as a training requirement. Attorney Anastasi stated there were continuing legal educational forums that the Mayor's office and OPED encourage commissioners to attend. He thought there were other training programs that would come up periodically.

Council member Walsh asked since he's been serving as an alternate, has he been asked to attend any meetings. Mr. Kenyhercz said yes, he has attending willingly.

Council member Walsh asked if he was ever at a meeting when there were more alternates than permanent commissioners in attendance. Mr. Kenyhercz said he was a second alternate, but now he was the only one; there was another person who only attended once. But there haven't been any cases where there were more alternates at a meeting. Associate City Attorney Howlett explained there were occasions where more than one alternate showed up at a meeting, but they didn't participate in voting.

Council member Pivrotto commended Mr. Kenyhercz for his dedication in attending meetings.

Council member Rodgerson asked about the 1500 ft. rule and if Mr. Kenyhercz was familiar with the Madison Avenue area. He pointed out issues concerning consumer licenses and serving alcoholic beverages the same as they do in the downtown area. Mr. Kenyhercz said if there were community concerns, he would have to weigh the issues before making a judgment on a particular situation.

Council member Mojica noted for the record that at the last meeting, the committee and the Public Safety Committee asked to put forth the recommendation to obtain a listing of all board members, when their appointments expire and their party affiliation.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER WALSH MOVED TO TABLE FOR THE PUPOSE OF OBTAINING INFORMATION ON WHOSE POSITION MR. KENYHERCZ WAS FILLING. AND ALSO TO OBTAIN AN UPDATE ON HIS TAXES STATUS**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **26-06 The Fair and Equitable Assignment of all City Sheriff Work to all elected City Sheriffs**

Council member Pivrotto stated that she and Council member Walsh were the makers of the resolution. She pointed out the matter involved sheriffs being elected and how work should be equitably distributed to all six sheriffs in the city. She updated on Mr. Cecil Young's comments that he made at the city council meetings, where he indicated that there was a lack of work going to him. She read *Section 7. Salaries of elected officials that outlined "The city council, by ordinance, shall have the power and authority to determine and change the salaries or other compensation of all elected officials of the city.* She stated that if the charter gives the city council the authority to

determine salaries, then this authority should also apply for a sheriff getting work. It was noted that Attorney Liskov indicated that Mr. Young was the best and most reliable sheriff.

Attorney Anastasi stated the legal opinion that he submitted was pretty clear on where he stood, in that, there was no legal basis to pass the resolution proposed.

Council member Mojica stated that he felt all elected officials in Bridgeport should get a fair share as far as jobs performed and distributed by the city. He felt this was important so that everyone gets a fair piece of the pie. However, he referenced *Section 7* that read "*During each even numbered year the city council shall review the compensation of all elected officials etc.*", he pointed out that even if they acted on that recommendation; this was an odd numbered year. Also, he didn't feel the city should tell the city attorney's office, whom should be eligible for a job, he didn't think the committee had jurisdiction to dictate that. He reiterated that they should send message to indicate that all elected officials should get a fair share of work.

Council member Rodgerson referred to the letter given to the city attorney's office regarding the sheriff's ability to work or not work. Attorney Anastasi stated that he wasn't able to discuss that matter because it was confidential. He pointed out also outlined were other justifiable reasons why there was a lack of work for Mr. Young.

Council member Rodgerson asked if that one item was sufficient enough to stop other work. Attorney Anastasi said absolutely.

Council member Walsh questioned some of the language that pertained to a portion of the charter related to the assignment of work per the retention of outside council. He thought that was specific to the city council, stressing that the bond council went out to RFQ, but the selection of sheriff's work was handled differently. He further suggested that in his opinion, sheriff's work should be done by rotation. He further noted that in reading the legal opinion, the party affiliation of a sheriff doesn't come into play. Attorney Anastasi replied that under federal law, they are forbidden to discriminate based on affiliation.

Council member Walsh stated that he would like to see a breakout of all work meted out to all sheriffs. Attorney Anastasi said that was FOI information. Council member Walsh clarified that he was requesting that information directly from the city attorney.

Council member Rodgerson stated that he e-mailed and phoned the CIO requesting detail and distribution of work over the last two years, but he never received it. Attorney Anastasi stated that the CIO wasn't available, but he would put in a request to him to follow up with that information.

Council member Walsh returned to the matter of rotation for sheriffs. Attorney Anastasi said there was one type of work done on rotation basis, but there were concerns for the individual to do the kind of work that sheriffs and marshals perform. He urged the committee members to carefully review paragraph 6 of his legal opinion.

Council member Mojica read the paragraph referencing that the position was terminated due to medical reasons that made him unable to perform his duties. He asked if as time passed, was a letter ever submitted indicating that Mr. Young was able to return to work. Attorney Anastasi said he would confirm that with Attorney Liskov. Mr. Young responded to the question. He said at the time, he indicated that he wasn't able to work for the boot finder program.

Council member Mojica asked him what month he submitted a letter indicating he was okay to return to work. Mr. Young said he issued a note stating that he was under doctor's care for anxiety. And during the same period, he got laid off without medical coverage. Mrs. Young clarified there was no note indicating that he couldn't do sheriffs work, but Attorney Liskov asked for a note indicating he could return and that was done on April 28, 2006. Mr. Young reemphasized that he wasn't able to perform the boot finder duties.

City Attorney Anastasi went on to say that Mr. Young referenced allegations that the City of Bridgeport and the city attorneys had issues with him and he alleged there was harassment and bribery taking place. Attorney Anastasi pointed out that if you have a professional relationship with a sheriff in the city; they need to have faith, integrity and an indication of workability in that person. He repeated that the committee should review paragraph 6 again.

Council member Pivrotto stated that the city's sheriffs were appointed by election. Attorney Anastasi said there was nothing in the charter outlining that they are empowered to work for the city and how they are hired is not addressed by the charter. Council member Pivrotto disagreed, noting that when people vote for a sheriff, most of them think they are being assured that a sheriff will be actively working. She also noted that even though there were human rights complaints filed, she didn't feel that was an offense that should result in being fired. Attorney Anastasi said if they employed that relationship that would be correct, but he emphasized there would be an issue hiring someone who has a grievance against the city and the city attorney's office, again, as was suggested by Mr. Young for harassment and bribery.

Council member Mulligan asked about the nature of the complaints Mr. Young filed. Mr. Young said he filed four or five ethics complaints six months to a year ago, but he hasn't received a response to any of them. Attorney Anastasi said that was because there was no probable cause found with respect to the complaints. He said however, that he would notify Mr. Young of the outcome of the complaints.

Council member Mojica stated that the process to implement a rotation process was an excellent suggested per Council member Walsh. Attorney Anastasi said while it sounded nice, from a professional standpoint, they needed to have mutual trust and confidence in someone. But it creates difficult circumstances working under someone who questions their ethics.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMER MOJICA MOVED TO TABLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING INFORMATION HOW SHERIFFS WORK IS METED OUT. ALSO, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MR. YOUNG TO PROVIDE COPIES OF ANY LETTERS REGARDING HIS MEDICAL LEAVE/RETURN**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMER WALSH SECONDED**

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

---

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA MOVED TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

*The committee entered into executive session at 7:46 p.m.*

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA MOVED TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

*The executive session ended at 8:15 p.m.*

41-06 Settlement of Litigation for: Thelma Claytor

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH TWO VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE VOTE IN OPPOSITION  
(COUNCIL MEMBER WALSH)

\*Council member Mojica stated for the record that the settlement amount was \$35k.

\*Not on consent calendar

#### ADJOURNED

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MOJICA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON  
ECD & ENVIRONMENT AND CONTRACTS  
FEBRUARY 13, 2007  
7:00**

**ATTENDANCE:** Council Members, Poletto, McCarthy, Depara, Valle,  
Mulligan, Pivirotto, Colon, Curran

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Valerie Sorrentino, Attorney Lisa Trachtenburg

**CALL TO ORDER**

Co-Chair Paoletto called the meeting to order 7:14

**59-06 ALLOCATION OF CDBG FUNDING FROM SADA TO CITY OF  
BRIDGEPORT/LEASE AUTHORIZATION**

Ms. Sorrentino stated to the committee that the money allocated to SADA needs to be reallocated to the City of Bridgeport for the operation of the Spanish Senior Center, we are presently up an running and need to transfer the money from the City to Marrakech. The seniors on the East Side really utilize the senior center, it helps them with social activities and hot meals.

Council member Valle sated that we need this center and that they really need the extra room that it will give the seniors.

Council member Colon stated that it is very overwhelming to have 27 seniors in the two rooms. This will be the best thing to happen to East Side.

Council member dePara asked how much more room they will have and is there room for expansion?

Ms. Sorrentino state that the rooms are very large and that they will now have a room for the office, a computer room and a room for a nurse.

Council member Mulligan asked if the lease was the same as SADA.

Attorney Trachtenburg stated that the new lease of \$40,000 which includes utilities comes to approximately \$10,00 a s.f. which is money already set aside for the lease at the time of the sale from SADA to Marrakech

Council member Mulligan asked about the renewal of the lease.

Attorney Trachtenburg stated that the City as well as Marrakech has an option to renew from year to year.

Council member Mulligan stated that he was not comfortable with the open-end renewal and thought it in the best interest to just approve this year's lease and rewrite the lease for the additional years.

Attorney Trachtenburg agreed to amend the resolution to remove "and an option to renew from year to year".

**ECD & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE:**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MC CARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE #59-06  
REALLOCATION OF CDBG FUNDING FROM SADA TO THE  
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT/LEASE AUTHORIZATION AS  
AMENDED.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DE PARA SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**CONTRACTS COMMITTEE:**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PIVIROTTI MOVED TO APPROVE 59-06  
REALLOCATION OF CDBG FUNDING FROM SADA TO THE  
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT/LEASE AUTHORIZATION AS  
AMENDED.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DE PARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECD & ENVIRONMENT & CONTRACTS:**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE 59-06  
REALLOCATION OF CDBG FUNDING FROM SADA TO  
THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT/LEASE AUTHORIZATION AS  
AMENDED.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER CURRAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY  
\*\* CONSENT CALENDAR**

**ADJOURNED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MC CARTHY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Meeting adjourned at 7:40

Respectfully submitted  
Pat Anzellotti, City Clerk's Office

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
and ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 21, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council Members: Dye, Mulligan, DePara, Valle

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Council Members: Curran, Pivrotto, Walsh

**OTHERS:** Ed Lavernoch; OPED, Samuel Shaw; OPED, Rina Bakalar; Central Grants, Angie Staltaro, OPED

Co-chair Dye called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of January 17, 2007

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**29-06** West End/West Side Neighborhood Revitalization Zone.

Mr. Shaw, of OPED and Angie Staltaro, OPED presented this item to the committee. Mr. Shaw stated they were present to address the west end/west side boundaries. He referred to the handout distributed that he said delineated the streets that surround the boundaries. He updated that they met with the Black Rock NRZ and the people from the proposed south end NRZ. Both were in agreement with the boundaries and there were no issues. He pointed out that as they read through the guide around the perimeter, they would see the outside of the street that was always taken into account, so no street was bisected. There will be development on one side, but they will have to work together where the two NRZ's abut. He explained that other common ground was discussed with Black Rock and the west end, per the denoted area on the map. He further noted that a problem came up where the census tracks were, regarding how the city took the census information and used it as a guideline. But out of concern for the two neighborhoods, they held meetings to discuss the boundaries.

Mr. Shaw referred to the changes around Rooster River near the railroad track, he pointed out the boundary made sense in that area because there were no viaducts and Black Rock can't access the area; the line then runs down to Bostwick Avenue. He noted that wasn't an arbitrary choice because there is a designated land use pocket in the area. He said they also discussed where affiliation was and it was felt they were connected to Black Rock.

Council member Valle asked which districts were in question. Council member Mulligan said the districts consisted of 130<sup>th</sup>, 131<sup>st</sup> and 132<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Staltaro explained that the 130<sup>th</sup> and 131<sup>st</sup> districts covered one half of the area and the other half was covered by Council member Pivrotto and Council member Walsh's district (132<sup>nd</sup>) where most of the NRZ falls that is heavy residential and a historic area.

Council member Curran asked about the Cedar Creek boundary out to the Black Rock Harbor. She asked if the language was available referencing that boundary. Mr. Shaw said he didn't have that information, noting that he dealt strictly with the borders, but he could add it in. Ms. Staltaro added that because of a lot of lobbying, they decided the same type of agreement should be made between Black Rock and the west end. Mr. Shaw added that he expected there would be a discussion between those parties.

Council member Mulligan stated that the map really seemed to outline the west side. He recalled that was Council member Mojica's question also. Ms. Staltaro said Council member Mojica felt that because the upper portion was more the west side, he thought perhaps they should call the other end the west end. Council member Mulligan repeated it really seemed that what was denoted on the map should be considered the west side. Mr. Shaw thought a solution would be to determine if the area should be designated Black Rock/west end or west end/west side.

Council member Pivrotto said she read e-mails concerning this point and she understood Council member Mojica's concern. She said it seemed to her the area would be considered the west side. Mr. Shaw said he didn't have an exact answer to the question. Council member Mulligan thought that as a matter of perception, they could let each NRZ decide what term they were comfortable using.

Council member Dye asked why Bostwick Avenue was included. Mr. Shaw said it was the most natural manmade marker. Also, businesses surveyed felt they had more orientation to the west end. It's also a big industrial area.

Council member Dye asked then if Ellsworth Avenue was considered to be Black Rock. Ms. Staltaro said yes. Council member Mulligan added that many believed that where Ellsworth Avenue ends was Black Rock.

Council member Mulligan thought the important area was where Mr. Shaw pointed out. He mentioned there was some fear by businesses about a condominium being proposed. He said in the future, the three districts will probably grapple with that issue and there may be a convergence of opinion or a difference in opinion. But he thought that was a matter for future discussions.

Mr. Shaw mentioned that the boundaries could be amended in the future if necessary.

Council member Mulligan asked if it was true the south-enders didn't want to include Winfield for the south end boundary. Mr. Shaw said that was correct.

Council member Dye asked if there were any problems with the Hollow NRZ. Council member DePara said there were boundaries that went into other districts, but they made sure that development didn't overlap, but essentially there weren't any problems.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

31-06 EPA CLEANUP Grant for 336 Central Avenue.

Ms. Rina Bakalar, of the Central Grants approached the committee. She explained the reason for the two separate applications was because the EPA requires that the parcels be viewed separately. So they needed to submit separate applications. She pointed out the property was located near the site named "Mt. Trashmore". She noted they were awarded funds to clean up the property in the past. She explained that across the street, there are two parcels on Johnson's Creek that have been urban developed, but this parcel is the larger of the two. They applied for a \$200k grant in clean up funds and the reason they are targeting this parcel is to allow access to Johnson's Creek for the community's use. However, the parcels need to be made safe, noting that they are currently contaminated. So this was the best case scenario in the interest of public health and also to save the ecological resources. She said the goal was to access \$200k through the EPA that will be targeted for development and green space boardwalk access. She noted that across the street, there may be potential for housing redevelopment. Overall, she expressed there would be a nice picture created as a result of the clean up.

Council member Valle said she toured the area with people from the EPA. She noted that they were aware the creek was unsafe, but below it there is a can company. She asked if any thought had been given to cleaning up that area also. Ms. Bakalar agreed there were a number of industrial buildings surrounding the area, but she said she wasn't sure if it was feasible to clean those sites up at this time. She further agreed there were other problems along the creek, but right now, they thought it was more important to clean up the sites proposed.

Mr. Lavernoich said the NRZ process would ultimately guide land use regulation in accordance with the master plan.

Council member Mulligan asked where the sites were located in relation to the new school. Mr. Lavernoich said the school was farther north.

Council member Mulligan commented that they couldn't weed out all the industrial businesses to accommodate the NRZ plans. He emphasized that it was important that they don't pollute the area, but some of them needed to remain for economical reasons.

Ms. Bakalar said there was an in-kind match of \$40k. She noted that it's possible developers may come up with the match, but if they don't the city is obligated to. She said the monies have already been identified per Nancy Hadley and CDBG sources.

Council member Dye asked if this proposal was part of the Johnson Creek project. Ms. Bakalar said it was in her opinion, noting it's a beginning.

Council member Walsh asked if there was anything in state law that would allow a city to impose surtax for development to the waterfront. He thought imposing a fee could aid ongoing development of waterfront access. Mr. Lavernoich said he wasn't aware of any proviso they could impose to accomplish that. He added that property owners on the water would probably indicate that they were overtaxed already. However, he thought they might be able to explore Council member Walsh's suggestion.

Ms. Bakalar thought they could identify other grants to pursue waterfront access. She commented that generally, when people see tangible action taken toward a plan, it sometimes becomes easier to obtain grant monies.

Mr. Lavernoich commented that Ms. Bakalar's office has done a great job securing grants.

Council member DePara commented that the work being done was a good thing. And although there was a match to meet, for a project of this magnitude he thought it was a worthwhile investment. He expressed the purpose was to do all they could to take the city back and he urged his colleagues to not perceive the \$40k match as an obstacle, but to look at it as paying \$40k to get \$200k.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**32-06** EPA CLEANUP Grant for 179 Trowel Street.

Ms. Bakalar stated the same information and details indicated above also pertained to this adjacent parcel.

Council member Dye asked if the grant would clean up both parcels. Ms. Bakalar said she expected it would.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\* Consent calendar

**52-06** 2006-2008 State Department of Health LEAD POSONING REVENTION GRANT.

The representative for this item wasn't present. The committee decided to vote on the item, noting if there was an issue it could be brought up during the next city council meeting.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Not on consent.

**54-06** State Funding for Steel Point Infrastructure Improvement and Acquisition  
Project: Modification to Resolution 305-05.

Mr. Lavernoich stated the resolution was amended to increase the amount the Mayor originally authorized according to the acquisition through the governor's office at \$5.5 million. He noted that authorization would increase it from \$13.1 million to \$18.6 million.

Council member Dye asked if this was state money. Mr. Lavernoich said yes.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\* Consent calendar

**ADJOURNED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DePARA MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MARCH 5, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletto, Co-chair; Marie Valle, Thomas McCarthy, Johnnie Dye, Thomas Mulligan, Angel DePara, James Holloway.

**OTHERS:** Keith Rodgerson,

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

73-06 Proposal to request that the Urban Green Builders come before the ECD & E Committee to provide an update on their projects and future phases.

**ITEM 73-06**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MAKES A MOTION TO APPROVE 73-06 PROPOSAL TO REQUEST THAT THE URBAN GREEN BUILDERS COME BEFORE THE ECD & E COMMITTEE TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THEIR PROJECTS AND FUTURE PHASES.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Mr. Rodgerson arrived at this point.

Mr. Rodgerson gave his opinion on ITEM 73-06 Proposal to request that the Urban Green Builders come before the ECD & E Committee to provide an update on their projects and future phases.

Councilmember Mulligan also gave his opinion on ITEM 73-06 Proposal to request that the Urban Green Builders come before the ECD & E Committee to provide an update on their projects and future phases.

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Sheehan

Telesco Secretarial Services

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment Committee

March 5, 2007

Page 1

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and  
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
MARCH 20, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council Members: Paoletto, Valle, Mulligan, McCarthy, DePara

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Council Members: Curran, Mojica, Walsh

**OTHERS:** Ed Lavernoich, OPED; Kathy Hunter, Deputy Director of Housing

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

Council member Paoletto reminded everyone that there would be a special meeting held on March 29 with Urban Green Builders.

Approval of Minutes February 21, 2007

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Approval of Minutes March 5, 2007

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**82-06** Disposition of 417 Myrtle Avenue: Offer to purchase from LaRosa Del Monte Express

Mr. Lavernoich referred to the resolution to authorize the sell of the property that is about to be foreclosed on. He said the property was located on the south end at the corner of Austin Street and Myrtle Avenue. The approval will allow a minority business to expand their business, noting they are already a tenant, and they were looking to stabilize the business. He pointed out the resolution was co-sponsored by Council members Mojica and Colon.

Council member Mojica said that LaRosa Del Monte was a Hispanic moving company that has been in existence for 25 years; they have been present in the community for a long time and are good neighbors and keep the area clean. The neighbor across the street owns three houses in the area and he expressed that they are great neighbors. Council member spoke about keeping the business in the city because they have been here a long time and are looking to stay. He thought rather than put the property out to bid for a higher price and perhaps force an established business

out, he felt it was a good opportunity to allow an existing business to stay. He said they planned to pay market value for the property at appraisal price.

Council member Walsh questioned if they were foreclosing on the property anyway, why come in now to negotiate. He thought they should have come before the committee when they had a dollar amount in place. He stressed that the city council couldn't be sure of the dollar amount negotiated after the fact. Mr. Lavernoich said that appraisal price was \$65,000 and the back taxes are \$6,000, but the appraisal may end up being more.

Council member Walsh asked if that was the minimum amount paid to the city. Mr. Lavernoich said no. Council member Walsh once again questioned, why not wait until the dollar amount was settled on.

Attorney Dzurick stated he was representing LaRosa Del Monte. He explained the foreclosure was virtually complete and the title should vest in the city next month. In terms of price, they will agree to pay fair market value, and they are trying to get the property as the most logical use; but determining a price by appraisal was by putting it on the open market.

Council member Walsh clarified that he would like to have seen the price negotiated first and then reported to committee.

Council member Valle commended the resolution makers for bringing the matter forward. She thought that if the property was put out to bid, it might have it open to anyone. So she was in full support regardless of the selling price, because it will help in the overall beautification process. She said she was in complete favor of something like this being done on the east side too.

Council member Mojica mentioned that if he thought there was something shady or inappropriate going on with the transaction, he wouldn't have submitted his name as a resolution maker. Again, the business is good for Bridgeport.

Council member Mulligan asked if the deal was contingent upon the purchase of the adjacent property. Mr. Lavernoich said yes.

Council member Mulligan asked for details about the purchase price. He asked if the fair market appraisal was \$65k, what could happen to change that. Mr. Lavernoich said there were some flaws in the appraisal that could result in an increase or decrease. But if they don't want to pay the \$65k, they will commission the appraisal and the interested party will pay for it.

Attorney Dzurick said the appraisal was done by a law firm in New Haven. And although there are contingencies, they are under contract to buy the remainder of the property because they need the space to carry out all the functions of the moving company. So there is no contingency to get out of the deal and in buying the property, they are not only talking about enhancement of the property, but it will allow a business to stay that has been here for 20 years.

Mr. Lavernoich commented that whether the price was lower or higher, it will still exceed the back taxes owed on the property, he reiterated they are dealing with a good appraisal company.

Council member Mulligan said he understood the comment about wanting a firm price in place, but he expressed the need to encourage a good business to stay. He said he would leave it up to the discretion of Mr. Lavernoich to negotiate the price. He pointed out this was also an example of an industrial use mixed in with housing; he said if it works for the community, then it's good thing.

Council member DePara asked if a full commercial appraisal was done. Mr. Lavernoich said they did a comparative sales appraisal.

Council member DePara asked if the client planned on pursuing another appraiser. Attorney Dzurick said not necessarily, but it was his fair guess whether an appraisal brings in more or less, it wasn't terribly important to his client given the ramifications of the transaction.

Council member DePara commended Attorney Dzurick's client. He shared that he remembered the business when from growing up in the area.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

**84-06** Request to forgive demolition Lien 33 Sixth Street

Ms. Hunter stated this request was to forgive and relieve a demolition lien in favor of Fannie Mae who became the owner for the buildable lot they were seeking to rehabilitate. She noted that Bridgeport was selected to receive a designation for revitalization, and as they went through the process of developing the lot, they realized there was a \$26,000 demolition lien applied during the 1990's. Overall they were requesting forgiveness of the lien so the property can be conveyed to develop the area.

Council member McCarthy asked if the city owned the property at one time. Ms. Hunter said yes, there was \$12,000 due in back taxes and \$6,000 for the sewer. They were asking forgiveness on the demolition lien to develop the lot for fair market housing.

Council member Baker said he felt there was a need to bring development into the area and bring life back.

Council member Mulligan asked about the conditions placed and what they were. Ms. Hunter said it needed to be developed in accordance with the plans for housing that is planned. Council member Baker added that it meant it will have to be in accordance with the NRZ plan for residential. He noted the plan identifies specific lots consisting of two houses.

Mr. Lavernoich said the city council approved the plan and it was adopted by the Redevelopment Agency in the year 2000. He said most of the lots were dedicated to one and two family housing.

Council member Walsh asked if the property was being given to the city by the developer. Ms. Hunter said no, Fannie Mae owned the property. Council member Walsh commented that they really didn't if there was a lien on it.

Council member Walsh said he had a concern about the number of demolition liens in the city, he thought they might perpetuate an attitude of "*do for one, than do for all*". Ms. Hunter said that federal funds can't be used to pay off liens for the city per Council member Walsh's previous comment.

Ms. Hunter said that each person would have to come before the council to have a lien released, but there's supposed to be a partnership between the city and Fannie Mae to develop properties, noting they can't develop the east end on home dollars.

Council member Walsh asked what the projected cost would be for development. The response was that it would be \$240k total.

Council member McCarthy asked if this would create homeownership. He also asked what the guidelines would be for purchasing. It was stated that the person would have to be able to pay off the loan.

Council member McCarthy asked what criteria they would use to sell to the owner occupier with the tenant on either the first or second floor. He also questioned if they were looking to increase the rate of home ownership in the east end. Ms. Hunter said they should be able to sell between \$40k and \$50k, noting they were looking to have sustainable homeownership.

Council member Mulligan commented that they don't want someone from say the Town of Easton to come along, buy the property and flip it; he emphasized it was important to possibly apply that caveat. It was stated that there will be home subsidies involved in the down payment.

Council member Mulligan stated that if the city was giving up something, they should be entitled to setting certain conditions, such as a covenant for releasing the lien. He asked if something could be worked out to assure the development is kept as home ownership. It was stated that the homes will be required to be sold as home owner occupied, but if there weren't any other subsidies to hold the family accountable, he didn't think they could do that. It was stated an attorney would be consulted on that matter and reported back.

Council member DePara asked if the homes would be marketed to first time homebuyers. Ms. Hunter said the preference would be to do that. Council member DePara said his intent would be to give an opportunity to a first time buyer especially for someone that has lived in the community for a long time. Ms. Hunter said it could also be perceived as giving an opportunity to someone living in the area to move up.

Council member Paoletto stated the next council meeting was on April 2, so if additional information was required, they could schedule a special ECDE meeting before then. Council member Valle asked if the information needed could be emailed to everyone. Ms. Hunter said she could report back with the alternative language.

Council member Mulligan suggested they hold a 5-minute meeting before the next city council meeting, and then the information could be added to the resolution and referred for council action.

Council member Valle commented that it was important that doors are open to first time home buyers. She said that although there are those that may want to move up, that's fine, but she felt if people were looking to do, most likely they would move to the suburbs. She also emphasized the importance of first time homebuyers attending workshops. She urged that they give the opportunity to first time buyers.

Ms. Hunter stated the reason for allowing people to move up was to promote a blending of people in a community, noting that currently there is no mechanism to encourage that. Council member Valle said that may be true, but by allowing first time buyers the opportunity, that will add to the wealth of the community as well.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO TABLE UNTIL APRIL 2, 2007 TO BE  
TAKEN UP BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING THAT EVENING  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**90-06** Proposed Moratorium on any and all new, and extension of existing, industrial use permits until new Master Plan that considers industrial zone, health and welfare issues is finalized

Council member Valle conceded to Council member Curran to speak first.

Council member Curran stated the beginnings of this matter happened after Council members Valle, Colon and she took a tour of the east side and the surrounding area that have heavy industrial uses. They found the areas were dirty with dumping and a power plant. She said on January 6, 2007, within three days there were two newspaper articles about mulching and a tree business that bypassed a directive. So with the master plan being implemented, she thought it was a good time to address the issue. She went on to say the result of the tour was amazing, in that they found health issues were at stake in terms of poor air quality. But there was also the presence of businesses surrounding homes, day care centers and the Steel Point site where work force housing is planned. The area is zoned Heavy-Industrial and what they saw had been pierced by residential, educational uses and tourist uses, so they didn't feel the area was functioning as a Light-Industrial zone anymore due to the people living there. She stressed that a concern for them had to come first.

Council member Curran recalled that everyone attended the subcommittee meetings dealing with the master plan and NRZ's and the theme was consistent regarding the need to fight the matter of dust and pollutants. She referred to some data researched that cited the City of Bridgeport as having one of the worse air qualities in the nation. She felt that because of the master plan being developed, it would be good to call for a temporary short-term moratorium on the uses described for heavy industrial, such as, rock crushing and mulching. She said they could use the time during the moratorium to have professionals review how to improve zoning in the future and also decide whether they should take measures to upgrade enforcement, monitoring etc. She further stressed that it was very upsetting that people can't get to the water, because it's either unsafe or hazardous. Again, they were recommending a moratorium until the master plan is complete and addresses the issue; and until they can examine and explore ways to do something definitive.

Council member Curran also noted that the business she was speaking of brings in big dump trucks with diesel fuel and then dumps refuse from construction jobs. She pointed out that it's unknown what could be buried in the trucks. Overall, she felt strongly about the issue, emphasizing that it was taken on as a women's caucus after they took the tour. She further felt there was a need to look out for the health and safety of residents and how to reclaim some of the land back.

Council member Valle added that her knowing firsthand what it's like to be asthmatic and realizing what an industrial storage business will bring to a community, she felt it was reason to move forward on the moratorium. She further added that perhaps it could be done by initiating a conversation with the City Attorney's office to put some type of policy in place that will stipulate that this type of industry should be far removed from residential. She wondered why someone could come into the city and continue to dump materials and get bigger and bigger. She stressed that all adverse elements were detrimental to the area, noting that people that live in these area shouldn't be forced to move because of it.

Council member Mulligan asked about the resolution indicating certain zip codes that have worse air quality than others. He asked if there was any analysis available as to the percentage of contribution pertaining to pollutants between industry and Bridgeport. Council member Curran said the problem would be throughout the city from what she was told by talking to school nurses. For instance, where Route-8 and the connector meet; there are buses that emit a lot of pollutants. She noted that many people in the area struggle with pulmonary problems.

Council member Mulligan questioned whether the air quality problem was more indicative of pollution from vehicles. Council member Curran said there was someone on the bus when they took the tour that when they drove into a certain area, her sinuses became clogged, but seemed to clear when they drive through another area. She reiterated that health was the driving issue, along with economic development.

Council member Mulligan felt they needed more anecdotal evidence and studies to back up the information. He further questioned why they allowed heavy industrial into residential zones. For example, there was a condominium proposed next to the Restco Plant, although it was eventually denied.

Council member Curran said that was the reason for the master plan. She said she hoped they will have experts to answer these questions at some point. She emphasized they should send the message that enough is enough until people look at zoning and consider other options.

Council member Mulligan spoke about the wording of resolution pertaining to heavy industrial where it read *"but not limited to"*. He said an example of this might be the matter of Direktor Shipyard that would be considered heavy industrial.

Council member Valle stated that all she could see was something in her community that is ugly! She said currently there is a pile of dirt on Barnum Avenue that has been there for at least six months. She asked everyone to put themselves across the street from one of these heavy industrial areas and ask themselves if they would want it there. She stressed that if they kept on with this type of operation in the community, it could have dire consequences. Council member Mulligan said that's why the matter needed to be defined as to specific business uses outlining what's truly considered a polluter.

Council member McCarthy asked if Attorney Anastasi's opinion on the matter. Attorney Anastasi stated the Mayor provided a letter identifying that procedurally, any moratorium would be in the form of a zoning regulation amendment that would be initiated by the Planning & Zoning Commission. Secondly, under the law, to adopt a regulation there needs to be a public hearing. And with regard to motor vehicle pollution, they will probably have opponents to point out where the dust really comes from. At any rate, he expected there would be numerous debates about the issue.

Attorney Anastasi stated that for a legal moratorium to be set, it has to be limited in duration and scope. And as far as the scope of it goes, they could **not** put a moratorium on all development because it would be perceived as a temporary taking of the property. So the Mayor is not suggesting placing a moratorium due to the possible loss of use to the property; the alternative is to leave the matter up to the developers to more prudent as to the types of development are proposed. He further stated that a moratorium has to be for only as long as it accomplishes a purpose.

Council member Walsh asked about the charter cited in the resolution regarding power of the city council overseeing health issues. Attorney Anastasi said that was true, but they can't trump zoning and the P&Z Commission.

Council member Walsh said they can't close down I-95, but they can deal with what they can. He thought the problem of the resolution was the mention of *only* certain zones, but if they changed that to reflect that the city council is empowered to deal with a public health issue, they could then have the health director sign off on development that have the potential to emit airborne particulates. Attorney Anastasi said these types of development are permitted by special permit only, but whether it concerns use or area, it's still a land use regulation that by statute is the charge of the P&Z Commission. He further stated that the P&Z Commission is cognizant of the matter, but

again, he didn't feel the council had the authority to usurp the authority of the P&Z. He said he didn't think it was an adversarial matter between the city council and the P&Z Commission.

Council member Walsh said he would define the matter as a pollutant creating activity and it begged the question as to why heavy industrial is allowed in residential zones; he said he wondered what came first. But if it's an activity creating the pollutants, he thought the council did have the authority.

Attorney Anastasi repeated that they didn't, because it's a special permit use, however, he suggested that if there was an avenue through P&Z to place a moratorium, that would be a legal and proper way to address it.

Council member Walsh questioned if it isn't a use addressed in P&Z, then what could be done. He said he thought the flaw was in the way the resolution was worded. Attorney Anastasi said land use has been taken away from political parties and placed in land use parties to address. He explained that if development ends up being taken away, it will be perceived as taking away development dollars. Again, he felt they should respect the authority of the P&Z Commission.

Council member Walsh asked why they couldn't approach the matter as a parallel action. He stressed that health should take precedence over land use. He urged the committee to either consider the course of action to make sure that the P&Z Commission doesn't drag their feet or have the city council issue a plan of action.

Council member Mulligan said if they went with Council member Walsh's recommendation, they would need broad language to weigh many aspects of the issue; such as the jobs the developments may bring etc. Overall, he didn't think they should discourage all development and he emphasized that they shouldn't approach the matter haphazardly. Again, they need data on the types of pollutants that are really hazardous.

Council member DePara stated that he felt the council had the responsibility and charge to address issues that affect residents of the city. Attorney Anastasi said the mechanism is to refer the matter to the P&Z Commission. He clarified that he wasn't suggesting that nothing be done.

Council member DePara asked if Council member Curran could draft language that will limit the scope. He emphasized that everyone should advocate to the P&Z Commission until the master plan was done.

Council member Curran said for some of commissioners present at the P&Z Commission hearing when the matter was discussed, it was very clear that they would be amenable to this type of moratorium.

Council member Mojica said that environmental issues that affect health are important. He noted that long gone are the days where they can put industry and residential completely separate; however, he did agree it was a broad based matter regarding the time of a moratorium, because it

may affect other industry that comes in that may not necessarily be a pollutant type business. He didn't think it was something that could be worked out in 15 minutes, because they need to consider the legalities and specific language. He questioned whether this matter was the result of a particular business in the city or was it broader based. Council member Curran said it was broader based. Council member Mojica felt there was a definite reason to look at the matter further and he thought many on the city council would be in support.

Council member Valle emphasized that the problem affected the entire city and something needed to be brought to the table to address it. She expressed that it was time to stop individuals from coming into the suburbs and dumping in Bridgeport, especially on the east side. She pointed out that most of the developers lived outside of Bridgeport and commented that if heavy industrial development was done in their community, she was certain it would have been addressed a long time ago. She further expressed the important thing was for everyone to work together to make things better.

Council member Mulligan recommended that the women's caucus get together with the city attorney to redraft the resolution.

Council member Curran said she submitted the resolution to City Attorney Anastasi and Attorney Conte and she didn't get word back that it was immaterial. She noted that she spend a lot of time researching the matter through varied sources – *she read the types of operations outlined in the resolution considered to be heavy industrial*. She noted there was no reference to Direktor Shipyard mentioned.

City Attorney Anastasi said although the resolution had the makings, he felt there was a slight problem with the wording, such as timing.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO TABLE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL McCARTHY SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH THREE VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE VOTE IN OPPOSITION**

\*Attorney Anastasi noted that a moratorium couldn't apply to pending applications.

ADJOURNED

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

City of Bridgeport  
Economic &Community Development  
& Environment Committee  
March 20, 2007  
Page 9

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND  
ENVIRONMENT  
APRIL 17, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Johnny Dye, Chairman; Angel dePara

Chairman Dye announced at 6:35 p.m. that the meeting was cancelled due to a lack of a quorum.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
APRIL 25 , 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: McCarthy, Paoletto, Holloway, Mulligan, Valle

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

**April 25, 2007: City Departments**

Council member Paoletto stated that as one of the co-chairs, there was some confusion as to why this meeting was scheduled. But in discussions with Council members Dye and Ayala, they felt it was necessary to give them a chance to decipher all city departments and agencies programs and to try to do the best job they could to become familiar with their needs. He said that hopefully, they will set a precedent to continue doing this in future years.

Council member Paoletto further announced that Council member Dye will not be doing any city council business for a month due to health issues. He said he could be contacted if needed via e-mail.

Council member Paoletto reviewed that each speaker would have five to ten minutes to address the committee.

Council member Holloway stated that he has been a member of the city council for fourteen years. He relayed that they received a form in March that indicated that Congress was cutting out block grants. Although they decided that they would fund certain programs this year, he felt that if they didn't get a democratic representative in Washington at the next election, he thought the republican administration would probably cut the block grant altogether. He further relayed that he told the people from the city and the private sector that CDBG is an incubator, so they shouldn't come forward expecting block grant monies as they have in the past. He pointed out that they were looking at a total of \$1,491,660 to address all the applications, noting there were applications submitted totaling \$9 + million. He expressed that although the committee would hear what they had to say, the fact that they only had \$1.5 million to work with, from the \$12 million that they had a few years ago, indicated that something was wrong. He asked everyone to be realistic in their application requests. And he stressed that the city council can't give something that is not there. He went on to list numerous departments that were looking for dollars, noting they all wanted approximately the same amount. He urged everyone to decide what they could live with and what they could live without. He asked for their patience and said that they would try to find what they could per the requests.

*The following speakers approached the committee to speak:*

**Joy Van Henert, OPED** stated she was the representative for the NRZ Initiative. She stated that she participated in the urban garden program and had seen a garden project abandoned while she was working there. She expressed that she encountered kids who offered to help and within a few days, they had 80% of the garden done. She further noted that there were (22) plots in the garden program and they spent \$400.00 last year to clean them up. She explained that although she only mentioned one garden, the city has a total of (18) gardens that help eliminate blight.

She stated she was asking for **\$57k** to cover the cost of the summer program to buy various materials. She expressed that the program will make a huge difference and could improve the quality of life.

*Council member Mulligan stated that there was an ongoing program with hearing speakers in council chambers clearly. He asked Ms. Henert if she had a statement she could submit into the record.*

**Nancy Hadley**, of City of Bridgeport/Planning and Economic Development and Neighborhood Revitalization stated she was present to speak about the NRZ. She said she had pictures to show on the overhead screen. She began and said OPED had five applications for different projects that were in the community development budget process – *indicated below:*

<u>Program</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Facilities	Madison Ave. Corridor – Façade Program	\$300,000
Public Facilities	City-Wide Façade Program	\$60,000
Anti-Blight	City Wide Anti-Blight	\$140,000
Planning & Admin./Anti-Blight	City Wide NRZ Support Initiative	\$326,750
Planning/Administration NEW	Mill Hill-Madison Reservoir Ave NRZ Plans	\$65,000

Programs details summarized below:

- Ms Hadley stated there was NRZ support to get three more plans started, that included, Reservoir Avenue, Madison Avenue and North Avenue streetscapes. She said there was money in the budget to put the plans together around the streetscapes, noting the businesses surrounding will be doing the same thing as it will be done in seven other areas. So the project will be extended to three more areas. She noted that the city will be spending money on the infrastructure, so the neighborhood needs to be organized around them.
- She spoke about the Park City Sweep program and said they were requesting **\$57k** to continue the project that goes on in the neighborhood. She noted there was one salary included in that request and the rest was program money.

- She spoke about the Anti-blight program community development money to capitalize the revolving fund to lien properties and get the tax money back. But there was a state issue that wouldn't allow them to do that, but it can get approved through the city council, in that the state will allow them to apply tax liens that will apply to co-enforcement and anti-blight. But they need the funding to get the lien process set up and then the money comes back via a revolving process. She further relayed that in the Condemnation Department they have fifty (50) buildings that need attention, so the extent of the money will allow putting liens on the properties and recapture the monies.
- She spoke about the commercial façade program, noting there was only one property on East Main Street. She said the community economic development fund appropriated \$2 million to allow getting the façade program going along all commercial strips.
- She spoke about the Madison Avenue façade program that has been in process to address getting outdoor dining and façade improvements.

Overall, there were five applications for various things in order of importance. She further mentioned there was a request for cameras that sit high on phone poles and operate 24-hours in areas where there is repeat dumping. So a camera in place will focus on who is doing the dumping and once the license plate is found out, Chief Norwood said the department would follow up. She noted one camera cost \$20k.

Council member Holloway asked what the department's total requests were. Ms. Hadley said a total of \$420k. Council member Holloway mentioned that he thought the anti-blight measures that have been taken were somewhat discriminatory. He relayed that he has driven through the north end and has seen cars, boats etc. on properties, but they remain there. He reiterated that he thought the process was discriminatory, emphasizing that he sees more and knows where the blight actually is. He mentioned that along I-95 where there are cameras, the state police don't use them for the purpose they were meant to be used. He asked Ms. Hadley how her department planned to use the cameras. Ms. Hadley explained said the cameras were put on I-95 to be able to clearly see someone's license plate. She stated that Tom Coble and Chief Norwood went out to Chicago to observe the cameras they use and it was found that they use them in neighborhoods to catch recidivist dumping behavior. And that's the purpose they will be used for in Bridgeport. Council member Holloway stated that he felt the discriminatory tracking seemed to be only focused in certain districts.

Ms. Hadley said that now that they were on the 211-system, the highest number of calls were to the anti-blight office, so response goes to where the complaints are from and she didn't feel this presented a discriminatory act. Mr. Holloway named areas such as 163 Wilmot Avenue that has four boats, 10 cars & other in the yard. He mentioned a lot located at 427-429 Hollister Avenue where a neighbor calls him all the time about the condition of the lot. He said these properties were clear cases of blight and he suggested they be checked out.

Ms. Hadley said that in general, anti-blight fines don't work, so they go before the condemnation board.

Council member McCarthy left the public hearing at 6:41 p.m.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Service	Public Safety Emergency Preparedness Guidebook & Training Program	\$230,000

**Ms. Kelly McDermott**, of City of Bridgeport, Emergency Management approached the committee. She stated that she would speak on behalf of Scott Appleby who was unable to attend tonight.

Ms. McDermott said the proposed project will support the development and distribution of emergency response guidebooks that will outline critical emergency procedures and measures to take during a disaster. And it will provide updated procedure information. She explained that the current book was approximately five years old and it's missing the recent evacuation plans for flooding etc., the booklet is also missing school emergency response procedures that are of course a concern should an event take place at a particular building. So the project will allow Scott Appleby to partner with the Board of Education to give parents guidance for their kids. She added that pandemic flu information will also be included in the booklet; as well as the city hazard list. The booklet will be distributed to 150,000 residents and businesses. And there will be six community informational sessions that will be held. And to culminate the entire effort, they will host a "Be Ready, Be Safe" day at Arena Harbor Yard where people will be able to participate in a mock emergency exercise. So to publicize the information, they will reach out to radio stations and put up banners and advertisements.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Housing	Code Enforcement	\$456,361

**Joseph Minopoli**, of City of Bridgeport/Housing & Commercial Code Enforcement approached the committee. He stated that he hoped they could fund the department as requested. He noted that the department was created back in the 1960's when people had no place to turn. He explained they previously employed numerous inspectors, but that number dwindled through the years. He referred to the booklet outlining the necessity and importance of the funding. He relayed that they incur revenue that is invisible, such as electrical or other repairs for a building. And all these repairs are referred to his department. Their mission is to deliver safe and healthy buildings for everyone in Bridgeport for residents and owners. He mentioned that he was told 10 years by the Tax Collector that they were losing \$10k a year because no inspections were being made. He gave examples of the types of building complaints and instances that owners were issued a cease & desist. He urged the committee to consider the importance of funding the department. He stressed that when an apartment is not inspected in a timely manner, the building becomes unworthy of keeping it maintained. He asked them to keep in mind that monies have also been raised by his department through the people of the City of Bridgeport.

Council member Holloway said he placed a call to the department about a property on Stratford Avenue, noting the building was in bad shape and an inspector came out and informed the tenant

that they should leave due to there being a severe safety hazard because of the electrical. He agreed it was a tough job and he commended Mr. Minopoli and his inspectors for a good job done.

Council member Mulligan said he noticed there was an increase of \$25k from last year's request. Mr. Minopoli said the increase was due to contractual increases, so he has to amend the costs accordingly.

Council member Mulligan noted this year's request was for \$456k. Mr. Minopoli said that was correct, noting it would cover six salaries.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Service	Grant Match	\$40,000

**Valerie Sorrentino**, of City of Bridgeport/Human Services/Youth Service Bureau Grant Match spoke about the Youth Service Bureau Grant. She said they received a grant and the city was required to match it dollar for dollar. She explained it was a direct service program that must be matched. She distributed a brochure outlining what the YSB was about. She noted the request was for \$40k that is exactly the amount needed to match the grant. She further spoke about the mission of redirecting youth through a program that assists with limiting drop out rates. They also work with the Bridgeport pregnancy program that works with girls to decrease unprotected sexual activity. They also work with a mental health agency that has a program for a child in crisis who can call a mental health professional to intervene. And the church council helps reunite kids with their families. Council member Holloway expressed all four of the programs were good. He further expressed that the pregnancy program was especially excellent to help young ladies improve their lives.

Council member Holloway asked how the state advocated the money. Ms. Sorrentino said the entire grant was \$146k that is for the direct service program and the rest goes towards salaries.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Service NEW	East Side Senior Center – Program	\$46,000
Public Service NEW	East Side Senior Center – Rental of Space	\$40,000

**Martha Santiago**, of City of Bridgeport/Human Services Department stated she was present in support of the center that is located on Arctic and East Main Street. They will be open and operating on May 4, 2007 and funding is needed to pay the lease and provide additional staffing and a program assistant to help plan various programs. They are also planning a grand opening on May 4 and invitations have been sent out. She went on to say that the center will be open from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. They will plan special trips and transportation will be arranged as needed. Other varied activities will also be offered and organized by the seniors. There is also a social services component and elderly health screenings. She noted that the Salvation Army will provide daily lunch. She expressed that with a lot of participation and hard work, they have provided a program they can be proud of.

Council member Mulligan asked how much she was requested. Ms. Santiago said the amounts requested were \$40k for the rental space and \$46k for program expenses.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Service	Retired Senior and Volunteer Program	\$32,000

**Mike Boyer**, of City of Bridgeport/ Department on Aging spoke on behalf of the Senior Volunteer Program that has been sponsored by Bridgeport for 30 years. He said the program is to mobilize volunteers to support and sustain the local non-profits. They were asking for funds to cover salaries and other. He said they worked with various other agencies and they have enlisted thirty-four (34) volunteers since January. They also provide volunteers supplemental insurance and they give them mileage and meals reimbursement. He said they were asking for \$32k to fill an Assistant Coordinator position.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Anti-Blight	Project NICE/Phoenix	\$125,000

**Tom Flynn**, Police Department Weed & Seed Program approached the committee. He said he was requesting continued support for the CDBG program. He noted they ran the Phoenix program in conjunction with the state Department of Corrections that do emergency clean ups and board ups. They also run a Target Hardening program that provides security service to homes and businesses in targeted neighborhoods. They also provide deadbolts, window locks and they are looking to increase the lighting security. They also try to offer block watch and they had seniors sign on to expand the program. He explained that they were seeking to get the police involved in a non-confrontational role where they can have youth involved in the police mentoring program. He stated the budget was ambitious and they would be happy to maintain the status quo of \$15k.

Council member Holloway said the proposed light protectors were an excellent program. He said that although the program is assisted through the Department of Corrections, they are doing a service to the city.

Mr. Flynn stated they were also looking to reintroduce the sector terminal in the Hollow area per Council member Valle's comment.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Housing	Childhood Lead Based Poisoning Prevention Program	\$157,000

**Audrey Gaines**, City of Bridgeport/Health and Social Services urged the committee to fund the program. She said they applied for \$157k that will pay for two and one-half employment positions

and for supplies. She said the money will help support the program and she mentioned they also received from the EPA and state and general fund. She stated they provide mandated inspections for Home programs and Section-8. They conduct (800) inspections per year and one-third of them are for the City of Bridgeport. So although the agency isn't destitute in terms of funds, and they are looking for ways to eliminate the \$157k request, they still need to maintain where they are now to continue.

Council member Valle asked about conducting inspections and if her agency worked with Housing Code Enforcement. Ms. Gaines said no, they do work in conjunction with them, but they are an entirely different department. They do strictly lead inspections with their own inspectors. They also draw blood from kids in schools to check for lead levels and then send the results to the state for the results. They also do outreach.

Council member Valle said she understood the nature of what the agency provides, but she felt there might be some duplication of efforts performed among agencies.

Council member Holloway stated that if the testing was done years ago, many lives might have been saved. He emphasized the importance of tracking any potential lead poisonings. Overall, he expressed the agency did a great job.

Council member Mulligan questioned the increase in lead poisoning incidents. Ms. Gaines said it was because the acceptable threshold had been lowered, so that's why they were seeing a higher rate. She noted that currently level-9 was considered to be the acceptable threshold.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
-------------------	-----------------	----------------

**Rosemary Hoyt**, of the Department on Aging said there were three senior citizens centers. She said they were requesting \$41,000 to keep the present programs going, as well as implementing new programs. She listed the numerous services the seniors received. She relayed that their problems began last year when they lost a full-time nurse who helped the seniors with their overall well being needs. They also lost a part-time person who monitored the Kings Pantry. So they need a person to organize workshops and special events. She further mentioned other varied services they provided. Overall, they were requesting funds for three part-time salaried people.

<u>Program(s)</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Request</u>
Public Service	Summer Youth Training and Employment Program	\$50,000

**Tammy Pappas**, City of Bridgeport/Lighthouse Program said they submitted two applications for CDBG. One is for funding the summer youth program and they were asking for \$50k. She said that although she hoped they receive state funding, they weren't sure they would. So the \$50k will help support youth employment for whatever kids qualified.

She also mentioned Hallan School and Caesar Batalia School after-school programs. She said they were requesting \$150k, noting this amount was only half that was needed to support the program. Overall, it costs \$4.7 million to support all three after school programs. She further noted that it was essential to receive the funding. She said they received \$155k last year and this year they were asking for \$150k, because they anticipate at least (150) participants.

Council member Holloway said he was a big proponent of the after-school programs and summer employment because they help keep kids out of trouble.

ADJOURNED

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
APRIL 25 , 2007  
5:45 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: McCarthy, Paoletto, Holloway, Mulligan, Valle

**ABSENT:** Council members: DePara, Dye

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ms. Alana Kabel

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 5:47 p.m.

**84-06 Request to forgive demolition Re: 33 Sixth Street**

There was a brief discussion regarding this item and:

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY MOVED TO APPROVE AS AMENDED (*to be submitted to the city clerk's office*).  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNED

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**MINUTES**  
**ECDE PUBLIC HEARING**  
**CDBG GRANT FUNDS**  
**APRIL 26, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletto, Chairman; James Holloway; Maria Valle;  
Thomas McCarthy; Thomas Mulligan; Angel DePara.

**STAFF:** Alana Kabel.

The meeting was called to order at 6:25 p.m. by the Chairman, who noted that last week's hearing had been cancelled due to lack of proper notification.

Mr. Holloway said he has been on this committee for 14 years. 14 years ago, there was a total allocation of \$6,500,000 or \$7,000,000; it is only \$3,300,000 this year. The City also has to pay for debt service, leaving \$2,100,000. They have requests for \$9,500,000, reduced from \$20,000,000. He asked everyone to look at duplication of services with other agencies and said that grants should be solicited from other entities. They cannot rely on these funds for welfare. Councilmember Holloway asked people to call their senators to ask that they vote to increase block grant allocations. There is a letter on the piano with Senator Dodd's phone number, which is 202-224-2823. The Bush administration is taking away social services money to fund the war in Iraq – there is a war in this country.

Sandra Vining, Ralphala Taylor CC/YMCA, asked for continued support. She was accompanied by 9 students who also spoke in support.

Carol Reid, ABCD, asked for funding for "Total Learning". They are asking for \$100,000 under housing, \$75,000 for the weatherization program and for rental assistance and for funding for the food pantry.

Charlene Lee, Catholic Charities, spoke in favor of funds for HIV and AIDS programs. She was accompanied by staff members and volunteers. They asked for \$10,000 for two different series of programs. Mary Rocher, co-facilitator, said she has AIDS and has benefited from the HIV University. LaTanya McNair said she has had HIV for 14 years. She lost a child to AIDS, but because of the University, has been able to go forward with her life.

The Chairman introduced Rick Cruz and Jeanette Moran from the Citizens Union.

Mike Marella & Jack McCarthy, Bridgeport PAL, spoke on behalf of PAL funding.

Terry O'Connor, Cardinal Sheehan Center, asked for funding for building repairs/upgrades.

Jose Torves, Casa Nuestros, spoke in favor of funding for substance abuse for youth.

Carmen Colon, Alpha Community Services, spoke for the Families in Transition program, saying it is the only emergency shelter for families in Bridgeport. She asked for \$50,000.

Carol Martin spoke in favor of Alpha Community Services Center, 576 East Washington, asking for new space and to repair a façade at 64 Kossuth.

Susan Schnitzer and Marissa Amorado spoke for funds for the Center for Women and Families emergency shelter and to renovate their kitchen and handicapped bathrooms.

Christine Cook, Ct. Community Gardening Association/Bpt. Community Land Trust, spoke in favor of funding for their efforts.

Erin Meaney, Bridgeport YMCA and Angie Saltaro, asked for funding for their Y-nights program for teens and their South End Community Center.

Mary Ellen Tattenk and Patrick Jones, E Power Development Corp. said they are looking to enhance the lives of children, youth and adults and seniors and asked for start-up funds of \$25,000. They will not come back to the City again.

Charlene Chambers, Kings Pantry, was accompanied by two individuals who spoke in favor of funding for their services.

Ted McGinness, President of East End Community Council, spoke in favor of a grant of \$37,500. Councilmember Holloway said there is a duplication of services with Kings Pantry in terms of food banks. Money is tight and they should work together.

Stephen Nelson, Second Stoneridge Cooperative, asked for assistance in their emergency repairs request. Councilmember Holloway said they are the pillar of that community and they deserve help.

Christine Hempowicz, University of Bridgeport and Angie Saltaro requested funds to upgrade the 24,000 s.f. floor and recreation center.

Donna Wartenbuch, Community Economic Development Fund, requested funding for the NRZ plan implementation of \$124,000.

Lea Brown, Caryn McIntosh, NRZ committee, spoke in favor of the various programs they provide. They were accompanied by Angie Saltaro.

Dan Braccio, Council of Churches, requested a grant for funding a PRZ program. They asked for \$15,000 for family support programs.

Dick Tiani, Groundwork Bridgeport Community Gardens, asked for \$37,000 for anti-blight work. Councilmember Holloway asked the difference between this community garden and Mr. Halstead's. Mr. Tiani said they are the same. Mr. Holloway said they are trying to get two bites of the apple.

Dianne Auger, American Red Cross, requested \$80,000 for renovations to their headquarters on 158 Brooklawn Avenue. This is a one time request.

Frank Derico, Music and Arts Center for Humanity, spoke on behalf of four applications. Councilmember Valle asked about the renovation/construction and said they should look for their own building. Mr. Derico said they have looked for a new facility but the costs would be much more than they can afford. Councilmember Holloway said he agreed with Councilmember Valle that they should look for their own place. Councilmember Mulligan asked if the money was for a separate entrance off of State Street. Mr. Derico said there is a separate entrance now. Councilmember Mulligan asked what the \$150,000 would be used for, and Mr. Derico responded that it would be for construction costs.

The Chairman called a recess at 8:15 p.m and the meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

Melissa Rivera, McGivney Community Center and Elizabeth Charo spoke about their requests. The Chairman commended both women on their accomplishments.

Robert Francis, RYASAP, and Angie Saltaro reviewed their programs.

Karen Seferi, Jewish Federation/Community Closet, spoke about the Community Closet.

Amanda Harmon and Iris Rosa, GBAPP, spoke about their request and the services they provide. Councilmember Holloway said he was on the Board of Directors two years ago and this program is one of the best he has ever seen.

Carmen Marcarjo, Helping Hands Center and three young men spoke in support of funding to expand their program. The Chairman commended the young men for telling their stories.

Michael D'Andrea, Liberation Programs, requested funding to replace and make repairs to their roof and the exterior of their building. Councilmember Holloway asked the difference between this program and the one on 410-415 Grant Street. Mr. D'Andrea said he could only speak to what they do.

Jamar Brown, Bridgeport Storm Basketball Organization, said he is trying to start a league and an amateur program. Councilmember Holloway asked where they operate out of; Mr. Brown said they have no gym now. 855 Norman Street is his own address.

Ramsey Williams, Southwest Community Health Center, said they are requesting \$35,000 to get the word out about the services they provide.

Delores Edwards, Sickle Cell Disease Association of Southern Connecticut, asked for an increase in funding so that they can increase their services.

Barbara Straton asked for funding to fix her house up.

Keith Cryan, BEDCO, asked for \$250,000, including \$125,000 for the Holly Street project.

Paulette Mack, Neighborhood House, reviewed the programs they offer and thanked the Council for their continuing support.

Pierre D'Haiti, International Performing Arts, said they are looking for \$25,000 for the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of free concerts. This money will not be used for administrative costs.

Kimberly Ford, Housing Authority COB, reviewed the three programs they are seeking funding for.

Ann Robinson, Bridgeport Neighborhood Fund, spoke about what they offer and their request for \$200,000 to provide homes to very low income people and for remediation of homes.

The public hearing was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Telesco  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE  
APRIL 30, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletta, Chairman, James Holloway, Angel dePara, Maria Valle, Thomas Mulligan

**OTHERS:** Council Member Andre Baker, Alana Kabel, Council President Andres Ayala, Deputy CAO, Housing; Deborah Caviness, Mayor's Assistant.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletta called the meeting to order and announced there was a quorum.

**115-06** Program Year XXXIII Community Development Block Grant Program, Emergency Shelter Grant Program/Home Program.

Chairman Paoletta said that he would review the list of applicants and some suggested amounts for funding. He then read the list entries out loud to the Committee members.

Council Member Valle asked why the Blessed Sacrament Church was removed from the list. Chairman Paoletta said he knew there were two organizations that had not qualified for the CDBG funding and that this was one of them. He also said that after reviewing the list, the Committee could discuss any of the organizations they wished to ask about. Chairman Paoletta said that the East End Community Council was not on the current list, but had been on the original list. The program will now be under ESG (Emergency Shelter Grants). After Chairman Paoletta finished reading the suggested amounts, he stated that he was as consistent as possible with last year's allocations. He also said that he would be asking for separate votes on each of the categories and one comprehensive vote on the entire package.

**EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS (ESG)**

Chairman Paoletta requested that the Committee turn to page 8 – Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) for the start of the discussion.

Council Member Holloway asked about the location of the food pantries and their allocations. Ms. Kabel reviewed that with him. Council Member Baker asked if the funding for Transitional Housing was going for placement and staffing. Ms. Kabel explained that Families in Transition is the only emergency shelter program for families. Emergency Shelter Services are available to a variety of family compositions twenty four hours a day and is located at the Brook Street Shelter and the Clinton Avenue property.

Council Member Valle said that she believed that Blessed Sacrament had submitted an application for food pantries but did not see it listed. Ms. Kabel explained that the church had a public service request in for a Bible Camp. This request was listed on original list. Council Member dePara pointed out that there was an additional request for the food pantry on the original listing. Ms. Kabel said that the food pantry listing should be under ESG. Chairman Paoletta then instructed everyone to add the Blessed Sacrament Community Food Pantry to the ESG listings. He went on to explain that in order to fund the addition, it would require reducing funding one of the groups who already had allocations. Ms. Kabel said that the most that could be given out under ESG is \$144,734. When asked why the entry was not on the updated list, Ms. Kabel said that it was most likely a clerical error. The request was for \$8,800 for three days a week, five hours at a time. Council President Ayala asked if anyone had been present at the previous meeting to speak for the program. Ms. Kabel then read the description of the food pantry program to the Committee from one of the documents. When asked why the earlier request for the Bible Camp had been denied, Ms. Kabel explained that the program requires the attendees to participate in the religious aspect of the program. This makes it ineligible under HUD's separation of church and state rules.

Council Member Holloway pointed out that there were two food pantries in that area already. Council Member Baker suggested that the Committee consider giving the program half of the funding request and see how the program works out. Chairman Paoletta then asked Council Member Baker which program should be reduced by \$2,500.

Council Member Valle said that the Eastern Community Council Health and Nutrition program. She pointed out that the same group had requested funds for their block watch. She said that she would rather have \$5,000 to the East End Block Watch. Chairman Paoletta explained that the amount of money allocated to ESG must remain within the category and can not be transferred to other categories. Council Member Mulligan then said that not only could the Committee not increase the amount in the category, but they could not decrease the amount either. Ms. Kabel explained that the ESG program was its own separate grant. A discussion about the allocation of funding followed.

Council Member Holloway suggested that the Committee consider reducing St. Stephen's Food pantry to \$11,000 and the King's Food Pantry to \$9,000 and Thomas Merton Health Meals to \$11,000 and reallocating \$3,000 to the Blessed Sacrament Food Pantry.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY MOVED TO REDUCING THE ST. STEPHEN'S FOOD PANTRY TO \$11,000 AND THE KING'S FOOD PANTRY TO \$9,000 AND THOMAS MERTON HEALTH MEALS TO \$11,000 AND REALLOCATING \$3,000 TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT FOOD PANTRY.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.**

Council Member Mulligan asked the Committee to consider the fact that with the cut backs that the funding had received each year, whether the Committee should consider funding any new projects. Ms. Kabel said that she had explained to Council President Ayala that as the Department moves forward with the new consolidated plan, which she believes will be ready by December, it is important to remember that federal funding is dwindling. She recommended that if funding is granted through ESG or CDBG or Home, that the program is funded for three years and no less than \$10,000 each year to get the program off the ground and hope that each program becomes self-sufficient. Council Member Mulligan asked if as the programs proliferate, whether Ms. Kabel was able to oversee the various programs. Ms. Kabel said that it was difficult to oversee 100 applications because regardless of the amount granted, it was the same amount of paperwork and oversight.

A discussion about the various communities service programs and the proposed policy ensued.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS (ESG) FUNDING ALLOCATIONS WITH A REDUCTION OF THE ST. STEPHEN'S FOOD PANTRY TO \$11,000, REDUCING THE KING'S FOOD PANTRY TO \$9,000 AND THOMAS MERTON HEALTH MEALS TO \$11,000 AND REALLOCATING \$3,000 TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT FOOD PANTRY.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

Council President Ayala said that he needed a point of clarification because he believed Chairman Paoletta had said earlier that there would only be one vote on the entire package. Chairman Paoletta reiterated that he would be asking for separate votes on each of the categories and one comprehensive vote on the entire package. Council President Ayala thanked Chairman Paoletta for the clarification and said that he had misunderstood.

**\*\* THE MOTION THEN PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION & SECTION 108**

Chairman Paoletta then directed the Committee to page 7. He said that the Committee would be considering both the CDA and Section 108 together. \$672,915.00 is the Community Development Administration request. Chairman Paoletta commented that Ms. Kabel runs that department. Section 108 - \$803,755 is non-negotiable. This is what is required for the amortization schedule for repayment. Ms. Kabel then reviewed the amounts and informed the Committee that there was an amount from the Grow Bridgeport 108 that was required to be returned to HUD for debt service. She reviewed the details of 108 grants with the Committee.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION FUNDING AND SECTION 108 AS LISTED ON THE UPDATED CDGB FUNDING LIST.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Council Member Valle asked for clarification on what the \$672,915.00 funds. Ms. Kabel said that those funds run the Housing Community Development Department and funds the majority of the staff.

**OPED NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ADMINISTRATION  
AND THE OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION**

The Committee was then directed to page 6 of 9. Ms. Kabel explained that between the two departments a total of \$133,320 is for staff. She then listed the staff and percentage of benefits covered by this amount. Other than Personnel Services, the projections to operate the office next year will be \$52,250.00 between the various categories listed. The final request is for \$185,570.00.

In addition, excluding the camera, there is a program expenditure request of \$118,500.00 that will include equipment rentals, maintenance and acquisition, NRZ support, Park City Sweep implementation expenses, NRZ implementation expenses, start up of the project and a small contingency. Ms. Kabel then reviewed the final numbers of the various requests and announced that the grand total would be \$304,070.00.

A discussion about these requests followed. Chairman Paoletta commented that it is important to remember that on pages 4, 5 & 6, - Public Facilities, Anti-Blight and Housing, has a total lumped together. Ms. Kabel then reviewed the various details of the programs with the Committee as they requested.

Chairman Paoletta commented that Council Member Valle had asked about housing entity that was not eligible earlier. Ms. Kabel explained that this was also a separation of church and state issue because of a religious participation requirement in the program. HUD will not allow any activities where religious participation is required.

Council Member Valle asked about the requests for sidewalk development. Ms. Kabel said that the office receives numerous requests from developers of affordable housing for the City to put sidewalk in front of their properties. This gives the agency the opportunity to have a site improvement program wherein people who want the funding have to fill out an application; they have to meet the requirements. Ms. Kabel then reviewed the process. She said that three contracts with allocations of funding have been put out to bid this year.

Council Member Mulligan asked why the Citizen's Union was recommending such a large increase for the sidewalks. Chairman Paoletta pointed out that the staff recommended \$30,000 but the Citizen's Union recommended \$100,000. Chairman Paoletta said that he had chosen a figure in the middle of the two figures. Ms. Kabel said that the Citizen's Union is aware of how bad the sidewalks are in the East End and they would like to have more comprehensive sidewalk program rather than a property here and there.

Council President Ayala suggested that the citywide façade program be reduced by \$5,000 and transfer it to the Connecticut Community Gardens Association, which would increase that to \$15,000. When asked, Chairman Paoletta said that the \$10,000 for Bridgeport GroundWorks had been transferred to the Connecticut Community Gardens Association. A discussion about this and the Sidewalk program followed. Chairman Paoletta pointed out that he was aware of all the requests for improved sidewalks and therefore, the sidewalk project was one of the few projects that had gotten an actual increase.

Council Member Mulligan asked about the amount that OPD is requesting for anti-blight and NRZ. Chairman Paoletta pointed out that the Office of Revitalization Planning has a figures of \$326,000 covered the cameras. There were number of Committee members who expressed their disagreement with this because there is not an extra \$200,000 available. Council Members de Para and McCarthy said that they were in favor of the cameras. Chairman Paoletta said he agreed with them and if there were another funding source, he would be in favor of it.

Council Member Mulligan said that he was in favor of the anti-blight programs. He also commented that they were looking for an extra \$50,000. Council Member Mulligan said that the Red Cross was an excellent fund raiser and that if the City did not fund them, they would be able to raise the funds elsewhere. Council Member Holloway pointed out that the Red Cross is one of the first relief crews on the scene of a fire or any disaster. He said that the Red Cross came to ask for funding only once and when the request was too high, they lowered it. Chairman Paoletta said that his reasoning was that his proposed figures were still a workable number from Ms. Kabel's perspective. Council Member McCarthy said that he agreed with Council Member Holloway and that this was a personal pet project of his. Council Member McCarthy also said that Council Member Pivrotto and Council Member Walsh were also in agreement. Chairman Paoletta said that he also agreed with Council Member Holloway and that the \$50,000 will pay for a new roof on the building and the emergency generator that the Red Cross is hoping to purchase. Even though it is not the full amount the Red Cross was hoping for, it is still a workable number for them.

Council Member McCarthy asked about the lead prevention programs listed on page 4. Ms. Kabel reviewed the details of that program with the Committee.

Council Member Mulligan asked about Stone Ridge. He said that if the City started to fund one condo association, then all of the condo associations would apply. Chairman Paoletta said that this condo association has completed approximately 75 – 80 % of their own repairs with their own funds. Ms. Kabel said that the housing ownership program on page 4, and her department was working on developing a housing rehabilitation program with two components. One program would work with the disabled and elderly population to repair the code violations they may have on their properties. The second half would be a low interest bearing program that would allow individual property owners to access to the funds. This would include entities such as cooperatives throughout the city that don't meet HUD's income requirements. Ms. Kabel said that she had placed under a low and moderate income housing program for this reason.

Council Member Holloway said that a number of cooperatives have received funding from CDBG during the last fourteen years. Council Member Holloway said that the resident population of Stone Ridge was now over 60 years old. He said that the CDBG funds would help to help the resident's monthly payments down.

Chairman Paoletta then asked if there were any further questions. He reminded everyone that they would be taking one vote for Anti-blight, Public Facilities and Infrastructure and Housing, then vote on the entire package at the end.

Council Member Valle asked about a couple that had come before Committee asked about rehabilitation of their property. Ms. Kabel said that rather than having the individuals coming to the Committee, the Committee would fund a program and the individuals would apply to the program. She then reviewed the perimeters of the program. Council Member Baker asked for further clarification and detail on this, which Ms. Kabel provided to him.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE ANTI-BLIGHT SLUM ELIMINATION (PG 6) AS AMENDED.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE PUBLIC FACILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE (PG 5) AS AMENDED.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE HOUSING SECTION AS LISTED ON PAGE 4.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## **RECESS**

Chairman Paoletta declared a five minute recess.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES**

Council Member McCarthy asked about the two Department of Aging lines. Ms. Kabel explained that the program people who had worked in the Senior Aid program have transferred elsewhere. Currently, the department head is attempting to hire some part time people to man the desk, in order to allow time to provide time to administer the services to the seniors. For the RSVP program, the application states that the funding would provide for a full time, bi-lingual assistant program director for coordinating the Senior Volunteer program. Ms. Kabel then reviewed the numbers with the Committee regarding this request. A discussion about this situation followed.

Council Member Valle asked what happens to funding that is not completely expended. Ms. Kabel said that the excess funds could be reassigned to other projects within the category headings. She is intending to have her program assistant review records from the past years to determine if there are excess fund balances remaining. These will be compiled under each category headings and then brought to the Committee for redistribution with new applications. She reviewed the process with the Committee. Ms. Kabel informed the Committee that anything in excess of \$50,000 is considered a major program amendment, which requires a whole detailed process, including public notice, and other steps.

The discussion returned to the RSVP and the Senior Aid programs allocations.

Council Member Valle said that she hoped that the Committee would also consider giving some funding to the Matt Jones/Robert Jenkins Foundation Salsa competition on page 2. She stated that there had been quite a bit of in-kind contributions for this group. Council Member Valle said that she hoped Ms. Kabel's department would be able to show the Committee what each group had requested, spent and any surplus funding. She said that she felt that the groups were putting staff in without others knowing about it.

In an effort to locate more funding for the Department on Aging, a discussion began about some organizations that have been granted small amounts of funding and because of the size of the allotment, the groups chose not to use the money or run the program. Ms. Kabel said that the requests totaled 3 million dollars and there was only \$504,000 in funding.

Council Member Holloway advocated maintaining the funds to the sports teams. Council President Ayala pointed out that the parents chose to put their child on the team, they pay a fee and there are other sponsors. Chairman Paoletta pointed out that there were three different leagues, two baseball and one football, with \$2,000 allocation each.

Council Member Valle asked what the City of Bridgeport Social Services Code Violations was for. Ms. Kabel replied that those funds cover the staff for the state required position to relocate people when the Housing Code Office had determined that the housing code people have determined that a dwelling is no longer fit for human habitation. The position is currently funded from the Department of Social Services.

Chairman Paoletta informed the Committee about the East Side Community Center rental. He then asked if there was any reason funding could be found for this project. Ms. Kabel said that this was the start up year for that project and cutting the funding could create difficulties for the project. Council Member Valle pointed out that the City had signed a contract with Marrakesh for a given amount and then the same group put in an application for CDBG funds. Ms. Kabel reiterated her point about the fact that this was the start up year for the project and cutting the allocation would harm the Community Center. The building is in serious disrepair and needs work.

Ms. Kabel then reviewed the positions that have been requested by the Department on Aging. Chairman Paoletta summed up the situation by saying that the Senior Aid program, \$20,000 was allocated and this would require an additional \$21,000 for full funding. Under RSVP, there was no allocation funding, which means it would take \$16,584 to reach the full request. This results in a final total of an additional \$37,000 in funding. Council President Ayala asked if there were any grant funds that might be applied for that could be applied to the Department's programs so that other funds could be shifted to salaries. Ms. Kabel said that she would be happy to have that discussion with Rena Bakalar, but at the moment, there is no alternative.

Council Member McCarthy suggested that \$3,000 be shifted from the Music Arts Center summer camps and an additional \$3,000 from Outreach Women program. Council Member Valle recommended that the funding for the sports programs not be touched. Council President Ayala said that for the record, he was a member of one of the Youth Leagues and there are scholarships. Chairman Paoletta suggested that BAM Youth Ministries be reduced by \$3,000. An additional \$3,000 was removed from the Bridgeport YMCA Knights.

Council Member dePara suggested that perhaps the Council needs to consider shifting some of the staff positions from the CDBG funding over to the City payroll. By doing it gradually, but having the City supply 4 or 5% of the staff salaries and then perhaps having the City increase their contribution by 1% each year in order to free up more of the funds for the other programs. Council President Ayala concurred with Council Member dePara and pointed out that there would come a day when CDBG would end and the Committee should be planning for that eventuality. Chairman Paoletta expressed concern that the City Administration seriously consider what it would do in that eventuality, especially with the mandated jobs. If those mandated jobs were transferred

to the City budget this would free up \$100,000. Ms. Kabel suggested that as the Committee works on a consolidated plan, this might be one of the goals.

The Committee then asked Ms. Kabel about the Heroes Program. Ms. Kabel gave a brief overview of the program. Council Member Valle said that the Heroes program was allocated \$2,000. She then suggested that this funding be reduced and that each of the Council Members donate a portion of their stipend money to the Heroes program. Chairman Paoletta addressed this by stating that it would be impossible to get all twenty Council members to agree on this. Secondly, the funding is an individual issue and the Council Members should not be pressured to donate their funds from their stipends.

It was agreed to reduce the \$2,000 from the Heroes program. This would cover the \$17,000 to the Senior Aid program.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE PUBLIC SERVICES FUNDING CATEGORY OF THE CDBG FUNDING AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED WITH THREE IN FAVOR (MCCARTHY, MULLIGAN AND DEPARA) AND ONE AGAINST (VALLE).**

*Council Member Valle left the meeting following this vote.*

Chairman Paoletta then asked Ms. Caviness to recite the final numbers for the Public Service category of the CDBG funding budget. Ms. Caviness then read the figures back to the Committee.

Ms. Kabel then made a presentation on HOME. She stated that the upcoming HOME allocation is \$1,428,931.00. This year the allocation plan calls for the HOME Program funding to go towards housing production and preservation of rental housing projects. The department advertised for project submissions. Some have come in and are currently being reviewed because they are being financially underwritten by the City to ensure that they are all in a position so that the projects can financially sustain themselves with the input of the HOME program funding. Over the course of the program year, the department will be granting funding awards. Ms. Kabel said that the department would be requesting the addresses out to the Council members that represent the various districts where the projects are located in order to get input from the Council Members. She said that she did not want projects to be started in various districts without the Council Members' awareness. There are seven requests in and they total almost 3.7 million dollars in funding requests.

Council Member Baker said that he noticed that the Heroes program had been cut while he was out of the room. Chairman Paoletta explained why the program funding had been cut. Council Member Baker said that it is a Peace Corp program and hoped that the Council would consider it next year.

Ms. Kabel said that the program income that was expected from the HOME when the original resolution was submitted early in the process was \$250,000. With the applications that are currently submitted, the anticipated income is now \$800,000 as it relates to the HOME program. She then asked the Committee to consider an amendment to the original draft resolution to reflect the program income of \$800,000 rather than the original \$250,000.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THE AMOUNT OF \$250,000 IN THE ORIGINAL HOME RESOLUTION TO THE AMOUNT OF \$800,000.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE THE AMENDED HOME RESOLUTION.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Council President Ayala commended Chairman Paoletta for his hard work on this program. Chairman Paoletta commented that he had been on the Council and the Committee for six years and he said that he believes that this year's allocation was one of the better budgets.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN]**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Service

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT  
MAY 7, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletta, Chairman; Maria Valle, Thomas Mulligan,  
Andres Ayala

**OTHERS:** David Cote, Construction Director

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletta called the meeting to order at 6:11 p.m.

**110-06 Amendment to Resolution Concerning State Public Library  
Construction Grant Contract/Renovations Black Rock Branch Library.**

*Mr. Cote distributed copies of the updated contract to the members of the Committee.*

Mr. Cote then explained that the original contract was adopted on September 20, 2004 as 257-03 "Contract with the Connecticut State Library" to receive Grant #015P-SC-98 for the Black Rock Branch for renovations and expansion as recommended by the Contracts Committee.

On November 15, 2004, the City Council approved Communication 302-02 relative to Amendment #257-03, to include language empowering the City Librarian to execute and deliver said contract.

Subsequently, the State Attorney General's Office required that the City of Bridgeport not the Bridgeport Public Library Board be the grantee under the Grant. The amended contract reflects this change and requests that the Mayor be authorized to execute the Connecticut State Library Construction Grant Contract.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT  
TO RESOLUTION CONCERNING STATE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
CONSTRUCTION GRANT CONTRACT/RENOVATIONS BLACK ROCK  
BRANCH LIBRARY.**

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Service

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
MAY 15, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletta, Chairman; Council President Andres Ayala, Angel dePara; Maria Valle

**OTHERS:** Edward Lavernoich, OPED Deputy Director; Jeannette Herron, Citizen's Union; Valerie Sorrentino, Human Services; Alanna Kabel, CAO's Office; Samuel Shaw, OPED Planning; James Slater, resident; Iris Molina, Bpt. Social Services; Kelly McDermott, Central Grants

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletta called the meeting to order at 6:55 p.m. He announced there was a quorum present.

**Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of March 20, 2007**

**Approval of Committee Special Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2007**

**Approval of Public Hearing Minutes of April 26, 2007**

**Approval of Committee Special Meeting Minutes of April 30, 2007**

**Approval of Committee Special Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2007**

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING MINUTES AS SUBMITTED:**

**APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 20, 2007**

**APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 25, 2007**

**APPROVAL OF PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2007**

**APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 30, 2007**

**APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 7, 2007.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**82-06 Disposition of 417 Myrtle Avenue; Offer to Purchase from LaRosa Del Monte Express.**

Mr. Lavernoich came forward and explained that this proposal had already been before the Committee, but that the approval sequence had been out of order. Chairman Paoletta asked if anything had changed in the interval. Mr. Lavernoich said nothing had changed.

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 82-06 - DISPOSITION OF 417 MYRTLE AVENUE; OFFER TO PURCHASE FROM LAROSA DEL MONTE EXPRESS.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**114-06 - Resolution to approve Dial-A-Ride grant from CT. Department of Transportation.**

*Ms. Sorrentino distributed copies the resolution for Dial-A-Ride to all the Committee members. She briefly reviewed the program details with the Committee.*

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 114-06 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE DIAL-A-RIDE GRANT FROM CT. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.**

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**124-06 - Youth Leadership Pilot Program.**

Ms. Sorrentino came forward and gave a brief review of the program. The grant of \$2,830.00 will allow the Health Department's School Based Clinic to pilot a youth leadership program at both Marin and Roosevelt Schools.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 124-06 YOUTH LEADERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.**

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**125-06 - NACCHO Grant for a Medical Reserve Corps.**

*Ms. Sorrentino distributed copies of a document outlining the Medical Reserve Program to the Council Members. She then gave a brief overview of the \$10,000 grant request program.*

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 125-06 - NACCHO GRANT FOR A MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**141-06 - 2007 Neighborhood Assistance Act.**

Ms. Sorrentino then explained that this program gives tax credits to businesses that contribute to community programs that have received both municipal and state approvals.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 141 – 06 - 2007 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE ACT.  
\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**142-06 - 2007-2008 Social Services Block Grant.**

Ms. Sorrentino then reviewed the details of this \$93,617 grant request, which will cover Case Management, Protective Services, Home-Based Services and Counseling.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 142-06 - 2007-2008 SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT.  
\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**143-06 - 2007-2008 Substance Abuse Prevention Program**

Ms. Sorrentino informed the Committee that this grant request for \$8,320.00 provides for prevention-orientated programs and activities for children and youth to keep them from ever starting to use alcohol, tobacco or drugs, or if they have experimented, to prevent a shift to regular use.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 143 – 06 - 2007-2008 SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.  
\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**144-06 - 2007-2008 Elderly Screening Grant.**

Ms. Sorrentino then explained that the Elderly Screening Grant request was for \$42,907 and would provide health screening, education, assessments and physical examinations for over 750 Bridgeport senior citizens at over 10 sites in the city. She then listed all the various locations for the Committee.

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 144-06 - 2007-2008 ELDERLY SCREENING GRANT.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**145-06 - 2007-2008 Youth Service Bureau Grant.**

Ms. Sorrentino reported that this grant request for \$143,378 has two components, the Administrative Core Unit and the Direct Services portion. She then reviewed the details of these two units with the Committee.

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 145-06 - 2007-2008 YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU GRANT.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**146-06 - SWCAA Grant Application – East Side Senior Center.**

Ms. Sorrentino explained that this grant application was for the East Side Senior Center, which is located at the former SADA site on East Main Street and hosts a variety of programs for the seniors.

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 146-06 - SWCAA GRANT APPLICATION – EAST SIDE SENIOR CENTER.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**123-06 - Resolution Amendment, Wheeler Center Bonding Application.**

Ms. McDermott came forward and explained that the original construction costs totaled approximately \$470,000 in funding. However, over the past two years, costs have increased and now exterior renovations will cost \$70,000. The State requires that this amendment be presented in order to increase the bond amount.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 123-06 - RESOLUTION AMENDMENT, WHEELER CENTER BONDING APPLICATION.**

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**136-06 - 2007-2008 Elderly Hispanic Outreach Grant.**

Ms. Molina came forward and reported that the program funding in the amount of \$40,000 will provide much needed outreach and referral services to our elderly Hispanic population in Bridgeport. No city funds are involved.

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 136-06 - 2007-2008 ELDERLY HISPANIC OUTREACH GRANT.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**119-06 - The Pequonnock (South End) Replacement Housing Program Property Acquisition of: 233 Lewis Street.**

Ms. Kabel distributed copies of a letter dated March 30, 2007 from the Planning Department to the Council Members about this project. Ms. Kabel and Mr. Shaw then reported that the acquisition and reconfiguration of 233 Lewis Street by combining it with 231 Lewis Street will provide conforming lots for construction of multiple family housing and will position the project to "near completion" status. This will assist the City in leading the program away from the threat of default to assured success. Chairman Paoletta asked what was currently located on 231 Lewis Street. Ms. Kabel explained that it was an empty lot and that by combining the two lots, the City would create a conforming building lot for a multiple family unit.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM 119-06 - THE PEQUONNOCK (SOUTH END) REPLACEMENT HOUSING PROGRAM PROPERTY ACQUISITION OF: 233 LEWIS STREET.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Paoletta requested that this agenda item be placed on the consent calendar.

**109- 06 - Demolition of Homes in cases of unpaid taxes.**

**\*\* COUNCIL PRESIDENT AYALA MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEM 109-06 - DEMOLITION OF HOMES IN CASES OF UNPAID TAXES.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
& CONTRACTS COMMITTEE  
JOINT MEETING  
MAY 22, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:**

**ECDE COMMITTEE:** Council members: Paoletto, McCarthy, DePara, Valle, Mulligan

**CONTRACTS COMMITTEE:** Council members: \*Mulligan, \*Paoletto, \*DePara, Pivrotto, Colon,  
Rodgerson, Curran

*\*denotes – serves on both committees*

**ABSENT:** Council members: Dye, Holloway

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ed Lavernoich, OPED

Council member Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. He stated that there was a question regarding how many members make a quorum, noting a quorum consists of eight members, but there is no requirement that a quorum has to be four members from each committee. Council member Paoletto requested that all cell phones be turned off.

**1236-06 Draft term sheet with the Downtown Cabaret Theater (Lease 263 Golden Hill Street)**

Mr. Lavernoich, of OPED stated there was a resolution submitted by the Chief Administrative Officer for a lease with the Cabaret Theater for 10 years that started in the year 2006. The resolution authorizes the Mayor to execute a lease according to the copy of the term sheet. He asked if there were any questions.

Council member Curran said she noticed that there weren't any benchmarks applied to the lease or any expectations of the level of activity for the theater requiring the use of the building, in regard to performances. Mr. Lavernoich said there might be a feature to that effect in the ultimate lease, but it hasn't been outlined yet. Council member Curran asked if the committee could have the opportunity to pass on the final term sheet. Mr. Lavernoich said that representatives for the Cabaret Theater could speak to their performances schedule. Although not knowing the frequency of shows yet, he thought that matter could be decided upon in the actual lease.

Mr. Scinto, the Director of the Cabaret Theater stated they would do a minimum of (200) performances. He noted that they had 35,000 kids that come through their doors. He further said he

appreciated the lease that they get from the city, noting that they kept the doors open for years and worked hard. He said they were looking to hold as many performances as they could, so they don't get in the red. He recalled that they have been in the red for years, but have been able to get out. He mentioned that the City of Hartford gets almost full funding from the state, but Bridgeport only gets a minimal amount. He expressed his thanks for everyone's support.

Council member Curran commented that she was an active fan of the Cabaret Theater. However, she noted that there should be a level playing field, noting there should be a way to initiate expectations.

Council member Mulligan asked in terms of funding; was there any expectation of receiving funding from the state. Mr. Scinto replied no, he said they tried to get funding for a long time, but haven't been successful. He stated that they may get a grant for remodeling.

Council member Mulligan asked the number of years they were located at the Eisenhower Center. Mr. Scinto said they have been there for 30 years. He said they kept the theatre operational by bringing people in to see live shows. Council member Mulligan acknowledged they have been at the Eisenhower Center for 30 years and prior to that at the Sacred Heart site.

Council member Piviroto said she thought they received bonding from the state. Mr. Scinto said they received \$1 million bonding for remodeling only. Council member Piviroto commented about the Cabaret Theater's loyalty staying in Bridgeport. She thanked them for their understanding about the benchmark.

Council member Rodgeron asked about the \$1 million in bonding for renovations. He asked if the money was actually there or if it was being passed through. Mr. Hugh Hallen, Executive Producer of the Cabaret Theater said the bonding was approved and on hold until the lease is put in.

Council member Mulligan questioned whether or not they would rely on getting the grant. Mr. Scinto said no.

Council member Piviroto asked about the final lease per a paragraph she read that outlined the execution of the contract by the Mayor. She asked if this left the committee out of it since the Mayor's authorization was needed. Mr. Lavernoich said yes, they were looking for authorization from the Mayor based on the (200) performances per year. Council member Piviroto said she would like the city council to ultimately approve the lease. Mr. Scinto said he didn't have a problem with that. Mr. Lavernoich said he would submit the detailed term sheet to the city council with the indication that it will be signed by the Mayor.

Council member Curran asked about the term extension on the lease. Mr. Scinto said the lease contemplated 10 years.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO ADD A BENCHMARK OF TWO-HUNDRED (200) PERFORMANCES PER YEAR. IT WAS FURTHER NOTED THAT THIS DETAIL SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE BODY OF THE RESOLUTION  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PIVIROTTO SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Final Motion

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER RODGERSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AS AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLED SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY  
\*Consent calendar

**127-06 Draft term sheet with the Music and Arts Center for Humanity (MACH) (Lease Space at 999 Broad Street)**

Mr. Lavernoich stated this was a resolution from the Chief Administrative Officer for a lease for MACH. The space is located on the bottom floor at 999 Broad Street. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued for the space and the lease was negotiated similar to that for the Cabaret Theater, but it contemplates a share of the utilities.

Council member McCarthy asked if a copy of the RFP was available. Mr. Lavernoich said he didn't have it available tonight.

Council member McCarthy questioned if it was found that the highest and best use for the space was for a non-profit organization. Mr. Lavernoich said yes, but he didn't know the rationale for the decision.

Council member McCarthy explained that he asked that question because although he liked what MACH does, he wasn't sure if he liked what was planned for this space. He noted that he is always an advocate of finding out what else is out there to fill the space. Mr. Lavernoich said there were concerns about MACH being in the space. He said the building currently has a tenant that is J.P. Morgan Chase that services the debt on the building at a cost of \$300k per year, so the rental concern was discussed and dismissed. Although there were some concern about noise in the building. And there was also the concern of parking, per the five spaces required by the school. He thought the representative from MACH could answer to the parking issue. But overall, the concerns were addressed.

Council member McCarthy spoke about J.P. Morgan Chase covering the debt service. He pointed out he would like to see someone else in addition to cover the entire debt service. Again, he wasn't sure this was the right spot for MACH.

Council member Rodgeron stated that as a member of the Downtown Steering Committee, in the plan they are specific about bringing in the arts both formal and informal. He said that most art institutions are located within a few blocks of one another and he felt MACH was a compatible use. He further pointed out that they discussed getting money to go towards MACH and he said his comfort level was high in choosing to put them in this building. He also thought there should be some ground signage to identify that they are there. Overall, he said he didn't have any issues with them being in the space, and he thought the city should subsidize MACH. Again, he didn't have a problem with regard to the location, noting them being there would create synergy to what is going on downtown.

Council member Piviotto said she felt the opposite of what Council member Rodgeron felt. She thought they could possibly get well over \$300k on a lease for the space. She questioned why that wasn't a concern. Mr. Lavernoich said the potential of space would be far less than \$300k. Council member Piviotto questioned if it could possibly be leased at \$24.00 per sq. ft. Mr. Lavernoich responded that amount wouldn't even be close. He said it may be rented at \$15.00 per sq. ft., noting that J.P. Morgan Chase pays \$17.00 per sq. ft.

Council member Piviotto asked the number of years left on J.P. Morgan Chase lease. Mr. Lavernoich said he didn't know that information off hand, but he could find out.

Council member Piviotto asked about giving MACH 1 to 1 ½ years to adequately soundproof the space. Mr. Harold Levine, Chairman of MACH approached the committee. He thanked all the members of the committee for getting the information. He said they focused on trying to get into the Art Space building and had a lease set up, but they were subsequently told not to occupy that space due to the construction of the building. They were also told they wouldn't be able to get in because it was suppose to be retail space. So they looked at other spaces and were ultimately advised to use the empty space behind Chase. He referred to the RFP that outlined that the space might be the best use for them; he said he was also told that it would be difficult to get a commercial tenant due to the lack of parking.

Mr. Levine went on to say that MACH has been in Bridgeport for over 30 years and by putting the MACH center in this location, he thought it was an ideal spot for Bridgeport because it will send a message that they support the arts. Furthermore, all the talent can be brought in since they will be in proximity to other arts entities, such as the Cabaret Theater, the library, Housatonic Museum etc. He pointed out that if they considered another location, they will not get the parents to bring their children. Overall, he thought MACH could be a catalyst for the downtown area.

Council member DePara asked about Housatonic College expanding. He questioned if they could possibly use some of that space. Mr. Levine said he wasn't aware of any space they had available. He reiterated that they looked at other spaces and none of them were as good as the one selected. He said he was confident the noise wouldn't be an issue. He further mentioned that many noted people from the business and educational communities support MACH.

Council member DePara stated that he also supported the arts, but he didn't believe a non-profit use was the best use for the location. Mr. Levine said that since the city took over, to the best of his knowledge, the space was never rented. He repeated that he truly didn't believe the best use for the building was retail. Once again, he felt MACH's presence would give a signal to developers and people moving here that they have a vital art endeavor in the downtown area.

Council member Mulligan asked where they were located in the past. Mr. Levine said the school was started at U.B. by a blind woman, noting the program was initially for blind persons. They were at U.B. up until five years ago. From there, they looked at space and found it at 510 Barnum Avenue. He noted there would be an investment of \$1.5 million into the new center. Council member Mulligan asked if that would be in addition to the \$700k and the renovations at a cost of \$1.4 million. Mr. Levine said monies will also be raised in addition to what they receive from the state.

Council member Mulligan asked if they don't get state funding, how will they get the rest of the money. Mr. Levin said they will raise the money. He noted they had a performance at the Klein Memorial Auditorium in March that raised \$700k, so there is tremendous support for MACH by many people.

Council member Mulligan asked if they were agreeable to the requirement that they raise funds within 18-months. Mr. Levine said yes. Council member Paoletto clarified there will an initial 12-month period that can be extended up to 24-months.

Council member Curran asked when an RFP last went out for the space. Mr. Lavernoich said none previously went out, but if they ever received a show of interest in the space, they would have brought it before the city council, however, they never received an offer.

Council member Curran said in effect there is a 20-year lease, but there is no provision for escalation or benchmarks. She mentioned that with market coming to Bridgeport, she felt a class-A building would be compromised from using it as a class-A building. She said she had a problem with taking a building off the market and she further questioned the sale of the building. Mr. Lavernoich said that detail was outlined in the term sheet on page 2 and it applied as long as the landlord owned the premises.

Council member Curran thought a 20-year commitment required more clarity about what happens. She noted there will be \$1.5 million in improvements for dancing and she questioned if this type of venture would help the market. Mr. Lavernoich said they could assume that if the building gets sold to a private party, there will probably be a dramatic overhaul, that wasn't an issue at this time.

Council member Pivrotto questioned the parents not wanting to go to the Barnum Avenue location. Mr. Levine said that was correct, noting there were concerns about crime and poor lighting in the area at night.

Council member Piviroto asked if there was any reason for not buying their own building. Mr. Levine said they inquired about empty land to build upon, but there didn't seem to be an appropriate property to accommodate them.

Council member Piviroto asked if they were aware of some of the vacant buildings downtown such as the Mechanics & Farmer building. Mr. Levine said they did look at twenty-five different locations within the past three years, noting this took a long time in discussions with the city.

Council member Piviroto agreed it would be a good thing for them to be located downtown, but again there was the question of occupying a first class office space. She pointed out the real possibility of retail going into that space that will bring in jobs.

Council member Rodgeron strongly expressed that MACH provided arts to disadvantaged children. He further pointed out that the new location would be accessible to public transportation. He offered an amendment for the language pertaining to the restrictions on signage be stricken. He said it wasn't a good approach not to have signage. He stressed he didn't want to see the institution experience anonymity.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER RODGERSON MOVED TO STRIKE THE LANGUAGE  
PERTAINING TO THE RESTRICTIONS OF SIGNS BEING DISPLAYED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED

Council member Mulligan clarified that the language was specific. He pointed out that reasonable acceptance meant the landlord couldn't resist a reasonable proposal. But if the tenant wanted say a 50 ft. sign; that could be questioned. Council member Rodgeron read the first sentence pertaining to signage; he emphasized the paragraph discouraged signage. Council member Mulligan thought when the lease was written, the tenant will have to obtain consent for any signage not reasonably held.

Council member Rodgeron questioned if they would have Mike Feeney, the CAO determine what type of signage could go up or he asked if they could trust MACH to put up reasonable signage so people can see where they're at. Council member Mulligan felt they could trust both, but any landlord will expect a provision as it was outlined. He said to also keep in mind they could have a 150-page lease and if both sides aren't reasonable, it will not work.

Council member Walsh questioned why they would amend the terms sheet, noting any changes should be reflected in the actual lease. Council member Rodgeron stated that by removing the language page pertaining to signage, they will send a communication to the administration. The matter is with regard as to how the lease should be structured.

Council member Valle questioned how MACH felt about signage. Mr. Levine said the language he was originally showed was more restrictive and they recommended opening it up to set a level of trust. He noted that the Town of Westport figured out a way to solving signage issues by going before an architect review board. But he said he hoped both parties would be reasonable.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER RODGERSON MOVED TO STRIKE THE PARAGRAPH  
OUTLINING THE SIGNAGE RESTRICTIONS  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION FAILED WITH THREE VOTES IN FAVOR AND FOUR VOTES IN OPPOSITION  
(COUNCIL MEMBERS: PIVIROTTI, DEPARA, MULLIGAN and McCARTHY)

Council member Curran asked if there was a requirement of the city to buy back the space after renovations were made. Mr. Lavernoich said that hadn't been contemplated.

Council member Curran stated she would like to see another escalation clause.

Council member Rodgerston felt MACH should be paying only \$1.00 per month and not \$300.00 per month. He emphasized that they do what the Board of Education doesn't do. Again, it's a good thing for the city.

Council member Mulligan asked for clarification on the term of 20 years, he questioned what could happen after 10 years. Mr. Lavernoich said if a sale is contemplated in the future, they could terminate or reopen the lease and the terms of the rent.

Council member Mulligan asked the percentage of the overall inhabitable space. Mr. Lavernoich said it was 15,000 sq. ft. and 130,000 sq. ft. total.

Council member McCarthy asked if in the first ten years, if someone came in with an offer of say \$20 million, where was outlined in the lease that will allow them to terminate within 10 years. Mr. Lavernoich said if they sold the building during the interim, they will have to have economic reasons to justify selling the building. He believed there would be a provision in the lease that the first few years after the investment, MACH will have to be compensated. He said there was a likelihood that someone would buy it and inherit MACH as a tenant and ultimately, the space would become more valuable.

Council member Curran referred to a copy of a 2003 filing indicating revenues of \$1.3 million. She noted that three-quarters of that amount were for salaries. Mr. Levine said the \$1.3 million was a ballpark figure based on rough drawings. Mr. Lavernoich clarified that Council member Curran was asking about revenues pertaining to salaries. Council member Curran repeated that she didn't feel good about a building being used for a non-profit and the issue of an RFP going out specifically to a non-profit. Mr. Levine said the highest and best use didn't preclude another non-profit coming in.

Council member Mulligan asked about the reference to expenses per Council member Curran's question about raising money on the revenue side. Council member Curran questioned the revenues of \$1.2 million and the officer's compensations of \$100k+. Ben, the Financial Officer of MACH said the concern of a high percentage being paid to employees was due to hiring 65 to 80 part-time teachers. He noted that many supplies were in-kind, but the teacher's expertise was where the money was being spent.

Ms. Judy Hammer, the Grant Administrator commented that they had a discussion with the Federal Grants Administrator about considering a grant and he questioned why they were paying their teachers so low. He thought they should be paid in line with other administrators.

Mr. Levine commented on the varied programs that MACH offers to youth. He pointed all the programs were related to having teachers inspire the kids in the arts. He shared that a sculpting program was implemented that is taught by a professional sculptor.

Council member Rodgerson asked for details of the services they provided to the BOE. It was stated that program was named "Make the Grade"; it's a program for 8<sup>th</sup> graders who haven't moved ahead. The program is funded to help the kids get out of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. He further explained that the program consisted of computer work, art and dancing, but subsequently the BOE lost funding, so now they only go to the schools one day per week. The program costs \$120k for 60 to 80 students. He explained the kids were bused from two high schools and three grammar schools and this program helps them with special issues. It was emphasized that they had a good relationship with the BOE.

Council member Pivrotto questioned if they ever moved downtown, would they still be going into the schools. She asked what would be happening downtown that isn't happening at the Barnum Avenue location. Mr. Levine said the population would probably double. The new facility will allow them to serve more children because parents would be more comfortable bringing their kids there. He pointed out that Bridgeport schools don't provide arts programs and he commented that 90% of the kid were from Bridgeport.

Council member Valle said that MACH was in her district and it was sad that they were moving out. She expressed that she loved the east side and it was also sad to get the impression that people from the suburbs won't come to the current location. She emphasized that she was aware how great MACH was and she knew that from working within the school system, how MACH has helped students that enjoy the programs and learn from them. She stressed however, that she would hate to see them move from the area and she would like them to stay in Bridgeport. She also mentioned that it would be nice if they could have their own building, but she realized they needed to continue the program. She urged approval of the request.

Mr. Levine stated that he questioned Nancy Hadley, OPED about other available space.

Council member Walsh asked if they reviewed the original resolution approved for the building. He questioned the intent of purchase to keep the space where Chase is as a commercial space. He thought this matter should be researched before asking for approval. He further stressed they should wait to see the final lease to avoid any ambiguity.

Council member Walsh went on to question the 15,000 sq. ft. at a cost of \$20. 00 per sq. ft. Mr. Lavernoich said that was correct. Council member Walsh said they should consider busing city employees to the space if that was the only thing holding up finding a commercial tenant. Mr. Lavernoich said the parking wasn't the only thing preventing a commercial tenant going in; there was also the question of the market. Council member Walsh didn't feel they would need any grandiose

construction for a commercial entity, noting any overhaul would be minimal. Mr. Levine expressed they were told the same thing previously that they couldn't move into prime retail space. Again, nobody bought the space, so he thought MACH being there was in the interest of Bridgeport and they would be better off providing an arts program to enrich children's lives. Council member Walsh stressed that still didn't mean there wasn't any space in the City Hall Annex available, noting the willingness to give up revenue for a non-profit. He felt if the RFP was structured properly they could find a tenant.

Council member DePara said he was hard pressed to say they couldn't find other space in the city. He mentioned reusing the old schools spaces. Mr. Lavernoich said they contemplated those uses, but he wasn't sure if MACH contemplated it. Council member DePara asked if it would be a feasible opportunity. Mr. Lavernoich said when they looked at schools to reconsider the use, they found that schools were very old, some over 100 years old and major work would be required for someone to occupy them. He said he didn't think a non-profit would be the ultimate use to do all the work that would be needed.

Council member DePara said he was bothered by the RFP that was designed by a CAO who wasn't present to answer to his thought process. Council member Paoletto said he believed that Mike Feeney was away on city business.

Council member DePara asked if the matter was time sensitive, noting that if it wasn't, this will allow time for Mr. Feeney to address the questions the committee had. Mr. Lavernoich said he wasn't sure if the matter was time sensitive.

Council member Rodgeron said he didn't feel the scope of the RFP was very relevant to what was being accomplished. He reiterated that once again, he supported MACH and he stressed that the kids should be near other arts entities in the downtown area. He said the downtown location was completely accessible for kids without transportation.

Council member Mulligan mentioned the importance of getting the schools back on the tax roll at some point. He mentioned this in response to Council member DePara's comment about the possibility of using the old schools for MACH's location.

Council member Mulligan asked how long the space had been vacant. Mr. Lavernoich said it's been vacant for 3 ½ years.

Council member Mulligan asked if realtors in the area know about the space being available. Mr. Lavernoich said yes, but they didn't formally market the space.

Council member DePara asked what was in the space now. Mr. Lavernoich said it was temporary space for the police and swing space for the BOE.

Council member Curran referred to a letter from a commercial real estate offer (*she submitted the letter into the record*). – Council member Paoletto read the letter from William Raveis Realtor

outlining the class-A lease space. The letter indicated the amount per square ft. the space usually goes for (*exhibit-A was submitted to the city clerk's office*). Council member Paoletto questioned where the letter came from. Council member Curran said she had a walk through done per her request and the letter was the result of what was found.

Council member Walsh asked about the number of students that attend classes on a regular basis at the current building. It was stated that there are 40 to 50 kids on Saturday; there are 20 to 30 kids two to three days per week that rotate classes at different times; there are 50 to 60 kids for the after school program; 70 kids for the Ailey Summer Camp and 30 to 40 kids for the MACH Neighborhood Studios Camp.

Council member Walsh asked if they would have that number in the City Hall Annex. The response was yes, but it wouldn't be overcrowded and the teachers would be there also to occupy the space.

Council member Walsh asked the maximum number of kids there would be in the city hall annex. The response was approximately 150 kids, noting that they are bused in or dropped off.

Council member Walsh commented that most schools wouldn't be found in the downtown area. The response was that MACH was an arts and education program; although the statement could be made that they are a school per se.

Mr. Levine said that within 60 to 90 days after opening, they will probably expand the number of students greatly. He highlighted again how great the program was. Council member Walsh questioned the excitement over generating a lot of additional business.

Council member Pivrotto pointed out it would be difficult to convert a school to class-A office space. She also pointed out the matter of the tax base, noting that although MACH generates a certain amount of excitement, it doesn't help the tax base. She further stressed that during the budget sessions, there was a debate to give the BOE and additional \$500k, but it was overruled due to the matter of the tax rate.

Council member Rodgeron repeated that MACH was the right thing for Bridgeport and that there were a lot of unexplored opportunities there. He said when you are looking at the space that isn't rented out, in comparison to what they charge schools per sq. ft. that is nothing; they are helping to put in a place that will enhance downtown that Bridgeport can be proud of. But locating MACH anywhere else would be less exciting. He thought having it in the downtown area would reenergize the city and also allow kids to interact with the suburbs. Again, MACH provides services that the BOE doesn't and he thought it was inappropriate to look at the annex as a revenue stream.

Council member Curran stated her issues had to do with the process that she thought should have been discussed before the RFP went out. She felt the matter coming before committee now was a fait accompli and she didn't feel enough research was done to determine what the building could get. Overall, she didn't think the RFP process was sincere to consider the highest and best use. She thanked all the art lovers that were present tonight. She commented there were other leases under

discussion noting inconsistencies in them and she hoped they would be addressed on a level playing field.

Mr. Levine said they intended to work to support other arts programs when they come forward.

Council member Walsh asked about form 990 and the amounts outlined. The response was they could submit the 990 forms for the last two years for review. It was further noted that their debt was down and current. And there was no long term outstanding loans.

Council member Walsh asked about the 4-year period beginning 2002 ending 2003, where MACH received \$1,092,000. Council member Paoletto interjected to say that it was nice his colleague found the information, but he commented that it would have been nice for the committee to see the information also. Council member Walsh said it was a 25-page document and he didn't think about making numerous copies.

The response to Council member Walsh's question regarding the 4-year period was that, that period in question was a month or two short period.

Council member Pivrotto stated that there were questions for Mike Feeney to answer, so:

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PIVROTTA MOVED TO TABLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER:**

- PROVIDE A COPY OF THE RFP
- PROVIDE CORRESPONDENCE PRIOR TO THE RFP i.e., memos etc.
- SUBMIT THE ORIGINAL RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PURCHASE OF THE CHASE BUILDING
- SUBMIT THE TWO (2) 990 TAX RETURNS FOR AUGUST 31, 2005 and AUGUST 31, 2006
- SUBMIT A LISTING OF CITY OWNED PROPERTY IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA FOR REVIEW AS OTHER SITE OPTIONS FOR MACH

\*It was noted that all the paperwork requested should be issued to all council members.

Council member Mulligan stated that they should try to schedule Mr. Feeney before the next council meeting. Council member Paoletto said he would try to do it in a timely fashion, noting he would contact Mr. Feeney this week to find out his availability.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH SIX VOTES IN FAVOR AND TWO VOTES IN OPPOSITION (COUNCIL MEMBERS: COLON and RODGERSON)**

Council member Mulligan stated that all requests should be processed through Tom White. And it should be reiterated that the meeting should be scheduled in a timely fashion in order for the matter to be referred to the full council.

ADJOURNED

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT**  
**JOINT COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
**AND ENVIRONMENT AND CONTRACTS**  
**JUNE 11, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletta, Chairman, Thomas Mulligan, Elaine Pivirotto, Leticia Colon, Keith Rodgerson, James Holloway, Thomas McCarthy, Maria Valle

**OTHERS:** Michael Feeny, Chief Administrative Officer; Ed Lavernoich, OPED; Mark Anastasi, City Attorney; Ron Pacacha, Assoc. City Attorney; Tom White, City Council Legislative Services; J. Celli, IPA; Dorothy Neves Freedman, MACH Board Member; Kevin Foley, Cushman & Wakefield; Harold Levine, MACH; Ben Mazotas, MACH; Bob Frost, MACH; Donald Raimone, MACH; D. Rosenbaum, MACH

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletta called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

**127-06 Draft term sheet with the Music and Arts Center for Humanity (MACH)**  
**(Lease Space at 999 Broad Street).**

Council Member Mulligan asked if there was a copy of the previous meeting's minutes available. Chairman Paoletta said that he had not received a copy of those minutes yet.

Chairman Paoletta said that at the last meeting, there had been a number of questions that the Committee had wanted to ask Mr. Feeny but Mr. Feeny was not able to attend the meeting.

Mr. White distributed copies of the resolution to the members of the Committee.

Council Member Pivirotto asked Chairman Paoletta what had become of the questions that were asked of the Chair and the information that was needed. Chairman Paoletta said that he had gone over the questions with the stenographer to insure that they were part of the records. Council Member Pivirotto then asked if a copy of the RFP was available and a list of the alternative properties. Atty. Pacacha said that he believe that the property was acquired through forfeiture. Council Member Walsh said that the City Council had approved the purchase of the property and he then asked if copies of the original resolution were available.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEM 127-06 DRAFT TERM SHEET WITH THE MUSIC AND ARTS CENTER FOR HUMANITY (MACH) (LEASE SPACE AT 999 BROAD STREET) BECAUSE THE COMMITTEE DID NOT HAVE COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE THE PROPERTY, THE RFP AND A LIST OF THE ALTERNATIVE PROPERTIES THAT HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PIVIROTTI SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE IN FAVOR (MCCARTHY, HOLLOWAY, PIVIROTTI, VALLE AND COLON) AND TWO AGAINST (RODGERSON AND MULLIGAN).**

Chairman Paoletta said that he would like to clarify which documents were being requested and information was needed before the next meeting.

Council Member Walsh said that he wanted to see the original resolution to obtain the property. Council Member Pivirotti said that she wanted to see a copy of the RFP and a list of alternative sites. Council Member Mulligan said that he wanted the date and year of the resolution. Council Member Walsh commented that it was during the Gannon administration. Atty. Anastasi pointed out that the City Clerk's Office was where the records of the resolutions were stored. Council Member Holloway objected, saying that once an item was tabled, there could be no more discussion. Chairman Paoletta repeated that he was trying to clarify which documents were being requested and information was needed before the next meeting. Council Member Holloway said it didn't matter.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PIVIROTTI SECONDED.**

Mr. Levine said that he had emailed all the Committee members copies of that list.

Council Member Mulligan asked when the next meeting of the Committees would be on this matter. There was a brief discussion about the various dates. Chairman Paoletta said that he would schedule the meeting as soon as possible.

**\*\* THE MOTION TO ADJOURN PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Services

City of Bridgeport  
Joint Commission on Economic and Community Development and Environment and  
Contracts  
June 11, 2007  
Page 2



**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT**  
**JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
**AND ENVIRONMENT AND CONTRACTS**  
**JUNE 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Council Members: Richard Paoletto, Jr., Co-chair; Tom Mulligan, Co-chair; Angel dePara, Jr.(6:12); Keith Rodgerson; Donna Curran; Elaine Pivirotto; Leticia Colón; James Holloway; Maria Valle; Bob Curwen; Carlos Silva; Bob Walsh (6:15)

**STAFF:** Ed Lavernoch, Office of Planning and Development; Michael Feeney, Chief Administrative Office; Mark Anastasi, City Attorney's Office (6:46)

**OTHERS:** Andres Ayala, Jr., City Council President; Harold Levine, MACH;

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Paoletto at 6:09 p.m.

**127 – 06                      Draft term sheet with the Music and Arts Center for Humanity (MACH) (Lease Space at 999 Broad Street)**

Mr. Paoletto distributed copies of the draft term sheet between the city of Bridgeport and MACH and opened the floor to Mr. Feeney to review the status of this item and its discussion up until the time of this meeting.

Mr. Feeney said that as of Monday, June 12<sup>th</sup> there were three questions that the committee wanted the administration to respond to. The first of these was the original resolution of the city actually acquiring 999 Broad Street. The second was a request for proposals for the lease of 999 Broad Street and the third was a request for a list of alternative locations that had been reviewed by MACH. Mr. Feeney said that these were all submitted via email on June 12<sup>th</sup> by the administration.

Mr. dePara entered at 6:12 p.m.

Mr. Paoletto opened the floor to the committee for questions and discussion.

Ms. Pivirotto asked for clarification as to whether MACH had previous interest in the corner of Jewett Ave and Main St.

Mr. Levine of MACH said that it was one of the sites they looked at.

Ms. Pivirotto referred to the original RFP, the resolution for November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1997 in the third paragraph from the bottom which says,

*Now therefore be it resolved that the Mayor is authorized to purchase or acquire via eminent domain 999 Broad Street. Be it further resolved, the Mayor is authorized to lease back portions of the structure at fair market rental value until such time as the space is needed for municipal operations*

Ms Pivrotto said that she wanted to make sure that MACH and its representatives and everyone on this council had read and understood the above.

Mr. Walsh entered at 6:15

Mr. Lavernoch described his interpretation of the intent of that paragraph. He said that historically, the Mayor was authorized to enter into commercial deals with commercial tenants without coming back to the council and the paragraph says that any deal that is not fair market value with a commercial tenant would require the administration to go back to the council.

Mr. Mulligan asked who the owner is referenced in the resolution that the city would be taking the property from if the city is authorized to acquire that property by eminent domain.

Mr. Lavernoch answered that he didn't remember the name, but the owner was a doctor based on Long Island who purchased the property via a fire sale. Chase Manhattan Bank of Connecticut was the tenant at that time. They had complained about the condition of the building and talked about leaving Bridgeport. The city decided it needed to retain Chase and so ultimately acquired the property by eminent domain in order to do so.

Mr. Walsh said that he was on the council at that time and said that the reason that language was added to the resolution was because it was clear at the time that Chase might move out and the council wanted to make sure that if there were any leases on that property that they be done at fair market value so that revenue stream would be available. He went on to say that at the time there was a great deal of controversy regarding the property's acquisition because it was deemed by a number of people to be unnecessarily spacious. The resolution was structured the way it was to prevent the mayor from setting less than fair market value.

Ms. Pivrotto asked Mr. Lavernoch for clarification on the mayor's authorization to lease back portions of the structure and the next paragraph that says, "Be it further resolved that the city's utilization of office space at 999 Broad Street will be reviewed and approved by the City Hall Committee and the City Council for subsequent action". She asked Mr. Lavernoch if he thought that these were two separate and distinct points and if it was his interpretation that if the mayor was leasing the space at fair market value, he would not need the approval of the City Hall Committee and the City Council.

Mr. Lavernoch confirmed that this was in fact his interpretation but if there were any changes in the city utilization of office space then that would require review by the City Hall Committee.

Ms. Pivrotto respectfully disagreed, saying that according to ordinances concerning the sale or lease of city property, everything must go through the City Hall Committee and City Council.

Mr. Feeney said that with the council's approval, the mayor would be able to lease this at below market value and that the lease before them at this meeting is below market value which is why they were gathered.

Mr. Mulligan said this resolution, however it is interpreted was passed in 1997. He said that 11.5% of the building has now been vacant for 3 ½ years. He also mentioned that there have been no changes to city offices and there won't be in the foreseeable future. He said that acting on this lease at the time of this meeting would be in effect, revising this resolution.

Mr. Rodgerson asked if this was going to go through the City Hall Committee.

Mr. Paoletto said that it would.

Mr. Rodgerson said that what the committee was dealing with is not encompassed in either of the previously mentioned two clauses and that it is well within this committee's ability to engage that kind of contract.

Mr. dePara asked of Mr. Lavernoch or Mr. Feeney if it wouldn't be more prudent to go to the City Hall Committee before bringing an item for council approval.

Mr. Feeney said that they've been trying to schedule a meeting before the City Hall Committee and would meet with them that week.

Mr. Paoletto said that he didn't remember this ever being an issue.

Mr. Lavernoch said that he didn't think that the ordinances specifically say that the City Hall Committee must act before the council.

Mr. Walsh asked Mr. Paoletto if he remembered an issue being approved by committee prior to going to City Hall Committee.

Mr. Paoletto answered that he couldn't recall such an instance.

Mr. Walsh asked if the committee had a written opinion by the City Attorney on the interpretation of this resolution.

Mr. Feeney answered in the negative.

Ms. Pivrotto expressed concern for taxpayers as owners of this property because the city is leasing it at such a low price of 24 cents per square foot. She said that the committee asked for the original resolution almost 4 weeks prior to this meeting.

Mr. Mulligan said that the resolution is 10 years old and can be revised. He said that he planned to propose an amendment that should this resolution be deemed by anyone inconsistent with the November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1997 resolution, this council hereby revises said November 12<sup>th</sup>, 1997 resolution to the extent necessary to permit the effectuation of this resolution, 127-06. Mr. Mulligan went on to say that he'd discussed this with Mr. Feeney and wanted to clarify that what the committee was, in effect doing is a 10 year lease and that he also wanted to amend the resolution where it says, "Any 10 year extension may be withheld in the exercise of the most prudent business venture". Mr. Mulligan then welcomed any further discussion.

No further comment or discussion was made.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO AMEND RESOLUTION 127-06 TO ADD THE LANGUAGE AT THE END THAT WOULD STATE "SHOULD THIS RESOLUTION BE DEEMED BY ANYONE INCONSISTENT WITH THE NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 1997 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL, THIS COUNCIL HEREBY REVISES SAID NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 1997 RESOLUTION TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY TO PERMIT THE EFFECTUATION OF THIS RESOLUTION, 127-06.**

Mr. Walsh raised a point of order, saying this resolution could not be amended by this committee because it was not properly before this committee at the time of this meeting and because this was a special meeting.

Mr. Feeney left the room at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Mulligan said that this was incorrect because he was not amending the 1997 resolution but rather he was amending the resolution before them that will by this amendment effectuate the permission to revise the 1997 resolution.

Mr. Walsh said that the original resolution would have to be amended and that a motion could not be passed that superseded that resolution simply because the original resolution was not before the committee.

Mr. Paoletto ruled in favor of Mr. Walsh and asked the opinion of Mr. Ayala.

Mr. Ayala said that he agreed with Mr. Paoletto and Mr. Walsh, saying that unfortunately, there was no legal representation present to verify which position is the correct one.

Mr. Mulligan reiterated that he was amending the item before the committee, not the 1997 resolution. He said that he had the right to appeal the ruling of the Chair and that it was the majority of the committee that would decide whether his resolution was in order or not.

Mr. Ayala encouraged the committee to err on the side of caution before excusing himself to start another meeting.

Mr. Ayala left the room at 6:46 p.m.

Atty. Anastasi entered the room at 6:46 p.m.

Mr. Paoletto briefed Atty. Anastasi on the committee's proceedings.

Mr. Mulligan restated his motion for Atty. Anastasi.

Atty. Anastasi stated that there was no harm in this motion and suggested that Mr. Paoletto was acting in excessive caution. He went on to say that he didn't think the amendment was necessary since a resolution passed in 1997 did not tie the hands of the organization for all time.

Mr. Paoletto rescinded his rule in favor of Mr. Walsh.

**\*\* MS. COLÓN SECONDED MR MULLIGAN'S MOTION TO AMEND.  
\*\* MR. MULLIGAN, MR. RODGERSON, MS. COLÓN AND MS. VALLE  
VOTED IN FAVOR.  
\*\* MR. DEPARA, MS. CURRAN, MS. PIVIROTTA AND MR. HOLLOWAY  
WERE OPPOSED.  
\*\* MR. PAOLETTO BROKE THE TIE AND THE MOTION WAS PASSED.**

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO FURTHER AMEND THE ITEM ON PAGE  
TWO TO ADD THE FOLLOWING WORDS WHERE IT SAYS "TERM  
RENEWAL": ANY EXTENSION IS SUBJECT TO THE LANDLORD'S  
PRUDENT JUDGEMENT.  
\*\* MS. COLÓN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* MR. RODGERSON MOVED TO PASS THE ITEM AS DOUBLY  
AMENDED  
\*\* MS. COLÓN SECONDED.**

Ms. Curran said that she noticed and wanted to discuss two properties that were not part of the list of alternative sites reviewed by MACH which were The Eisenhower Center and The Downtown Cabaret. She said that she didn't want to see the city buying back

alterations to the building from the tenant which would be very specific to that tenant. She then asked if special permits were required for performance space.

**\*\* MS. PIVIROTTO MOVED TO AMEND THE LEASE TO STATE THAT THE CITY WOULD NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY IMPROVEMENTS MADE IN THE SPACE.**

Mr. Rodgeron asked for clarification from Ms. Pivirotto asking hypothetically if a non-profit were to come in and invest \$1 million in the building and then the city decided to sell the building, if the non-profit would lose their money.

Ms. Pivirotto said that this was correct.

Atty. Anastasi said that this amendment would be unnecessary and that the lease doesn't say that the city would have to buy back improvements, so it doesn't.

**\*\* MS. PIVIROTTO WITHDREW HER MOTION TO AMEND THE LEASE.**

The committee voted on Mr. Rodgeron's motion to pass the item as doubly amended.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN, MS. COLÓN, MR. RODGERSON, MR. HOLLOWAY AND MS. VALLE VOTED IN FAVOR  
\*\* MR. DEPARA, MS. CURRAN AND MS. PIVIROTTO OPPOSED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MR. RODGERSON MOVED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* MS. COLÓN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

This meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC COMMUNITY and DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT  
JUNE 19, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: Paoletto, Valle, Mulligan, DePara

**OTHERS:** Council member Colon

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**168-06            A Resolution regarding the sale of City Owned vacant lots to  
Bridgeport Community Land Trust (BCLT)**

Council member Valle stated a resolution was made for the purpose of securing the existing community gardens, and for the land trust to purchase the lots from the city. She stated they were trying to model the New Haven and Manhattan land trust, noting an event would be held in New Haven to see how the gardens operate. She went on to say that she attended such an event at Beardsley Park where they had a presentation on different activities and showed pictures. She expressed that she wanted to make sure the existing gardens operating weren't sold. Such as the ones on Park and Elm streets. She mentioned that she thought the previous minutes regarding this matter were inaccurate and didn't reflect that those lots weren't supposed to be sold. And an error occurred in the city clerk's office, so she wanted to make sure that didn't happen again.

Council member Paoletto referred to the resolution. He reviewed the first sentence that read **"Whereas, the City of Bridgeport has 12 (twelve) community gardens established on City owned properties under its Bridgeport Urban Garden (BUG) program, and"** ... he asked if the BUG program fell under Tom Coble's office. Council member Valle said yes.

Ms. Lydia Silvas stated she was a member of the Community Gardens. Council member Paoletto stated that normally, they don't allow the public to speak, but he agreed to allow her to clarify some questions the committee had.

Council member Paoletto referred to the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the resolution that read, **"Whereas, The City of Bridgeport through its CDBG program has provided substantial funding for developing these properties and is capable of investing more funding for the 35% match, and ...** he questioned what was meant by the basic acquisition. Christine said they would like to buy them and they were looking for funding through the DEP, but they won't buy the whole thing. Council member Paoletto commented that the city already owned the property. Christine said if the garden was going for say \$100.00 the city would give \$35.00 towards it, so the \$35.00 will be excused and the DEP would pay \$65.00.

Council member Paoletto asked what improvements were involved. Council member DePara said they were trying to outfit each garden with its own water meter. He noted that now, the water has to

be shipped in or borrowed from neighbors, so that's one of the major improvements. Christine added they tried to locate water barrels that could be donated and they are working to have them filled.

Council member Paoletto said the improvements were very vague. Council member Valle said she understood they might be, but...Council member Paoletto said he asked who should get the resolution, so it was sent to Mike Feeney's office and Brian Williams, but he was told they weren't involved. So he just wanted to make sure that everything was done properly. At any rate, there was a question whether or not they could move forward when they didn't have everything they need.

Council member Valle said one thing they were attempting to do, is there is a grant due on June 30, so they will submit the grant to have the monies to purchase the lots and continue with the community gardens. They are also looking to improve the gardens, sidewalks and fencing and the funding will help develop the gardens in place of those that were sold. She noted the money is expected to come from the state.

Council member Paoletto referred to the last sentence of the resolution that read **"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED" that the City of Bridgeport sell the attached Schedule "A" of City owned vacant lots to the Bridgeport Community Land Trust (BCLT) for appraised value with the contingency that the BCLT attain approval from the State of Connecticut DEP and that the DEP agrees that the City has or will provide the required match of 35% for acquisition and improvements for this project.** He noted there was no approximate value on how much the improvements would be to allow the required match at 35%. He further noted that sixteen (16) properties were indicated. There was a correction that it should read twelve (12) properties. He said if they said yes to the resolution, it would mean they will be giving up and estimated amount of \$16k.

Council member Mulligan said he would like to see a list of the properties. He asked if the program could operate on the lots and have them remain city owned. And if down the line, there is no interest in a particular lot or a lot goes unattended, then this will result in losing a property and then the city won't own it anymore.

Council member Paoletto referred to the matter of sustaining the gardens in perpetuity. He said he liked the idea overall, but they still needed to work out some things. He said that he would like to get some more information from Nancy Hadley's office to find out what she felt about the resolution. He said he would also like an estimate as to the amount of the actual improvements.

Council member Paoletto also requested that information from the DEP be provided. He asked if the paperwork had been filled out yet. Christine said it was in process. He commented that there would be a time line to meet to have it done before June 30.

Council member stated that if they accepted the 35%, he asked if they would continue to apply for CDBG funding. Christine said yes. Council member Paoletto took issue with the fact that they were looking for them to give up 35% of acquisition costs for improvements, and yet they would still

request CDBG money. Mr. Halsted said they cut back the costs from \$30k to 10K, but they could probably do the improvements on \$10k.

Council member Paoletto asked Mr. Halsted in what capacity he was present at the meeting. Mr. Halsted said he was there on behalf of the Bridgeport Community Land Trust.

Mr. Halsted said there were some rehabilitated gardens and some would be new gardens. He explained that under the grant, it will find new sidewalks, fencing and waterlines. Council member Paoletto asked with the improvements, did it mean it will cost \$630k to buy and fix them, if so, does that mean the city gives the 35%. Mr. Halsted said they might consider that as part of the 35% match, plus there's unspent CDBG money. Council member Paoletto said that may be true, but the matter has to go before the city council and the citizens union for reallocation. Mr. Halsted added they would get the grant for hundreds of thousands dollars to put into it.

Council member Paoletto asked how the city will make money off the deal. Mr. Halsted said the land trust will purchase it from the city using state grant money. Then the city gets the grant money that will result in a discount of what was already owned. Council member Paoletto said if he was saying the properties were worth \$413k, and if they were giving 35% to buy them from the city, then he didn't understand how the city made out. Mr. Halsted clarified that a lot of money going in will go towards new sidewalks etc. Council member Mulligan said but the city was contributing 35% to do that. Mr. Halsted replied it would be considered a match.

Council member DePara requested a copy of the grant proposal for the committee members, for the purpose of reviewing the language and numbers so they could understand what they were asking the state to do. He stated that the real question was how much the city had to contribute. He pointed out that \$220k was a far fetched number as far as he was concerned. And he thought the cost was probably closer to \$60k. He emphasized that's why it was important for the committee to have the information.

Council member DePara also requested a full accounting of properties in question to be compared to the listings that Brian Williams and Attorney Liskov generates. He said the listing should indicate the property, the size, the assessed value and dimensions. He repeated that a full packet of information should be provided, and when it's complete, if anyone has questions as to what the city was responsible for, the chairman could contact the DEP to find out exactly what the city was getting into.

Council member Paoletto added that the Bridgeport Community Land Trust should provide a list with specific rehabilitations per property; it should consist of a breakdown of each property. He said the proposal will be issued between the BCLT and city, Ms. Hadley's office or Tom Coble's office responsible for the package of properties. Again, it should consist of size and appraisals and comparable to the list that Attorney Liskov generates. There should also be an itemized list of each property, rehabilitations and cost.

Council member Paoletto said the would put the onus on Council member Valle to touch base with Mr. Halsted and assure that he gathers all the information. He said he would contact Ms. Hadley for the other requests.

Council member Valle noted all the information should be submitted to the other council members.

Council member Paoletto said they should also have something from Ms. Hadley indicating their take on the BUG Program. Mr. Halsted said the matter fell under the Community Development Office, not Ms. Hadley's office. Council member Paoletto said then Alana Kabel should be contacted.

Mr. Halsted spoke about the appraisal for \$413k, noting that was the current appraisal; however, he thought it could be more.

Council member Paoletto stated there was some question about Mr. Halsted working for the city and also being involved in the BCLT. He thought this could be perceived as a conflict and he cautioned that Mr. Halsted may have to answer to other council members.

Council member Valle said there were some questions that pertained to how the gardens would benefit belonging to an organization. She said if they were on the tax role, which she knew they weren't, she questioned what would happen to the current gardens. So there was a concern that they won't be removed from the list since they are very active in other sections of the city.

Council member Paoletto said another question was why they are suddenly working with the BCLT when they never have in the past. Council member Valle said she didn't think it was really being done that quick, however, it's taking place now. She noted that many of the lots are in the process of being cleaned up. Mr. Halsted said they've been doing business with them for the last year and they have cleaned up a lot, noting this had nothing to do with Groundwork, who works with the schools and does street clean ups.

Council member Paoletto emphasized there were two lists submitted and they contained some discrepancies. He stressed that there needed to be some clarifications made. For instance, 161 Denver Avenue wasn't on the list. He noted other lots that weren't on the list, again, noting the inconsistent addresses. Mr. Halsted said he made corrections to the addresses that afternoon. Council member Paoletto pointed out there won't be any approval until he reviewed the accurate information. He repeated once again, there were too many address discrepancies.

Council member Valle stated that they presented the resolution because there was a certain individual in city hall that makes decisions that hurt the community and although she understood there were some discrepancies and the resolution needing tweaking, she thought it should be approached reasonably. Council member Paoletto said that as co-chair of the committee, he needed to make sure all was correct and accurate. He commented that his comments weren't meant to be belittling or badgering. He expressed that he believed in the gardens, but he thought they needed the information as requested.

Mr. Halsted stated this was a golden opportunity for the city, because it will result in them getting money. Council member DePara disagreed that the city would end up seeing any money. He noted that 35% would result in a cost of \$220k and he didn't feel the city would get a dime of that, because they really don't have the money available. He strongly felt the BCLT will actually see the money.

Council member Mulligan asked if the past accounting records were kept of past construction done. Mr. Halsted said yes, they had that information for the fence and water installations.

Council member Mulligan said he wondered if they adopted the resolution, if the 35% was considered in-kind for past construction, he thought an accounting should be done. Mr. Halsted acknowledged the remark.

Council member Mulligan asked if most of the lots were buildable lots and what percentage of them were not buildable. Mr. Halsted said roughly half of them and others might need variances. Council member Mulligan asked if they would still be appraised at \$415k. Mr. Halsted said yes.

Council member Mulligan asked how long the BUG program had been in existence. Mr. Halsted said since 1980 through mostly volunteer work. However, the land trust was formed a year ago and they will own the properties.

Council member Mulligan asked if there was a charitable IRS exemption applicable. Mr. Halsted said yes, noting they just submitted the information to the IRS.

Council member Mulligan questioned where the land trust owned property, do they have liability insurance. Mr. Halsted said yes.

Council member Mulligan requested the following information be submitted:

- denotation on the listing whether the lot is buildable
- if listed as 2 separate lots, but adjoining, should be listed as lot A&B

Council member Paoletto questioned that BCLT has been in existence for a year; then he further questioned the previous comment by Mr. Halsted that the gardens have been going on for 20 years. Mr. Halsted clarified that the gardens have been in existence for 20 years. Council member Paoletto further questioned the matter of the BCLT being in existence for a year. Council member Valle stated the gardens used to be run by UConn, but they were always done through the city and someone she called Mohammad. Council member Paoletto said the bottom line was that the BCLT has only been in existence for 1 year and not 20 years.

Council member Colon said she had two community gardens in her district and they have worked well with the community getting involved. She said that out of respect for the situation, this matter should be approached in a different manner.

Council member Colon asked if Mr. Halsted would be overseeing the gardens through the BCLT. Mr. Halsted said others would be involved also. Council member Colon felt it would be a good thing for him to do, since he was already involved.

Council member Colon said everything should be organized and clarified to address all the questions the committee had. And although the chairman seemed frustrated at the discrepancies, she thought it would be better to have everything clarified. She further expressed that she was in favor of the gardens, because they plant a seed for everything in the city. She repeated that bringing everything together would help clarify things.

Council member DePara said he would also like to get information on funding from the DEP and if any past investments count towards the 35%.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO TABLE PENDING SUBMITTAL OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS FOLLOWS (to be submitted by Mr. Halsted):**

- 1. GRANT PROPOSAL THAT WILL BE SENT TO THE STATE**
- 2. ITEMIZED LISTING OF REHABILITATED PROPERTIES IN THE CITY**
- 3. A NEW SCHEDULE-A**

It was noted that Council member Paoletto would request the following information:

- 1. A FULL PACKAGE OF PROPERTIES AND APPRAISAL VALUES COMPARABLE TO THE PROPERTY LISTINGS THAT ATTORNEY LISKOV'S GENERATES**
- 2. A RECOMMENDATION LETTER FROM THE PROPER CITY DEPARTMENT THAT THIS ITEM FALLS UNDER - *Alana Kabel's office will be verified.***

Council member Valle stated that the resolution was sent to a few people at city hall, such as Mike Feeney, Brian Williams and Alana Kabel all had copies. Council member Paoletto disagreed that was the case. He recalled that the city clerk wasn't aware of whom to send it to. He reiterated that Brian Williams told him that he didn't think it was under his jurisdiction.

Council member Valle expressed some discontentment, because she felt that approval was being somewhat sabotaged. However,

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED THE MOTION WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE RESOLUTION SHOULD BE CLEANED UP AND WITH THE CONDITION THAT ALL THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BE SUBMITTED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

ADJOURNED

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
JULY 31<sup>ST</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Jr., Chair; Maria Ines Valle; Tom Mulligan; Tom McCarthy; Angel dePara, Jr.

**STAFF:** Russell D. Liskov, City Attorney's Office; Ed Lavernoich, Planning and Development Office; Brian Williams, Deputy CAO

**OTHERS:** Kevin Nunn, President, Bridgeport Economic Resource Center, Inc.

**CALL TO ORDER**

This meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

Mr. Paoletto announced that the Committee would be getting a new member, Mr. Richard Bonnie at the next City Council meeting and that Mr. Bonnie would be replacing Mr. Dye on every Committee he was a regular member of.

**APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE AND MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 15, 2007.**

\*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE.  
\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**APPROVAL OF JOINT COMMITTEE ECDE AND CONTRACTS MEETING  
MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 2007.**

\*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE.  
\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Paoletto said that the order of the items on the agenda would be changed to discuss item 193-06 first.

**193-06 Disposition of City Owned Properties.**

Mr. Liskov distributed and reviewed a list of properties sold since the beginning of this project saying that the City had made over \$3.4 million in closed real estate.

Ms. Valle asked where the money from this real estate went to.

Mr. Liskov answered that it was given to Michael Lupkis, the City Comptroller but he could not say with confidence where the money would go from there. Mr. Liskov then reviewed a list of properties that he felt were sellable and should be auctioned.

Ms. Valle asked during this review that it be noted that Mr. Liskov was instructed to speak with the Police Chief who may choose to use the lots at 446-450 Kossuth, 438-440 Kossuth and 122 Clarence Street for parking and not to auction that property without first getting the Chief's approval.

- \*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE THE LIST OF PROPERTIES TO BE AUCTIONED OFF, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE POLICE CHIEF OF THE AUCTIONING OF THE LOTS AT 446-450 KOSSUTH STREET, 438-440 KOSSUTH STREET AND 122 CLARENCE STREET.**
- \*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Liskov then reviewed a list of properties that he felt should be made available to abutters (adjacent property owners).

Ms. Valle requested that 751 Kossuth Street be removed from the list of properties that will be offered to abutters because this was something that she and Mr. Ayala had been working on for over three years and it was finally being resolved. She said that the property may be used as a Community Garden to replace the two Community Gardens on the East Side that were sold and that there were discussions with the Boys and Girls Club and it was possible that they may use the property for recreational purposes.

Mr. Liskov said that the Boys and Girls Club was in fact an abutter and that the Committee could request that he sell or give the property to them but that the longer the City holds on to the property, the longer they have to worry about upkeep and potential lawsuits in case someone injures themselves on that property.

Mr. Lavernoich said that if the property were removed from the list, someone from his office could negotiate its sale and then bring that deal as an individual item back to the Committee for final approval.

- \*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO REMOVE 751 KOSSUTH STREET FROM THE LIST OF PROPERTIES THAT WILL BE OFFERED TO ABUTTERS.**
- \*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- \*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE THE LIST AS AMENDED.**
- \*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- \*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 193-06 AS AMENDED.**
- \*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Paoletto said that they would now move on to item 197-06 and that if there was no representative of the Health Department present by the time discussion of item 197-06 was completed, items 185-06, 186-06, 187-06, 188-06, and 189-06 would be tabled.

**197-06 Operating Agreement with Bridgeport Economic Resource Center, Inc.**

Mr. Lavernoich said that the Committee may recall that there was a Council action approved last June that authorized the Mayor to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with BERC that was supposed to lead to the negotiation and creation of an Operating Agreement and that a year later that Operating Agreement has been created. He said that it had been a busy year for the City and for BERC which explained in part why it has taken so long to get back to this Committee on this item. He said that the Committee may also recall that there were a couple side agreements regarding the Reservoir Avenue RFQ and RFP and the Pequannock Development Site RFQ and RFP and that he felt BERC has handled those admirably. Mr. Lavernoich said that the reasons for this Operating Agreement are the same as the reasons for the Memorandum of Understanding. He said that BERC had until now been paid almost 100% by the private investment community, banks, utilities, insurance companies, etc. and going forward BERC seeks an arrangement that is actually spelled out in the financial plan that was supposed to be attached to the submission and was not originally. Mr. Lavernoich took responsibility for that oversight. Moving on he said that these private companies are going to invest in this partnership and the city's investment, which was ultimately supposed to be approximately 50% over time is going to be almost entirely on a fee-per-service basis. Mr. Lavernoich told the Committee that in approving the Operating Agreement they were actually approving 'Standing Rules' for BERC's formation and its engagement with the City on specific projects. He said that whenever the city gives BERC the responsibility for the disposition of any property or management of any project that involves city powers or city assets, there will be a separate contract before this Committee for that individual engagement. Mr. Lavernoich said that the only financial commitment that comes from this agreement is the \$30,000 that has already been committed in the budget.

Mr. Mulligan asked what sources contributions other than the \$30,000 in the schedule would come from.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that they could come from contracts related to various projects, land use proceeds or it could come from the marketing budget but that it would be clearly spelled out where the money was coming from in each and every individual case. Mr. Lavernoich then noted that there were several typos in the Operating Agreement that should be addressed. These were as follows:

Page 3, item (v) "3.04(a)" should be changed to "3.03(a)".

Page 4, items (rr) and (uu) "3.05" should be changed to "3.04" in both items.

Economic and Community Development and Environment Committee

July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2007

Page 3

Page 15, section 7.03(a) the last word of the second line should be “quarterly” instead of “monthly”.

Mr. dePara said that in that section 7.03(a) it said that BERC would be submitting reports to the OPED director and asked if that information would be disseminated to the City Council or this Committee.

Mr. Lavernoich said he thought there was a provision to provide reports to the City Council but that those reports would be less frequent than those submitted to the OPED Director.

Mr. Nunn said that Section 7.03(b) said that BERC would furnish an annual report to the Mayor, the President of the City Council and the OPED Director containing a financial statement reflecting BERC’s then-current financial position.

Mr. dePara asked why that report would only be furnished to the President of the City Council and not the entire City Council.

The Committee agreed and Mr. Paoletto suggested that “the President of the City Council” be changed to “the City Council” in section 7.03(b) of the Operating Agreement.

Mr. Lavernoich asked that that amendment be made in the resolution as opposed to just putting it in the Operating Agreement with the understanding that the Operating Agreement will be changed.

Mr. dePara suggested that the Committee also get reports more frequently than an annual basis.

Mr. Nunn said that the quarterly reports that he’d already be preparing for OPED could be forwarded to the City Council and/or this Committee.

Mr. dePara said that he was comfortable with that.

Mr. Lavernoich suggested that the following be added to the *Resolution by the Bridgeport City Council Regarding an Operating Agreement between the City of Bridgeport and the Bridgeport Economic Resource Center*: “Further, be it resolved, that OPED will make available to the City Council the quarterly reports it receives from BERC”

**\*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 197-06 AS AMENDED WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDED TO THE RESOLUTION: “FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT OPED WILL MAKE AVAILABLE TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE QUARTERLY REPORTS IT RECEIVES FROM BERC”**  
**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- \*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO TABLE ITEMS 185-06, 186-06, 187-06, 188-06 and 189-06.**
- \*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**The following items were tabled:**

- 185-06            2007-2008 State Department of Public Health LHD/Youth Violence/Suicide Prevention Grant**
- 186-06            2007-2009 State Department of Public Health STD/TB**
- 187-06            2007-2009 State Department of Children & Families Positive Youth Development/Parent Aide Programs.**
- 188-06            2007-2008 State Department of Public Health AIDS Prevention Education Services.**
- 189-06            2007-2008 State Department of Public Health SBHC Health & Dental Grant.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

- \*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.**
- \*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.**
- \*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

CITY of BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 21, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: dePara; Co-chair, Paoletto, Bonney, Mulligan, Valle

**ABSENT:** Council members: McCarthy, Holloway

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ed Lavernoich; OPED

Co-chair dePara called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of July 31, 2007

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTS  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**185-06** 2007-2008 State Department of Public Health LHD/Youth Violence/Suicide Prevention Grant.

Ms. Connie Cotrone presented information for this grant. She said the item was a continuation of funding that they have received for the last four to five years. The grant was for \$31,000 and the amount contributed to the salary for a youth leader at Bassick High School. It also provides classroom sessions for youth related to the drop out rate and substance abuse prevention.

Council member Mulligan asked if the grant was all state funds. Ms. Cotrone said yes, but it doesn't totally cover the salary. However, this year they will receive funds from another department grant.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**186-06** 2007-2009 State Department of Public Health STD/TB.

Ms. Valerie Sorrentino presented information for this item. She said the program was for a \$138,000 grant from the State Department of Public Health. It covers salaries for the HIV/AIDS program and the salary for the person that draws blood. The grant also pays for salaries for the outreach program for STD/TB prevention.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**187-06** 2007-2009 State Department of Children & Families Positive Youth Development/Parent Aide Programs.

Ms. Connie Cotrone said this was the second year of the 4-year award, they received a \$100k award and it supports youth prevention at Roosevelt School. It also pays the salary of one coordinator and a facilitator. It also supports F.A.S.T. team that consists of parents and teachers who help families become stronger parents.

Council member Mulligan questioned what the amount of \$393,000 was for. Ms. Cotrone said that amount covered the life of the grant.

Council member Mulligan asked if the amount was renewed yearly. Ms. Cotrone said no, they don't have to reapply unless Department of Children & Families (DCF) changes their policy, and they get the \$100k annually to continue the work.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**188-06** 2007-2008 State Department of Public Health AIDS Prevention Education Services.

Ms. Sorrentino stated this was a renewal grant. It provides for the partial salary in the HIV/AIDS Prevention Department; who does education and prevention on the community van.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**189-06** 2007-2008 State Department of Public Health SBHC Health & Dental Grant.

Ms. Sorrentino stated this item pertained to continuing funding to support the school-based health center. It supports nine (9) clinics that are operated in the schools.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**204-06** Grant Submission (acquisition of Ox Brook Property).

Mr. Richard Yao, of Central Grants presented information for this grant. He explained that this project allowed the city to take over the property located in the north end. There was a problem with the tributary with flooding, so the residents want the city to take over control to avoid problems in the future. They will add ten acres to the open space (park area).

Council member Bonney asked where the site was located. Mr. Yao said it was located in the north end along Summit Street.

Council member Mulligan asked about the city's contribution of \$840k and if the state grant was obtained, how they will raise the money. Mr. Yao said they would do it through bond issuance. But there are no other funds allocated and it's contingent upon state funding.

Council member Mulligan asked if the concept was to be a holding area for overflow at Oxbrook. Mr. Yao replied that he was new to the topic, but he thought the idea was to acquire the property and keep it as open space until there was a better plan to focus on the flood issues.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBR BONNEY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**205-06** Grant Submission (Lighthouses in the Community).

Ms. Tammy Pappa, Lighthouse Program presented information about this item. She distributed some information that highlighted an error that was corrected on page 2 of the document. She reviewed what was previously submitted, noting there were two applications to the State Department of Education to service four (4) schools to look at the budget and the gaps, and to supplement programs, such as: parent literacy, family nights, and science and math programs. She referred to page 2 that outlined who would receive the dollars.

Council member Paoletto asked what the differences were in the submission. Ms. Pappa pointed out that they were replacing Beardsley and Park City schools for Hallen School and Madison School. The YMCA and Discovery programs were also part of the submissions.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO AMEND TO CORRECT THE SCHOOLS SUBMISSIONS OUTLINED IN THE DOCUMENT – *amended copy submitted to the City Clerk's office***

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE AS AMENDED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**206-06** Grant Submission (Home Financial Education and Fair Housing).

Mr. Richard Yao stated Ms. Hunter and Ms. Kabel worked with this program to build focus around home ownership education. They will submit brochures and educate people and they will create a study around Bridgeport capacity concerning aggressive loan processing. So the grant will pay for those services. There is no city match.

Council member Mulligan asked if the matter was related to sub-prime loans. Mr. Yao said yes, he gave an example of a company borrowing \$16 million to support loan capabilities.

Council member Valle asked if the monies would be dedicated to the City of Bridgeport or will they hire an outside agency to oversee the program. Mr. Yao said they would hire a financial loan educator that will work with different departments. They will hold seminars and distribute information to the public.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBREE MULLIGAN SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**207-06** Grant Submission (Connecticut Clean Fuel Program).

Mr. Yao stated this grant was to pay for the cost to compress natural gas vehicles. It will pay for them to purchase two (2) vehicles that have that capability. The city will put up the funds to replace the current vehicles.

Council member Mulligan asked if the \$39k was already budgeted. Mr. Yao said that was correct. He explained that natural gas cars cost more, but the additional amount will allow them to purchase vehicles that have more efficient capabilities.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**208-06** Grant Submission (Urban Green-Knowlton Street Pequonnock Riverfront).

Mr. Yao said this grant was through the State Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to pay for the urban green initiative to help put in green space and to create urban haven for people to escape their busy lives. He said that Knowlton Street was targeted as a good are to implement it, since it's a blighted area. The funding will be \$250k and it will come from the capital improvement fund and has already been approved.

Ms. Angie Staltaro updated that they held a charrette with the residents and there was emphasis to open up the waterfront on the Pequonnock River. They will run over the bridge to use Knowlton

Street as a gateway to the Upper East Side area; so it's the desire of the neighborhood who has been interested in the project for over a year.

Council member Paoletto asked if the \$99k was already fully allocated from the capital improvement fund. Ms. Staltaro said yes.

Council member Bonney questioned how the businesses surrounding the area would be affected. Ms. Staltaro explained the current cobblestone walkway will be paved to open up the area; they will also fence the area in.

Council member Mulligan asked if this only involved improvements on the city streets and won't affect private properties. Ms. Staltaro said that was correct.

Council member Mulligan asked if they were putting up substantial barriers to the water as a safety precaution. Ms. Staltaro said yes.

Council member Paoletto asked if the area would be cleaned up. He expressed it was a great idea and will look a lot better.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**209-06** Grant Submission (Urban Green-Johnsons Creek Boardwalk).

Mr. Yao stated this grant was through the DEP, it's the priority of the city to open green space and access the water in Johnson Creek. They will create a boardwalk to the water and plant some trees and open up the access point to the water. Ms. Staltaro added that the city owned more of the streets in this area, noting that the idea was pushed by the NRZ. She said it will result in a nice clean up in the neighborhood.

Council member Mulligan asked if would create more room to put a promenade along the waterway. Ms. Staltaro said yes, it will enhance the walkway already there. *Mr. Yao displayed a drawing showing the plan of what was intended.*

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**210-06** Grant Submission 2007-2008 Husky Outreach Grant.

Ms. Sorrentino stated this was a new DSS grant; they receive \$50,000 to increase the number of citizens who are accepted into the Husky Program that covers public health insurance for children.

It supports events and education related to the program. And it also provides stipends to the outreach staff that get to people to administer services. It's a 1-year grant through the Department of Social Services.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**211-06** Grant Submission (Urban Green Central Ave. Fishing Pier).

Mr. Yao said this grant was through the DEP to open up public properties not being used. Construction is being done on the pier end to make it safe for fishing and standing. They will create green space and they will put in benches, plantings and lighting. But without the enhancements, it won't be very attractive. *He had a picture to give an idea of how it will look.*

Council member Bonney asked if the area he was talking about was just before the bridge. Mr. Yao said yes, there's a gap between the pier and bridge. They won't create access, but they will open up the paper street for access.

Council member Mulligan asked if the contribution of \$2 million was from the state capital improvement budget. Mr. Yao said that decision would be made, but a CDBG grant will also be tapped to contribute.

Council member Valle asked how soon they will hear about the grant if it's approved. Mr. Yao said the grant was through the land acquisition as a sub-program. They expect to hear something by the end of October.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Consent calendar

**222-06** Extension of Reverter Right for 235-257 William Street.

Ms. Kathleen Hunter presented said she was there to present three separate, but related properties for developing. She noted that Larry Klitch, of Mutual Housing; a Habitat for Humanity representative, Mr. Kanable and Liz Torres of Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust were also present to give information.

She said they met with the Historic Commission and the site plan was approved. She said they hoped to get final approval in September for the exterior building permits. They were looking to move ahead with the project and they needed the extension through August 2008 to complete the project. It will provide fourteen (14) home ownership opportunities and she noted that each development was important to the other.

Council member Valle asked if the site was a red brick building that was being developed. She also questioned if any work was being done there yet. Ms. Hunter said they needed to submit the site plan first. Mr. Kanable added that as soon as they obtained the Certification of Appropriateness, they can move forward with the improvements to do the exterior work. Then they will start the project in mid-September to late October; they expect to complete it in August 2008.

Council member Valle said she had a concern about the surrounding area and it being kept clean. She noted that back in April or May there were (150) kids from Hopkins School in New Haven who helped clean up sites throughout the city. She relayed that this was a great success and their efforts were recognized by homeowners. She further mentioned the concern of someone buying a home that will be surrounded by blight, although she noted that wasn't a problem with Habitat for Humanity.

Council member Paoletto echoed Council member Valle's comment that it was important the area be maintained and kept clean. Mr. Kanable spoke about the program and bringing people in to do some cleanup work. He added they have made an effort to clean the site because it was an eyesore.

Council member dePara asked if there was anything to prevent them from completing the timeline on schedule. Mr. Kanable said there could be some variables due to the sub-contractor schedule and the timeliness of the inspections could be a delay factor. He said the only the thing issue that could delay it is that one of the unit is owned by a private party, but they are in discussion with the owner who is a big supporter of Habitat for Humanity. So they are in negotiations with her and she may donate the unit. If not, they may have to buy her out, but this won't stop them from selling the other units.

Council member dePara questioned the on-street parking matter. He asked if any off-street parking was planned. Mr. Kanable said there was enough parking in the back for 12-units, but providing off-street parking was part of the plan.

Council member Valle asked if they would use the City of Bridgeport list for the RFP bidding. Mr. Kanable said they would send out the RFP from the city list and they will use their own contractors as well. Council member Valle emphasized that due to the disparity study done, she would like to see minority contractors used on the project.

Council member Mulligan asked what the term of the original reverter was. Ms. Hunter said the date it began was February 2006; it began 18-months prior to that, so the original date would have been around August 2004.

Council member Mulligan asked if the units would be on the tax role when they're completed. Ms. Hunter said yes and they will be affordable housing units.

Council member dePara asked the area median income that would be used. Ms. Hunter said the qualifier would be 50% of the median income or approximately \$40k for a household.

\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**223-06** Extension of Reverter Right for 11 Armstrong Place.

Ms. Hunter said they would partner with Habitat for Humanity to do the construction for the two-units of housing; they are looking to extend the reverter to February 2008 to complete it.

Council member Valle asked if it would actually be completed by February 2008. Ms. Hunter said yes.

Council member Valle repeated that the street was in bad condition. She stressed that they needed to give it some attention and clean it up. Ms. Hunter acknowledged the comment.

Council member Valle mentioned that it might be good to research a grant for the youth or adults to possibly train them to clean up these sites. She expressed it would be a good program to implement. Ms. Hunter said she thought The WorkPlace Inc. may be considering an application to get youth involved in job skills to address that.

Council member dePara asked what the hold up was with this property. Ms. Hunter said they had to get financing in place. She said they couldn't close until the extension was approved. Mr. Kanable added that there was a glitch with the Bank of America due to the reverter and they wouldn't go with the loan until it was approved.

Council member dePara asked if it would be done in approximately six to seven months. Mr. Kanable said yes.

Council member Valle asked how the families were selected. Mr. Kanable said it was done by a Habitat for Humanity model. Typically, the units are for stand alone single mother families, but they will also market to other families.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**224-06** Extension of Reverter Right for 101-103 Barnum Avenue.

Ms. Hunter stated that Mutual Housing was in an agreement with Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust, Liz Torres who has assembled financing of over \$1 million to rehabilitate the historic property. But to close on the financing, they were looking to extend the reverter until April 2008. Ms. Torres said the delay was due to the high construction costs, so they put together applications for tax credits and determined the total development will cost \$1.1 million. The City of Bridgeport is providing \$220k.

Council member Valle asked where the site was located. Ms. Torres explained it was located around the corner from William and Barnum streets.

Ms. Torres said the units will be two attached two-family townhouse style. Council member Valle commented that the site appeared messy when she saw it. Ms. Torres said they were in the process of cleaning it up, but it's boarded up right now. Council member Valle emphasized once again that the property must be maintained, she good-naturedly noted that she intended to keep an eye on it to assure that.

Council member dePara added that they enacted legislation to address blight. He pointed out that it didn't look good for the city if the properties weren't kept up.

Council member Valle said the project was welcomed, and the agencies working together to build homes was a good thing, but she was against having them built by people outside of the city.

Council member Mulligan asked if the units would be rented or sold. Ms. Torres said there would be one renters unit and one owner-occupied unit. She also noted that a local minority owned construction company would be working on the project.

Council member dePara asked if it would be approximately eleven months to complete. Ms. Torres said they should be done by August 2008; otherwise they will lose the tax credits. She further noted there would be 2 ½ weeks of remediation work to do.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

**225-06** Lease with Housing Authority, Parking for Arena and Ballpark.

Mr. Lavernoich stated that he provided a lengthy resolution, but he understood that the Housing Authority wanted the resolution to detail the arrangement and activity surrounding it. He said the punch that it is essential to the city was found in the last three paragraphs of the resolution. It outlined the history of the RFQ and RFP process and the legal obligations the Housing Authority had to HUD. So the lease is an extension for the site that has been in since 2002 and it satisfies the obligation they currently have to provide parking. They don't anticipate a long term relationship with the Housing Authority, noting that will have to be negotiated.

Council member Mulligan asked when they first entered the lease agreement. Mr. Lavernoich said they did it in the year 2002.

Council member Mulligan asked if there was a provision that it could be shortened if development occurred and they're not committed for the full three years. Mr. Lavernoich said yes, he noted that the resolution contemplated what could happen with development and use of the property, but he expected cooperation to see the property developed.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**  
**\*Consent calendar**

**226-06** Pequonnock Development Site: MOU with Bridgeport Sound LLC.

Mr. Lavernoich stated that in the previous item, there was a development solicitation process between the city and housing during 2006 that resulted in a partnership with a metro New York based developer and a Washington based developer. They were proposing a period of 90 to 120 days wherein they wouldn't market the property and they can do due diligence to complete the deal. They were proposing a 120-unit development and he was told all the financial supplements were feasible. If it's allowed, they won't have any permanent development rights and it could only be done through a master agreement, so they're looking for the Mayor to sign an MOU.

Council member Mulligan asked if there was a specification term in the 120-days. Mr. Lavernoich said the information reads there is 90 to 180 days on page 3 of the resolution. He noted there was enough to negotiate, but there are legitimate reasons why it has to be extended and that's why it's outlined in the resolution.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**  
**\*Consent calendar**

**227-06** Agreement with National Development Council.

Mr. Lavernoich stated that they review this agreement yearly to do consulting work on a qualified purchase basis. He explained it's the only firm that offers a full range of services. He added that Bridgeport was one of two cities in the country that they did a brochure about. *It was noted that he was featured in the brochure.* He went on to say that the firm provides full range services, such as training to staff at no cost. They also provide them with opinion letters and technical assistance to the community capital fund. And most importantly, they competed successfully for an allocation of new market tax credits that were used for three separate transactions in Bridgeport. Overall, he felt the company is unique and has done some innovative projects that see results. He noted that in the future, he may invite members of the firm to address the city council.

Council member Bonney asked about the training courses and who they were open to. Mr. Lavernoich said they were open to anyone in the city; the firm NEC will pick up the registration cost, but transportation for the attendee is paid by the city.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**  
**\*Consent calendar**

**213-06** Resolution to conduct a municipal office space utilization study.

Council member dePara said he received a request from the co-sponsors to table this item.

\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO TABLE**  
\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**  
\*\* **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**216-06** Resolution Proposing Clean energy commitment.

Council member dePara said there wasn't a representative from the city to address this item. Council member Mulligan spoke up to say that Mr. Emmett Pepper called him to ask if he could speak at the meeting tonight.

Mr. Pepper addressed the committee and noted that Mr. Bob Wall was also present to speak. He said he lived at 175 Wilson Street and was a member of the Citizens Campaign for the Environment. He reviewed the role of the city in developing a clean energy market. He relayed that there was state interest in giving 20% of the electricity to the endeavor, noting that fifty different municipalities in the state made the same commitment.

Mr. Wall said he worked on the campaign for a long time and he found there was overwhelming support for the initiative. He said there was a consensus that a portion of the tax money should go to the program. He shared that Fairfield was the first city to commit to reap the benefit. He added that Bridgeport had a serious air quality issue, but they found it could be helped, because they will be eligible to get a free solar system that is worth \$20k. It's equipped with a monitoring system and gauges how much electricity is generated and how much money the city is saving. He also mentioned turning the schools into clean energy schools and emphasized the transformation to take place. Overall, it's a logical step in the process.

Council member Mulligan asked if there will be a penalty to the city if they don't achieve the 20% goal. Mr. Wall said there wouldn't be a penalty, it's really just a good faith effort, but when it's done, they will find that the town will benefit through the effort. He noted that the City of Hartford went straight to the 20% and they met the goal, so it's feasible to do and take control of their energy destiny.

Council member Mulligan asked if the goal of 20% was for municipal facilities. Mr. Wall said yes, it was for municipal buildings.

Mr. Pepper stated that the program not only helped the city, but the commitment allows citizens to benefit by getting the free solar panel system. He noted that that there was a residential program and (250) families already benefited from it.

Council member Paoletto stated that Council member dePara was a co-sponsor of the program and he highly recommends it and noted he had a great interest in it for himself. Council member Paoletto recommended that they return to a subsequent committee meeting when a representative from the city could be present, perhaps the Public Facilities Manager and a Board of Education

representative. He suggested that the co-chair contact the proper contact from the city for his input. Council member dePara said he did that, but he never heard anything back. Mr. Wall said he spoke to Mr. Patel and he indicated he was interested. Council member Paoletto noted that no action would be taken tonight and again, he suggested that they get some input from a city department contact.

Council member Bonney asked about the qualification standards pertaining to the 20% goal. Mr. Wall said that (100) residents signed up, but there is a component that involves the community.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO TABLE

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

*A 5-minute recess was called at 7:29 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:34 p.m.*

ADDENDUM AGENDA ITEM:

**168-06** Resolution regarding sale of city owned vacant lots to the Bridgeport Community Land Trust

Mr. Bob Halsted, President Bridgeport Community Land Trust was present to address this item. He said that since the last meeting he was notified by the Department of Environment Protection (DEP) that they would not allow the land trust to purchase property - *he read a lengthy resolution regarding the matter into the record.* He highlighted that the same grant was applied for earlier under the green space initiative, but it was being earmarked for the first time this year for community gardens. He had a couple of copies to distribute reflecting the breakout of the costs.

Council member dePara asked if he had copies of the revised resolution. Council member Paoletto commented that there were a lot of changes to the resolution and he considered it to be an entirely new resolution. He also felt it should have been submitted earlier to give the committee members a chance to review and absorb it. He noted that the matter was originally off the agenda, but he received a request to put it back on by Council member Valle. However, he reiterated that the information should have been submitted earlier.

Council member dePara echoed Council member Paoletto's comments. He noted that the budget was requested in June and again, there was a lot of information to digest and sift through to make an informed decision that he said would affect and bind the city for a long time. He also agreed that the resolution was completely different than what was previously submitted. He said he wasn't comfortable making a decision that would lock the city into a perpetuity clause without a thoroughly reviewing the matter.

Council member Bonney asked if the pieces of property proposed would ever be developed and kept as community gardens. Mr. Halsted said that was correct, the properties were found to be non-developable.

Mr. Halsted attempted to explain why the resolution was submitted late, he said it was due to the lack of resources available to him to make copies etc. He made the statement that he hoped the item would be approved just as others were approved tonight. Council member Paoletto responded that his resolution was totally different than other items that were presented tonight. He clarified that they were mostly for grant applications, plus they were presented with all the pertinent information required. He stressed that having lack of resources wasn't a valid excuse for not having all the information requested.

\*\* **COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TO TABLE**

**-There was no second to the motion-**

Council member Valle stated that she understood that information was previously requested, but she had an issue with the last time they had a meeting and the way it was conducted was unacceptable to her. She agreed that the resolution needed tweaking, but she stressed that the lots shouldn't be placed on the auction list. She further noted that if they visited the sites, they would see people doing plantings already. She thought that the criticism directed at Mr. Halsted was a bit harsh and she felt they would work instead to resolve the issue.

Council member dePara said he wasn't disputing the use of the gardens, however, the decision to be made now and in the future was a long lasting commitment by the city, so this wasn't a meeting to endorse or negate the benefits of the program.

Council member Mulligan stated that the major difference in the resolution was that they would need more time to repair the homes and get them back on the tax role. However, he questioned the language of the lots being in "*perpetuity*" and whether or not they will be successful in that context. He said he wanted to ride around to observe all the sites to determine if they are build able or not. He reiterated his concern about the term "In Perpetuity". He emphasized that it was hard to say that right now, through say the year of 2050, a piece of land will still be a community garden.

Council member Paoletto responded to Council member Valle's comments regarding the sites and recognizing her strong support behind developing the program further that he didn't have a problem with at all. However, he said he had an issue with those attending a meeting where not only should the co-sponsor be well prepared, but the attendees as well. He admitted that although he may appear brash at times, he repeated that in this case, the resolution was revised and is totally different than originally presented. And although he was a co-signer of the resolution, he still didn't feel all the required information was submitted as requested.

Council member Valle responded that anyone that comes before the committee should be treated with respect, regardless of what information is missing. She emphasized that the attendees should be treated respectfully.

Mr. Halsted said he talked to the DEP and he was told that the gardens should be maintained in perpetuity. A member of the Bridgeport Community Land Trust that was present was recognized to speak. She said it was a rush to get the information together and it wasn't an easy task. And

although the word perpetuity was troublesome, the sites proposed aren't build able. She asked that The request be strongly considered contingent upon additional information required.

Mr. Halsted presented some pictures showing some of the proposed properties for the gardens. Council member Mulligan commented that one of the sites appeared to be developable. He agreed that more information was required and he repeated that he wanted to see the sites himself. He further questioned how they could commit to never developing the sites. Mr. Halsted said the lots were very small. Council member dePara asked what happens if the lots become a big component in a larger development in the future.

Council member Valle asked Ed Lavernoch about the language "In perpetuity". For example, if they built a house on one of the lots in the future, what other language could be used that will allow the city to sell it. She pointed out a property on Hoff Street that was a small lot and she clarified that she wasn't advocating selling the bigger lots.

Council member dePara stressed the size of the lot wasn't the key factor. Again, the term "In perpetuity" was a crucial matter to consider for the benefit of the community and the city.

Council member Mulligan questioned if the city attorney reviewed the matter. Mr. Halsted said no. Council member added that the matter needed to be clarified as it pertained to perpetuity, future developments and other factors. He was adamant that because he wasn't clear what he was voting on, he was reluctant to go forward.

Council member Paoletto emphasized that it seemed they were being asked to vote on something because it was time sensitive, but again, the information wasn't submitted early enough and in time to absorb it, they were still missing information. With that said he,

- \*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO MOVED TABLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE PRESIDENT of the BRIDGEPORT COMMUNITY LAND TRUST TO SUBMIT THE REQUIRED INFORMATION:**
- 1. A NEW COPY OF THE RESOLUTION**
  - 2. A COPY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION GRANT APPLICATION**
  - 3. A COPY OF THE BUDGET**
  - 4. A LIST OF THE BOARD of DIRECTORS AND BRIDGEPORT COMMUNITY LAND TRUST MEMBERS**
  - 5. THE BY-LAWS OF BRIDGEPORT COMMUNITY LAND TRUST**
  - 6. A COPY OF THE FINANCIAL INFORMATION**
  - 7. INPUT FROM THE GRANTS OFFICE COORDINATION**

Mr. Halsted said he contacted someone from the Grants office, but the request was ignored. Council member dePara clarified that was probably because Central Grants works for the city.

Mr. Tom Coble, NRZ consultant stated he didn't realize the item was on the agenda tonight. He explained that an application was required and it denoted that the land should be in perpetuity, but if it's developed, they would have to pay back what it took to develop. However, the slivers of land

proposed could probably be supported for the gardens and the larger pieces of land for possible development should be left alone. *He noted his comments were informational only.*

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Not on consent calendar**

ADJOURNED

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER PAOLETTO SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Tom Mulligan, Jr.; Leticia Colón; Maria Valle; Tom McCarthy; Angel dePara, Jr. (6:20 p.m.)

**STAFF:** Tammy Papa, Lighthouse; Ed Lavernoich, Deputy Dir., OPED; Lisa Trachtenburg, Assoc. City Attorney; Richard Yao, Grants Office

**OTHERS:** Garfield Spencer, First National Development; Aurora Leigh, First National Development; Robert Halstead, BCLT; Christine Cook, BCLT; Rafael Mojica; Andre Baker; Susan Brannelly; Carlos Silva

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2007**

**\*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.  
\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**240-06 Request to Sell City-Owned HUD Disposition Property.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 240-06.  
\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**241-06 Request to Transfer City-Owned Properties to Pequannock Housing Residential.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 241-06.  
\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**242-06 Proposed Amendment to the City's Consolidated Plan for Housing & Community Development (2003-2008)**

Mr. Paoletto said that the opinion of most of the Council Members that he'd spoken to and the people in Ms. Alana Kabel's office was that even though it was not required by HUD to hold a public hearing, since this was such a great deal of money, it was only fair and right to allow the public to give their input. Mr. Paoletto said that this Committee could call for a public hearing tonight and he would contact the City Clerk the following morning to arrange a hearing to discuss the reallocation of CDBG dollars.

Ms. Valle asked if the item could still be discussed at this meeting.

Mr. Paoletto answered that it could put that Ms. Kabel was not present to answer questions.

Ms. Valle said she wished that this process could be reopened because a notification of it was put in the newspaper August 8<sup>th</sup>, and she would've liked to have been informed sooner that these monies were available. She said that very few Council Members were aware of this and therefore could not lobby for it or inform their different agencies that the opportunity was available. Ms. Valle requested that this be reopened and the date extended to allow more people to become involved.

Mr. McCarthy said that he thought it was a good idea to have a public hearing and discuss the item again after the public hearing.

Mr. Paoletto said that he did not know the particulars of how to reopen or extend this process and would not venture to say if it was possible, but promised to call Ms. Alana Kabel to ask her and report back to Ms. Valle and the rest of the Committee.

Ms. Valle said she was not in favor of having a public hearing until that could be settled.

Mr. Mulligan asked if this could be tabled until this was straightened out.

Mr. Paoletto said that this item was on the agenda because a public hearing could not be held before something was properly given to the Committee through the City Clerk's office as a resolution.

Mr. Mulligan asked if what was before the Committee was an itemization of where all the money should go.

Mr. Paoletto said that this was not meant to be on the agenda for the Committee to meet and distribute funds and close the item but rather it was on the agenda for the purposes of calling a public hearing to discuss it. He said that the Citizens Union had met on this item and held a public hearing and their recommendation was to follow the normal CDBG process. He said that HUD did not require the City Council to have a public hearing on this but that in speaking with Ms. Kabel, Mr. dePara and several others, because it's a large sum of money they felt it was only fair to keep the process open to the public and get their input.

Ms. Valle said she did not know how many Citizens Union members were required to make these decisions but that one of the representatives in her district was not informed of the meeting that took place and could not represent the district. Ms. Valle wondered how many others did not know about this meeting to discuss these monies.

Mr. Mulligan said that the Committee ought to get clarification on this.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 242-06.  
\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**236-06 Submission of Grant Contract to the WorkPlace, Inc., Summer Youth Employment Program**

Ms. Papa distributed and reviewed the Department of Labor – Youth Employment and Training Program Interim & Quarterly Report.

*Mr. dePara arrived at 6:20 p.m.*

Ms. Valle asked Ms. Papa since there were so many youth in the City looking for employment, if the youth could be split into two groups, each working for three weeks, instead of having twice as many youth all working for six weeks so that all youth would be given the opportunity to work.

Ms. Papa said that could be discussed and that there was enough funding for 5 weeks worth of work so if all 800 kids that had applied were hired, they could each only work for 2 ½ weeks and Ms. Papa didn't know how meaningful two and half weeks worth of work would be but it was an option.

Ms. Valle suggested that this could be tied in to the GIS Tree Mapping Boot Camp.

Ms. Papa said that she didn't think that the GIS Tree Mapping Boot Camp would be providing paid positions but perhaps this could be discussed further so that something could be worked out for the following year.

Mr. Mulligan asked what hours the youth worked.

Ms. Papa answered that they worked four hours a day, five days a week from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. or from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 236-06.  
\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**234-06 Urban Forestry Education Grant Program, Park City GIS Tree Mapping Boot Camp.**

Mr. Yao reviewed the resolution and grant summary for the Park City GIS Tree Mapping Boot Camp included in each Committee member's agenda packet.

Ms. Valle asked how the students would be selected for this program.

Mr. Yao said that he was not sure about the selection process.

Ms. Valle suggested that students should be picked from each of the 10 districts and that the selection should be diverse and racially balanced. She then asked if this program would be providing paid positions for the youth involved and if there was a way to network with the Lighthouse program with regard to that.

Mr. Yao said that there was no money budgeted to pay the youth but perhaps that could be done in future programs.

Mr. Paoletto noted that ultimately the selection of the students would fall under the purview of Parks and Recreation and that any question on the selection process could be addressed to them

Mr. Yao said that there would be a presentation meeting held on the project and he would add Ms. Valle to the invitation list.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 234-06.**  
**\*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Paoletto asked that this item be put on the Consent Calendar.

**233-06 Grant Application with State of CT. Department of Environmental Protection- Bridgeport Arbor Day 2008 Citizen Tree Planting Campaign (America the Beautiful Grant Program).**

Mr. Yao reviewed the resolution and grant summary for Bridgeport Arbor Day 2008 Citizen Tree Planting Campaign included in each Committee member's agenda packet.

Mr. dePara asked if Mr. Yao knew if the roots of these trees would grow down or out because many Council Members were experiencing problems in their districts with tree roots growing out and under sidewalks and damaging them, creating a public safety hazard.

Mr. Yao could not answer, but offered that the two trees that were being planted in the project were the Northern Red Oak and the Homestead Elm.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that while she did not know if the roots of these trees would grow down or out, she did know that one of the goals of this project was to not plant these trees

between the sidewalks and streets so that this problem would not occur in the future and that each planting site would have to be approved.

Mr. Yao said that he would check with the Parks Department and have someone contact Mr. dePara with regard to his question.

Mr. Paoletto said that he wanted the trees spread out as evenly as possible throughout the whole city, suggesting that three be planted per district for residences and one per district be planted in public areas.

Mr. Yao said that he would extend the invitation to this Committee for the implementation meeting for this project at which these issues could be discussed.

Mr. Paoletto asked Miss Trachtenberg if it was appropriate for this Committee to amend this resolution to require the even distribution of the trees.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that that might adversely affect the grant requirement and recommended pursuing that through other routes such as the aforementioned implementation meeting.

**\*\* MS. VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 233-06.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Paoletto asked that this item be put on the Consent Calendar.

**216-06 Resolution Proposing Clean Energy Commitment.**

There was no representative present to speak about this item.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 216-06.**

**\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**230-06 Tax Abatement for the Property Located at 1095 South Avenue.**

Mr. Mojica suggested that perhaps tax abatement was not the proper term but that Mr. Lavernoich could get into the specifics about that. Mr. Mojica said that this property was right behind Seaside Village and that the Seaside Village Board was in favor of this item. He said that the property had been vacant for years and had been used as a dumping ground for years despite chains being put on the fence. He said that Mr. DiNardo wanted to put a large warehouse on the property and had agreed that there would not be any factory operating there that would adversely affect the quality of life of nearby residents, such as a mulching or asphalt facility or a quarry. Mr. Mojica noted that there was a problem at the property with the irrigation system that was contaminating the water and Mr. DiNardo had agreed to fix that. He said that the nearby residents were happy about

this because finally there was someone who wanted to do something with this property and put it back on the tax rolls, adding that Mr. DiNardo would pay all taxes for the property before the close of this agreement. Mr. Mojica said that this was a good thing because as industrial factories left the City, the City was left with large lots that remained vacant for years with no one wanting to buy them or do anything with them.

Mr. Lavernoich said that his office had looked at this property and the proposal from Peter DiNardo Enterprises extensively and had been preparing a submission to the Council. He said that given all the other things happening at the time, they'd not had the chance to complete the submission and so Councilwoman Colón and Councilman Mojica out of justifiable frustration with OPED's pace of work decided to submit it themselves. Mr. Lavernoich said that he was prepared to comment on the resolution which his office was generally in support of with some possible amendments. Mr. Lavernoich said that this property was about 1.8 acres in size and was a linear property that stretched from South Avenue, southward immediately adjacent to Seaside Village. He said it was owned by an entity called 9 State Street, LLC, which was wholly controlled by the owners of Peter DiNardo Enterprises and that the property had been in continuous tax delinquency since 1992 and had not been reported in any way since 1993. He said that Peter DiNardo Enterprises had purchased some of the early liens in the mid-90s that were previously sold on the property and subsequently bought the property from a bank in early 1998, and then set about to diagnose the environmental conditions on that property, finding significant environmental conditions on it. Some of the environmental conditions were created by the former use of this property but most in fact were caused by the old Bassick Castors Factory that was immediately to the west. He continued, saying that DiNardo Enterprises acquired property tax liens from National Tax Funding in 1997 and acquired the title to the property itself from the prior owner in 1998. DiNardo proposed a settlement where his company would pay the taxes on the property since he took ownership and would like for the city in some way to waive the taxes prior to his taking ownership in consideration of the environmental conditions, and also because of his willingness to accept certain deed restrictions which were described briefly in the resolution before the Committee, including that there be no asphalt or rock crushing operations or demolition or wood mulching operations. He said that the taxes that were due on the property, accrued since 1992 were about \$677,000 in total and the 1997 taxes, and those that accrued prior to that were \$376,000 and that the taxes since DiNardo took ownership were about \$301,000.

Mr. Paoletto asked if the Committee was being asked to forgive the entire \$677,000.

Mr. Lavernoich said that they were not, that they were being asked to essentially sell or to abate \$377,000 of that and to accept payment of \$300,000. He suggested that the resolution before them be changed to include that the liens for 1997 and prior years be sold to Peter DiNardo Enterprises for one dollar in consideration of the \$300,000 they would pay the City and of the use restrictions that they would put on the property. Mr. Lavernoich then passed the resolution with his corrected language added to the City Attorney for her review.

Ms. Valle asked what it was exactly that Peter DiNardo Enterprises wanted to bring to that property.

Mr. Lavernoich said that it had been proposed was that they would tear down a portion of the building that was there, rehabilitate what remained and add on to that. He said that this would be generally a speculative development on their part and they did not yet have a tenant in mind, but would try to bring in a manufacturing or light assembly tenant such as a printing company, and that he believed that it was light industrial zone.

Mr. Mojica said that it was right near Sikorsky Airport which indicated the type of zoning on the property but that the developer had agreed to restrict the use of the property to tenants who would not adversely affect the quality of life for near by Seaside Village residents.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the tenants allowed there would be a low impact, manufacturing operations that did not have emissions, excessive vibration or excessive noise.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that Mr. Lavernoich had done an excellent job with the resolution but that she'd added something to the end. She said that what was being suggested was that the first RESOLVED paragraph be deleted so that the resolution would read as follows: "RESOLVED, That the tax liens pursuant to the 1997 grand list and all earlier years be sold to the current owner at a price of one dollar per year." She added that at the very end of the resolution, she'd changed the period to a comma after "premises" and added "and that the Mayor and/or director of OPED is hereby authorized to execute those documents to effectuate this resolution subject to the approval of office of the City Attorney"

Mr. McCarthy asked to own the property before 1997.

Mr. Lavernoich said he believed the name of the company was Associated Audio and that the property was foreclosed on by a bank but never foreclosed on by the people who bought the tax liens for some reason and it would be incumbent on Mr. DiNardo to foreclose on those liens even though he would own them.

Mr. McCarthy asked who currently owned the liens on the property.

Mr. Lavernoich said the National Tax Funding bought the liens from 1992 and 1993, and Mr. DiNardo bought those liens from them in 1997 and that there were other liens with the City for 1994 to 1997, and those liens were still held by the city of Bridgeport.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the \$377k was money that the City would actually see.

Mr. Lavernoich said that one of the things that he was asked to look at was the assessed value of the property and the likely environmental exposure of the property. He said that it had been confirmed that there was a minimum six-figure exposure on the environmental conditions at the property and the assessor's appraised value was

approximately \$400,000. He said that he was not sure what amount the property could be sold for but if the property was taken through foreclosure the City would have to comply with the Connecticut Property Transfer Act because it clearly was an establishment under state law and the only alternative if Mr. DiNardo's proposal was not granted would be to sell the liens outright to a bidder.

Mr. McCarthy asked if it was correct that the City would have to take on the environmental impact issues in that case.

Mr. Lavernoich said that every transfer of an establishment through foreclosure or eminent domain triggered the Connecticut Property Transfer Act and if a property was taken through eminent domain or foreclosure, the Act was not triggered on properties transferred to the City but the City would then be obligated to comply with the Transfer Act upon the sale of that property. He said that the owner would either have to comply with the act themselves, which meant doing a form filing and ECAF (Environmental Conditions Assessment Form) and reporting the condition of the property to the DEP or the owner could pass that burden onto the buyer. He said that the question in this case was what the City could get a buyer to pay for this property with that burden if that burden were passed on and Mr. Lavernoich suspected that with the burden of the filing, taking on all of the obligations, providing the City with the indemnification that it would insist on under that scenario and taking on an environmental problem that would cost at least \$100,000 to fix, perhaps more, what someone would bid for this property would probably be no higher than what Mr. DiNardo was willing to pay and in all likelihood probably lower.

Mr. Mojica said that the past taxes were a lot of money but that in his district he did not have a line of developers coming in and wanting to buy dirty industrial property, clean it up, develop it and get something back on the tax rolls, perhaps providing jobs and at the same time willing to sign an agreement limiting the use of the property to facilities that would not harm the quality of life in the area. Mr. Mojica said that this was a dirty piece of property that had been vacant for years and if the City sold it to someone else they would have to clean it first which would be very expensive. He said that no school or public facility could be placed there because of the contamination and this was an opportunity to get some money back on the tax rolls in an area that has been desolate for years.

Mr. dePara asked Mr. Lavernoich what the current yearly taxes on this property were.

Mr. Lavernoich said that because the property was so deteriorated the taxes were in the amount of approximately \$11,472 which was a very small amount given the size of the property.

Mr. dePara asked if Mr. DiNardo would get any future tax break after purchasing and rehabilitating the property.

Mr. Lavernoich said that Mr. DiNardo would not receive any tax breaks for fixing up the property but he could conceivably bring in a manufacturing tenant that would qualify for tax breaks from the State and in that case the City would be reimbursed  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the amount given up on the tax break and it would definitely be more than what was currently being paid. He said that a new building measuring about 30,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> would typically pay approximately one dollar per square foot, not counting any personal property the developer might move there.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the last several years' taxes had been paid.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that they had not.

Mr. Mulligan asked who had arranged this proposal.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he'd spent some time negotiating with Mr. DiNardo who originally proposed to pay \$250,000 and that Councilwoman Colón and Councilman Mojica proposed \$300,000 which is what he would have proposed as well.

Mr. Mulligan asked how a commitment to complete the project would be tied in if this were passed.

Mr. Lavernoich said that under the current resolution there would be no such thing but that he would propose that there be an enforcement mortgage that would be released on the property after the improvements were completed.

Mr. Mojica added that Mr. DiNardo was currently having the land cleaned up.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that the resolution could be further amended to include an enforcement mortgage.

Mr. Mulligan said that that would be his preference before this resolution was voted on.

Mr. Paoletto asked if this was the general consensus of the Committee, and it was.

Mr. dePara asked what amount OPED would have asked for and if the amount was comparable to that which was proposed in the resolution before them.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he'd been prepared to ask for \$300,000, the same as what was proposed in the resolution before this Committee and that he'd arrived at that amount because the assessor appraised the property at \$400,000 and he was assured that the cleanup of the property would cost at least \$100,000.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that in addition to the other amendments proposed, she'd added a fifth whereas which would read, "WHEREAS, The owner proposes to construct approximately 30,000 square feet of low intensity building" and at the very end of the

resolution after "...subject to the approval of office of the City Attorney" she'd added a comma followed by "including an enforcement mortgage to construct as stated above."

Mr. Lavernoich then read the additional language he wanted included in the resolution.

Ms. Trachtenburg said that she could attach that language to the resolution as an exhibit and that perhaps it wouldn't be the neatest thing she could do but certainly the most effective.

Mr. Mojica said that he wanted to make certain that the Committee had all the information needed to make this decision and if the members felt that they needed to wait to have a clean copy of the resolution before them, he had not objection to that.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 230-06.**

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**168-06 Sale of City Owned Vacant Lots to the Bridgeport Land Trust (BCLT).**

Mr. Paoletto opened discussion of the item by thanking Mr. Halstead for providing all of the information requested.

Mr. Halstead said that this item was on the agenda as a sale of city property but that it actually was not a sale. He said that what was actually requested was the agreement of the City to partner with the BCLT to allow the BCLT to use city-owned land for small parks and public gardens. He said that the DEP was considering this and had received it very well and that he'd presented them with the same informational package presented to this Committee. He said that the DEP was in the business of creating open spaces for cities and city people and so were of the opinion that this project should proceed. He said that the DEP had implied that the BCLT could probably get this \$160,000 if the City would commit to this being an open space in perpetuity adding that he didn't know what the penalty would be if the City rescinded that in the future in favor of another use for the property.

Mr. Mulligan said that he could not as a City Council Member could not bind a generation 100 years in the future from using this land for another purpose by granting anything in perpetuity.

Mr. McCarthy said that he generally liked the idea of this and was impressed with the people who were involved but agreed with Mr. Mulligan in that he could not see himself committing the City to something in perpetuity and asked if the City administration had given any opinion on this.

Mr. Halstead said that there was no representative from the City Administration for this resolution.

*Mr. Paoletto left the meeting at 6:30 p.m. at which time Mr. dePara took over as Chair.*

Mr. dePara said that if the Committee was going to make such a decision they should speak with representatives from the City Administration and Parks Department and the Director of DEP.

Ms. Valle asked if this could legally be rescinded at some point in the future.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that the City was currently having a tremendously difficult time trying to build a high school on land at Fairchild Memorial Park because of deed restrictions that were in perpetuity and so this was a challenge faced on a regular basis in this City.

Mr. Valle asked if the word “perpetuity” could be changed or replaced with something else.

Atty. Trachtenberg said that she could not answer that because she did not know if it was a requirement of the grant or of the DEP.

Mr. Halstead said that the City had tried to sell community gardens in the past and that the administration had not been generally supportive of community gardens which was why no city agent sponsored this. He said that the City had put these gardens on the market without even telling anyone in the past and that the DEP wanted to have some sort of strong language and commitment on behalf of the City that the City would not do that going forward. He said that perhaps the word “perpetuity” did not have to be used, that it was language that he’d added himself but some language should be used to communicate a commitment to open space.

Mr. dePara asked if it would jeopardize or compromise the grant proposal if the word “perpetuity” was changed. He said that this required open communication between the DEP and City Attorneys to find out what the DEP found to be acceptable language and what they found to be an acceptable commitment on the part of the City to maintain the city gardens.

*Mr. Silva arrived at 6:40 p.m.*

Mr. Halstead said the nature of the DEP was such that this agreement was currently at their staff level and would later be escalated to a review board and then to the commissioner and currently no one person at the DEP could give the final word.

*Mr. Paoletto returned at 7:35 p.m. and resumed as Chair*

Mr. McCarthy said the City Council, regardless of the City Administration had been completely supportive of community gardens and hadn’t rejected a community garden request yet. He asked if it was correct that the City would retain ownership of these

parcels of land while the BCLT would have control over them and asked how that would work according to the current scenario.

Mr. Halstead said that McCarthy was correct that the City would retain ownership of the property and the arrangement would be the same as for other organizations who worked with block grant money, where the federal or state money would come in to the Development Administration or Parks Department who would be the grantee and in this case the BCLT would be the sub-grantee and would have a contract with the grantee and would have to satisfy certain conditions of performance including developing these properties and when the work was done, the BCLT would sign off on it and escalate it to the grantee for them to sign off on. He said that following that, Public Works and any vendors involved would get paid through this grant.

Mr. McCarthy asked if BCLT would be a sort of vendor to the City taking care of the land.

Mr. Halstead said that they would be the stewards of the land.

Ms. Valle added that these gardens could be used as educational tools for students and the City needed the open space. She said she was tired of developers coming into the City, building boxes and turning the City's homes into rooming houses. Ms. Valle asked that the word "perpetuity" be changed so that this project could be moved forward.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the City would be faced with purchasing or procurement ordinance problems with regard to this and if an RFQ would have to go out for it.

Atty. Trachtenburg said she could not adequately advise on this without having reviewed all documentation.

Mr. Mulligan asked what would happen after five years there was a community garden and the person next door wanted to build three or four reasonable homes on the property to help solve the housing crisis in the City. He asked which the greater good was and how that would be weighed, adding that if a three-family home were built on one of these parcels of land that paid \$12,000 in taxes, that would pay for one child's education for a year. He said that the gardens he'd seen were beautiful but he preferred to have flexibility for the City to decide that the land could be put to some greater use.

Ms. Valle said that she wanted to move this forward and prevent the City from selling community gardens in the future and urged the Committee to fix the language so that the City was not bound in perpetuity so that this item could be moved forward.

Mr. McCarthy said that he felt that the City Attorney should review and analyze this because he thought there were probably multiple legal issues with the item, not limited to the perpetuity issue and including a possible purchasing and or procurement issue.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO TABLE ITEM 168-06 PENDING THE OUTCOME OF A REVIEW BY A CITY ATTORNEY.**

Mr. dePara said that some conversation with the state DEP should also be held to find out what would work for them what kind of commitment they needed on the part of the City.

Mr. Paoletto said that he wasn't sure if a representative from the state DEP could be made available to them.

Mr. dePara suggested that perhaps a phone call or something in writing could be arranged but that some sort of dialogue should take place.

Mr. Paoletto asked Ms. Valle if she could work with Mr. Halstead to try to facilitate someone from the state DEP speaking with the Committee or at least addressing the perpetuity issue.

Ms. Valle said that she would.

**\*\* MR. MULLIGAN SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH ONE OPPOSED: MS. VALLE.**

**235-06 Disposition and Redevelopment of 333 State Street**

Mr. Lavernoich said that the resolution before the Committee contemplated the authorization of the Mayor to enter into a Land Disposition Agreement or Land Development Agreement with First National Development for the sale and development of 333 State Street. He said that the property at 333 State St. had been tax delinquent for many years and that the liens on it were sold in the early 90s but that the liens could not be consolidated entirely back into the City's name until the fall of 2005, after which the City moved to foreclose on the property, meeting several legal roadblocks with the owner of the property and ultimately reaching with that owner in which they waived all claims and the City in turn granted development rights to Greenfield Partners of Norwalk. He continued, saying that the City did not close on the property with Greenfield Partners and that the condition of those development rights was that evidence had to be produced that the financing and all necessary approvals were in place before the City would transfer the deed to the property. Greenfield Partners subsequently decided not to pursue the development after several months of looking at it and the City put the development out for bid through an RFP process. There were three respondents to that RFP process and each appeared to be capable. A selection committee was formed composed of people from the OPED office, the Housing and Community Development office, and Jeff Bishop from the Bridgeport Economic Resource Center. Mr. Lavernoich said that the selection committee conducted a thorough analysis of the proposals and ultimately recommended the First National Development and the Mayor accepted that recommendation and instructed him to bring this to the City Council. He said that the proposal that Mr. Spencer and his company submitted as well as some of the documentation from the selection committee was before the Committee and more could be requested through his

office. He said that there was a letter available for review from a consultant at National Development Council who was in support of this proposal as well. Mr. Lavernoich said that what was being proposed was an outright sale through an LDA, in which the City would retain reversionary rights and a reverter deed would be signed by First National Development and the City would retain the right to file that deed on the land records in the future and take that property back subject to whatever financing might have been placed on the property if in fact First National Development did not perform. He then added that this had not yet been through the City Hall Committee but that he'd requested an audience with them and that this had not yet been through Planning and Zoning so the Committee was being asked to approve this item subject to the approval of the City Hall Committee and Planning and Zoning.

Mr. McCarthy asked for an explanation of Mr. Spencer's proposed solution to the lack of parking at the property.

Mr. Spencer said that his company planned to build a fully automated parking system which would accommodate in excess of 150 vehicles on the second story of the building. He said that such a system could stack three cars on top of each other with a clearance of 15 feet and that the 17 foot ceilings on the second story of this building would adequately accommodate such a facility. He said that fully automated parking systems had been built all across the United States and that there were several in Massachusetts and New Jersey but none as of yet in Connecticut. He said that he would reach out to neighbors for parking as well and make a last minute attempt to approach Housatonic Community College once his company legally owned the property just to get additional parking. He added that his company had met with people at 1000 Lafayette Blvd. and that they would have at least 50 spots available for immediate use.

Mr. McCarthy asked how many spaces were needed for the project.

Mr. Spencer answered that his company would want as many as possible but the amount needed would depend on what was done with the property and if zoning approval was granted to build two additional stories of residential space, more parking would be required to accommodate that.

Mr. Lavernoich added that the proposed parking facility would satisfy zoning.

Mr. Paoletto said that in his experience, Mr. Spencer's had taken on projects that other companies had walked away from and that other companies would not even look at and been successful in every project and all of their projects had been beneficial to the City of Bridgeport.

Mr. dePara asked how long Mr. Spencer expected this project to take.

Mr. Spencer said that barring any major problems, he estimated construction could be completed in 24 months.

Mr. dePara said that he'd heard mention of the side of the building being damaged.

Mr. Spencer said that the building was fine according to Fletcher and Thompson and the Building Department.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the Land Disposition Agreement would be attached to the resolution.

Mr. Lavernoch answered that the Land Disposition Agreement had not been created and said that what the Committee would be doing by approving this item would be authorizing the Mayor to enter into a Land Disposition Agreement that was consistent with all of the facts that were contained within the attached documents.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO APPROVE ITEM 235-06.  
\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Tom Mulligan; Maria Valle; Tom McCarthy; Angel dePara, Jr.; Richard Bonney; James Holloway

**STAFF:** Ed Lavernoich, Deputy Dir., OPED; Ron Pacacha; Associate City Attorney; John F. Stafstrom, Jr.; Bond Counsel; Alanna Kabel, Deputy CAO, Housing & Community Development

**OTHERS:** Council Members: Andre Baker, Donna Curran, Bob Walsh, Carlos Silva (6:20 p.m.), Elaine Pivrotto (6:20 p.m.), Amy Marie Vizzo-Panniccia (6:20 p.m.), Leticia Colón (6:30 p.m.), Michelle Lyons (6:40 p.m.), Warren Blunt (7:45 p.m.)  
Bridgeport Landing Development: Daniel Pfeffer, President; Michael E. Stone, AIA, Vice President; Bruce Cutright, Director of Infrastructure & Planning; William Lopez, Community Relations

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing Development relating to Steel Point.**

Mr. Holloway opened by speaking about development projects elsewhere in the State and how they'd pushed residents out who could not longer afford to live there. He offered Stamford as his first example, saying that residents there were forced to move to Norwalk and when Norwalk was redeveloped residents were forced to move to Bridgeport. Mr. Holloway wondered if the same thing happened in Bridgeport, where these people would go from here. He compared these redevelopment projects to a tidal wave that was coming through and carrying people out of town because they could not afford to stay. He said that he'd asked the Developers a year and a half ago if they were going to build affordable housing in this development and he was told flat out, no. It seemed now that the Developers had softened their tone a bit and told the City that they would put 50 affordable housing units on-site and 250 off-site and Mr. Holloway wondered where those would go because the City had been selling all of its assets and he didn't think there were 250 parcels of land in the City to build on and if the Developers could not include those individuals who could not afford \$350,000-\$400,000 houses then something was

wrong. He said that if the Developers wanted this project to go through, perhaps they could show him where these 250 affordable housing units would go and if the Developers already had them they should start to develop them immediately as a good faith effort.

*Mr. Silva, Ms. Vizzo-Panniccia and Ms. Piviroto arrived at 6:20 p.m.*

Mr. Lavernoich said that they would discuss why they were going with the mix of land use that they were, why the agreement had changed since the 2002 agreement, what their critical path was to get to the groundbreaking and the expected economic impacts. They'd also talk about the negotiation process that had been going on for the past two years and they'd produce documentation of some analysis being done on the proposed plans that would help show that the development was feasible and that the Developer was capable of making it work, adding that they could discuss the agreement whatever detail the Committee needed.

Mr. Stafstrom distributed Exhibit 1, Highlights of 2007 Development Agreement between City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport Landing Development, LLC to all Council Members. (see attached)

Mr. Lavernoich continued, saying that when this agreement was discussed in 2002, they thought there'd be state funding in place to pay for the infrastructure remediation on the property but that the funding had never materialized, causing them to have to consider other means of financing the infrastructure construction and site remediation and that had prompted some changes in the Developers overall program in order to be able to take care of those issues on the site. The agreement that the Committee had in front of them tonight and the resolution that went along with it attempted to amend and refine the agreement reached in 2002 and reflected the availability of City funding and changes in the marketplace.

Mr. Pfeffer said that he and his associates had worked very closely with the City for many years to be able to arrive at this point and were glad to finally be ready to speak with the Committee. He said that they'd had a number of major hurdles and obstacles overcome in this project such as a lack of available funding and financing from the state and a tremendous number of issues in terms of being able to just get a hold of the full peninsula that they'd talked about developing for so long but all of those obstacles were now behind them and for the first time ever the Steel Point Project could be a real project. He said that there were a lot of issues that faced this City and as they'd gotten to know and love the City of Bridgeport they continued to see that the biggest issue was that the residents were driven out of the by the high taxes. He said that this was a very difficult challenge for them as Developers trying to build housing on-site but that they'd adjusted their program to be able to generate sufficient tax dollars to pay for itself through tax increment financing which he would cover shortly. Mr. Pfeffer said that they needed to create a tax base to be able to pay the debt service on the bonds that would have to be issued and get the tax rate down in the City of Bridgeport so that they as developers could attract people that wanted to come in and live in the City of Bridgeport. He said that

Bridgeport's high taxes didn't just affect people buying residential properties but also affected retail tenants because as lessors, they had to pass the cost of taxes onto tenants. Mr. Pfeffer went on to say that Bridgeport had a problem that a lot of other growing urban cities had in that the City couldn't cut its spending without a lot of pain in the process and couldn't raise its taxes because the burden that would create would decrease the tax base but what the City could do was increase its tax base and that was the goal of this project. He said that every hurdle and every obstacle that had been thrown at Bridgeport Landing Development, whether it was state funding issues, UI, Tallmadge, or Pequonnock had all been resolved and they wanted to start development immediately.

Michael Stone said that this development would be on about 52 acres of land surrounded by I-95 in the North, Bridgeport Harbor in the South, and the Yellow Mill and Pequonnock Rivers on either side. The property was intended to have a program of over 7 million square feet including parking structures as well as occupied space and about 4 million of that was intended to be programmed. In that program it was intended as the Committee had seen in the site plans and renderings that there would be a mix of buildings of varying heights and designs that would create a neighborhood environment that was pedestrian friendly and was expected to be a 24-7 community, connected to downtown and the adjacent communities in the east side and east end. It would have a waterfront esplanade in the range of forty to fifty feet wide providing access to the Bridgeport waterfront around the entire perimeter of the property which would be open to the public. There would be a marina, boat yard and boat facilities as well as a yacht club available on the waterfront on the building side and the Developers intended to bring a substantial amount of retail, entertainment and restaurants to that area. He said that there would be a retail center up to the north closest to I-95, north of Stratford Avenue and a second component of retail shops with residential above coming down what they called their Main Street Component which bridged from the retail center in the north down to the waterfront which would have restaurants and entertainment uses and additional retail included there, making it a truly mixed use community. There would be residential space, most of which would be above or adjacent to the retail space and there would potentially be some office uses and maybe some hotels. He said that the sidewalks would be 20 feet wide to allow comfortable pedestrian walking space and the parking facilities would be internalized so that people would not be walking by a parking structure and be looking at the cars inside, but rather at store fronts and homes and restaurants so it would be a friendly, comfortable place for people to visit. In addition to the program of the actual development they also intended to have a street car that would connect the interlocal center into the Steel Point Peninsula allowing visitors to arrive by public transportation or to park in one location and experience the downtown as well as the Steel Point Peninsula and also allow residents to be able to get to public transportation without having to use a vehicle.

Bruce Cutright said that both the City and Developers had worked diligently for 3 solid years to resolve all the environmental issues and property acquisition issues and everything that it took to get to the point of being able to present this Land Development Agreement the Committee. He said that they'd been charged with finding what it would

take from an infrastructure standpoint to manage this so that the City didn't have to pay anything or borrow anything for it and so the City would take absolutely no risk from an environmental standpoint or from a financial standpoint and so all the benefits of this would roll up to the City and all the risk was assumed by the Developers. The first step was the Land Development agreement in front of the Committee which was an extensive agreement with numerous attachments. Next they would need their Urban Renewal Plan amendments approved by the Bridgeport Redevelopment Agency and the General Development Plan which included the zoning for Steel Point Development planned development District had to be approved. They also had to get the interlocal agreement which established the District which would manage the bond funds that would be used to construct the public works for the development and finally they had to issue the bonds so that the funds would become available. He said that the Developer would then take responsibility for the property, and for the bonds and begin the construction and that if this team continued to work as diligently as they had all these things could be accomplished in time to start construction in the next spring construction period. He said that Bridgeport Landing Development was prepared to do that and expected this program to take approximately 9 years for full build out and that after all of the paperwork hurdles were cleared with all building construction permits in place, the construction would focus first on the retail center on the north side and on the public facilities and public access to the waterways, in particular to the waterfront on the south side.

Mr. Pfeffer said one of the most challenging things they'd had to do was getting a handle on the infrastructure requirements for the peninsula. He said that at one time, single family homes, factories, shops and other things had occupied the peninsula but what the City was left with at this time was an antiquated infrastructure that couldn't support development with deposits from utility work, contamination from underground storage tanks that had leaked and other issues regarding petroleum and some heavy metals on the property.

*Michelle Lyons arrived at 6:40 p.m.*

Mr. Pfeffer continued, saying that there'd been some misperception about what the bonds were all about and explained that the bonds themselves were called Tax Increment Financing Bonds and were referred to as TIF. He said that they were not backed by the City in any way and there was no risk to the City. Very often the City was issued general obligation bonds which affected all taxpayers but that these were not general obligation bonds and TIF bonds were solely backed by additional tax revenues that they would generate from their development activities. He said that currently the peninsula paid \$0 in taxes to the City and that as developers they couldn't afford to spend nearly \$2 million just to bring this property up to a state where it could be developed so the only mechanism available was to look to alternative funding mechanisms. The first thing they were able to do in conjunction with the City and State Representatives was to get signed into law an approval from the government to issue them \$190 million worth of bonds. Mr. Pfeffer explained that the mechanism for those bonds would be for a District to be formed which would issue the bonds and the only sources of repayment for those bonds

were additional tax revenue generated as the property was built and out of pocket payment by the developer in the event that they did not generate those additional taxes. The City would not be responsible in any way for the repayment of those bonds and the bondholders were institutional investors who were used to taking this type of risk. He continued, saying that the bonds would be used only for infrastructure, gas, water, electric, sewer lines and public parking and a public promenade. Before they could actually build a public promenade they had to establish a bulkhead because the bulkhead was failing in several sections of the property and water was reclaiming it. Once the bulkhead was fully repaired they would build a public promenade, very much like the public promenade that they were in the process of completing in Baltimore. He said that people should have access to the water and there would be a very wide public promenade there that would be open all of the time. Their goal was to have restaurants and small shops along the promenade and from a utility standpoint, they would like to see this as the ultimate definition of a mixed-use project

Mr. Lopez said that he'd found in two and half years that he'd been in Bridgeport was that there was a great demand for jobs and the City wanted to hire local people and minority local contractors; people from Bridgeport that had businesses here that for one reason or another could not get into some of these projects. He said the most of the problems the contractors faced were related to bonding and insurance and what they were able to do in Miami was to have a major construction company pick up the bonding expense for some of the smaller contractors. He said that he'd found that in speaking with several local organizations, the hiring of local minority contractors was not a matter of finding the people but of the Developer supplying the jobs because there were already people in this community doing a great job of finding the contractors. He said that beside the local hiring agreement he was assuring this Council that he was networking and would do everything in his power to make sure that residents of Bridgeport would get the first shot at jobs. He said that as soon as this project was approved, and he hoped it was soon, they would have to get an office and the staff of that office would be from Bridgeport. He said that Bridgeport Landing Development was changing the way it did business to make sure that they had more control of the construction companies they worked with so that those companies understood their values and community commitment.

Atty. Strafstrom distributed copies of the following to all Council Members present: Exhibit 1, Highlights of 2007 Development Agreement between City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport Landing Development, LLC (attached); Exhibit F, Subordination, Non-Disturbance and Attornment Agreement; Letter of Opinion from The PFM Group.

Mr. Lavernoich said that his office was satisfied that this Developer could do this project and that the Committee was being given copies of an opinion letter from Kevin F. Gremse of the National Development Council. He reviewed that letter before the Committee and the favorable results of the analyses therein. He then reviewed Exhibit 1, Highlights of 2007 Development Agreement between City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport Landing Development, LLC which contained the most significant business points in the agreement. He said that he was not claiming that it covered every point in the agreement

but that those things that he knew that the Council cared most about were covered within this documentation. Mr. Lavernoich then briefly reviewed the documentation from Public Financial Management, Inc. who the City consulted with for feasibility studies for capital projects, including this fiscal impact analysis that showed the expected revenues and obligations of the project and the net benefit that the City could expect to gain from it.

Mr. Holloway said that the City was selling off its properties and had agreed to go into a third phase of selling off properties and asked if that was what was happening, where the 250 off-site parcels of affordable housing would come from.

Mr. Pfeffer said that these would not be 250 separate parcels of land and that the appropriate way to do this would be to build a mixture of affordable and market rate units clustered together. He said that they'd been working with Fannie Mae to identify potential properties that could be developed as affordable housing and would use 375-379 East Main Street as the first off-site affordable housing property.

Mr. Holloway asked if it was then true that they would not try to acquire properties that the City had already acquired and if they would try to acquire private property. He said that this did not make sense if the City already had property for sale and that the City should give the Developers the first shot at the properties that they were already selling so that they could develop them as off-site affordable housing units.

Mr. Pfeffer said that he absolutely agreed with Mr. Holloway and in fact he and Alanna Kabel had discussed looking at the inventory and they'd actually asked for the City's cooperation. It was their goal to take the non-taxpaying properties and renovate or them or build new properties and put them back on the tax rolls.

Mr. Holloway said that if this could be arranged they could start developing those properties immediately as a good-faith effort. He went on to say that it over the past 14 years there had been three major developments in the South end of Bridgeport and none had involvement by minority contractors. He said that the Developers wanted to remedy that in their project and talked about their plan for that but that the City already had a contractor charged with that task and asked why they couldn't work with that contractor to make sure that they found Bridgeport minority contractors.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the Developers had been in contact with the City's consultant on this project to find minority contractors.

Mr. Mulligan asked how many units were contemplated on the E. Main St property.

Mr. Pfeffer said that until they had the property under their control they were unable to answer that.

Mr. Mulligan asked if that property was currently privately owned.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that the City currently owned that property.

Mr. Mulligan then asked what the Developer's general contemplation on how to satisfy the 250 off-site affordable housing units was.

Mr. Pfeffer said that if they had their druthers they would look at some of the larger properties that the City had under its control or could get under its control that had not been paying taxes. It made sense to them to work with larger properties with 15 to 25 but they could also rehabilitate smaller properties and single family homes.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the plan was then to sell those properties or to rent them.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that they would be both sold and rented out.

Mr. Mulligan asked what the minimum income would be for a person to qualify to own or rent these homes.

Ms. Kabel said that there were Area Median Income (AMI) limit requirements on the Developer as they related to both for sale and rental housing. Those limitations were different for both rental and for-sale housing, and they were based on the Area Median Income. She said that any federal or state funding that the City received to help low income people was all based on the Area Median Income so if, for example there was a household of four and the 80% AMI income currently was in the \$50,000 range for a household of four and the family was making \$35,000 and could not afford to buy the unit that was for sale to a household making \$80,000, the family would be eligible to participate in a number of programs, including a down payment assistance program for low-income households which provided up to \$25,000 of assistance to help them purchase properties that they would otherwise be unable to afford. She said although the assistance was a lien on the property there was no repayment on the first \$10,000 of it as long as the homeowner stayed in the property for five years and kept it up to housing code standards. The remaining \$15,000 would be deferred for at least 10 years and at the end of the 10 year period there would be a review of the household's assets and liabilities to determine at that point whether or not they could afford to pay back on that loan to the City and if they could not, they would continue to defer it. She said that with all of the assistance that the City had at its disposal to help low and moderate income households either purchase or rent units in this development and the goal of the assistance program was to make the units affordable through rental assistance or home ownership assistance.

Mr. Mulligan asked if this program would be available to households with a yearly income of \$35,000.

Ms. Kabel said that as they got closer to the actual development phase and the actual construction of the units they would evaluate the program to be sure that it was in sync with what was being done at this development, and be available to as many households as

possible and make the prospect of home ownership more realistic for low and moderate income families.

Mr. McCarthy asked for the actual breakdown of City services to be explained to him. He said that he believed for instance that in Miami the maintenance of the streets came under the development district and he wondered what they would be required as a City to do service-wise.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the City would be required to provide the normal civil services that it would to any neighborhood and the additional cost of those services was talked about in the Public Financial Management document distributed to the Committee.

Mr. McCarthy asked who would own the streets in the development.

Mr. Lavernoich said there would be some completely private streets within the grid of the development and that other streets would be owned and maintained by the City.

Mr. Cutright said that one of his roles in Miami was chairman of the Community Development District and that Miami's Community Development District was very similar to one that would be formed in Bridgeport in that they would use the bond funds to construct public facilities once construction was completed to the standard that the City required, the City would maintain ownership, for example, there was one street in Miami that was not wide enough to meet the City's criteria so the District maintained ownership of it. That maintenance would be paid for by funds generated from public parking.

Mr. McCarthy asked for the special District to be explained in terms of zoning and the City's zoning board's control over that

Mr. Lavernoich said that the District would create its own zoning standards with the approval of the City and its Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Bonney asked what the term "unit" constituted in terms of the affordable housing units and if the on-site and off-site affordable housing units would have the same amount of space.

Mr. Lavernoich said that a unit constituted one residence for one household and so one single family house with four bedrooms would be considered one unit and one building with four separate apartments would be considered four units.

Mr. Pfeffer said that from their perspective, any difference in size or quality between on-site and off-site affordable housing units didn't make sense.

Mr. Silva asked if negotiations were still ongoing and if the project would be halted if they decided as a Council that they wanted to change the amount of on-site affordable housing units to 100 units instead of the 50 being proposed.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the agreement before them was the result of many compromises and it had been discussed and found that any more than the currently proposed amount of on-site affordable housing units was not economically feasible.

*Mr. Blunt arrived at 7:45 p.m.*

Mr. Holloway said that over the past 14 years the City had borrowed more than \$10 million against CDBG funds and were paying that back currently and he hoped that that would not adversely affect the individuals who would depend on block grant money.

Ms. Kabel said that the program that they would look to was actually not CDBG and so the repayment of the CDBG funds would not affect housing benefit programs for this development and TIF would not affect CDBG.

Mr. Holloway asked Mr. Lavernoich if an amendment could be added to the agreement before them that the Developer would work with the City's consultant on its Minority Contracts Ordinance, the Rufus Wells Group, LLC to ensure that the Minority Contracts Ordinance was enforced.

Mr. Cutright said that it was included in the agreement that their first preference for hiring contractors would be local contractors based in Bridgeport.

Mr. Holloway said that this was understood but that perhaps Bridgeport Landing Development could be working on something else while the consultant that the City had already hired worked on hiring contractors for them.

Mr. Cutright said that they would rely on the City and their resources at every step and that the recommendations of contractors and employees were all incorporated into this agreement.

Mr. dePara referred to Exhibit 1 under City Rights and Consideration, number 11, (see attached) and asked what the salary range was that the City was using under the AMI to define workforce housing eligibility.

Ms. Kabel said that the 50 on-site affordable housing units were to be made available for sale or rental to a household with an income of no greater than 105% of the Area Median Income, which was currently \$77,000 per year, 105% of which being approximately \$81,000 per year and the Area Median Income changed every year.

Mr. dePara asked what the minimum was.

Ms. Kabel said that the minimum would depend on the amount of assistance available and on the individual household.

Mr. dePara asked if the City was committing to assisting each of the owners or renters of each of these 50 on-site affordable housing units

Ms. Kabel said that would be up to the will of the City Council and if they were willing to grant that level of assistance.

Mr. Lavernoich said that there was no minimum requirement as long as a person could qualify the mortgage on the unit

Mr. dePara asked if there was a known range of how much one of these units would cost

Mr. Lavernoich answered that they would be somewhere in the range of \$220,000-\$250,000

Ms. Valle asked, knowing that it would take another five to six years to complete the construction of these affordable housing units and that during that time the cost of the homes would go, how people would be able to afford them.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the cost of the homes could only go up as fast as and relative to the federally reported Area Median Income which changed only once a year.

Mr. Walsh asked if the City envisioned ever taking any property at this development by eminent domain, adding that the language in the agreement would allow for that.

Mr. Lavernoich said that they did not and that any acquisition of a property at the development would have to go before the City Council.

Ms. Curran asked how the enforcement mortgage would be dealt with on this development.

Atty. Pacacha said that this was still being worked out but he believed that it would be released upon the Developer's reaching a specified minimum amount of construction.

Ms. Curran asked for explanation of the interlocal agreement.

Atty. Stafstrom said that that agreement would come back to the City Council and was not before them because it was dependant on several unresolved financial conditions.

Ms. Curran asked if the District that would be created for the development was a creation of the City or of the Developer.

Mr. Stafstrom answered that it was created by state law but still had to be actualized by the City.

Ms. Curran asked who would monitor the Developers transferring of properties to third party organizations and why they couldn't retain control over that conveyance by requiring that they had to come to the Council first for approval.

Atty. Pacacha said that there were very tight controls on transfers outlined in the agreement and that transfers would require approval by several City departments.

*Mr. Paoletto called for a recess at 8:45 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 9:00 p.m.*

Ms. Curran asked for further explanation of a critical path of the financial arrangements with relation to the Development.

Atty. Stafstrom briefly reviewed the contents of the opinion letter from Public Financial Management, Inc. and where in that letter that information could be found.

Ms. Curran said she hoped that this project didn't get rushed and that she wanted it to go through but not at the expense of the taxpayers or risk to their homes.

Mr. Holloway said that he thought that it would be best for this meeting to be continued so that the Committee and Council Members could prepare their questions and be ready with them so the remainder of the meeting could go more smoothly.

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY MOVED FOR A CONTINUANCE.**  
**\*\* MR. BONNEY SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was continued at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

Highlights of 2007 Development Agreement between  
City Of Bridgeport and Bridgeport Landing Development, LLC

**Developer Rights and Consideration**

- 1) Developer acquires property for \$100,000/acre, the same price as in 2002 Preliminary Development Agreement. (Section 6.4)
- 2) The Developer acquires 375-379 East Main Street and adjacent City owned parcels for \$300,000. (Section 6.8)
- 3) Developer receives City's promise to cooperate in establishment of special district (District) and negotiation of Interlocal Agreement between City and District. The District must be established to issue the tax increment financing (TIF) bonds, which are necessary to pay for the infrastructure. (Sections 4.1 to 4.7)
- 4) Developer receives right to sell interests in or take on new partners in BLD LLC, with some restrictions. (Section 12.1)
- 5) Developer receives right to sell parcels of property to other developers, with some restrictions/limitations. (Section 12.1)
- 6) Developer receives right to create its own General Development Plan (zoning) for the project through the Planned Development District mechanism, subject to City approvals, Right to create its own zoning through the PDD Regulations, subject to OPED approval and P&Z approval. (Section 3.2)

**City Rights and Consideration**

- 1) The Developer cannot acquire the property until the District issues the TIF bonds. (Section 5.1 (ix))
- 2) The Developer inherits all responsibility for environmental issues (e.g. prior contamination) on the property, including DEP requirements. The Developer indemnifies the City for all environmental liabilities. (Sections 15.1 to 15.6)
- 3) The Developer will guarantee real property tax revenue in the form of a PILOT to the City; a portion of the revenues will be prioritized for the City on a "First Call-Right", further ensuring that not all real estate property taxes will go to pay off TIF Bonds. (Sections 4.7 and 4.8) (Business property and motor vehicles will be unaffected by the agreement)
- 4) The City and Developer must agree on what the District will construct with the TIF bond proceeds. (Exhibit R)
- 5) The Developer will guarantee the debt service payments on the TIF bonds; the City will have no responsibility liability for the payments. The Developer will be responsible for cost overruns experienced by the District. (Exhibit R and Section 4.6)
- 6) The Developer and/or District will assume all obligations to obtain permits and approvals for the project. The City may elect to hire third party professionals for inspections (e.g. building inspections) at the Developer's expense. (Sections 3.2 and 7.3)

- 7) The City, acting through the Planning & Zoning Commission, will have approval rights for the initial General Development Plan (GDP) and subsequent amendments to the GDP. (Section 3.2)
- 8) The City, acting through OPED, will have approval rights for the initial General Development Plan (GDP) and subsequent amendments to the GDP, until a substantial portion of the project is constructed. (Section 3.2)
- 9) The City is assured that the Developer cannot transfer interest in BED LLC to criminal or disreputable partners. (Section 12.1)
- 10) The City is assured that the Developer can only transfer parcels of property to other qualified and reputable developers. (Section 12.1)
- 11) The Developer is obligated to construct 300 units of Workforce Housing. A minimum of 50 units of the Workforce Housing must be "On-Site". (Section 3.7) The Developer will be obligated to pay the City \$200,000 for each "On-Site" unit that is not constructed. The Developer will be obligated to pay the City \$100,000 for each "Off-Site" unit not constructed. (Section 13.2)
- 12) Developer will use 375-379 East Main Street and adjacent City owned parcels for specifically for the "Off-Site" Workforce Housing requirement. The units cannot be considered "On-Site". (Section 6.8)
- 13) The Developer will be obligated to create a program similar to its Miami project's "First Source Hiring" program to ensure the participation of a significant number of local residents and contractors in the privately funded portion of the project. (Section 7.5)
- 14) The Developer will work cooperatively with the City to ensure that the District will a) adopt a "First Source Hiring" program; and b) adopt standards and goals as similar as possible to the City's Minority Business Enterprise Ordinance. (Section 7.5)
- 15) The Developer will provide the City with an Enforcement Mortgage, to secure Developer's performance. The City will have a lien on parcels that are impacted by bank foreclosures or bankruptcy. (Article 19).
- 16) The Developer will inherit MOVE Yacht Club and Pequonnock Yacht Club as temporary tenants. (Section 5.1 and Exhibits C and K)
- 17) The Developer will allow a new facility for Tallmadge Brothers to be constructed within the project, pursuant to the Court settlement. (Sections 5.1. 18.1 and Exhibit F)

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Maria Valle; Tom McCarthy; Angel dePara, Jr. (6:25 p.m.); Richard Bonney;

**STAFF:** Ed Lavernoch, Deputy Dir., OPED; Ron Pacacha; Associate City Attorney; John F. Stafstrom, Jr.; Bond Counsel; Kathy Hunter, OPED

**OTHERS:** Senator Ed Gomes; Council Members: Andres Ayala, Jr., Andre Baker (7:05 p.m.), Donna Curran, Bob Walsh, Carlos Silva, Elaine Pivrotto, Amy Marie Vizzo-Panniccia (6:25 p.m.), Leticia Colón (6:30 p.m.), Michelle Lyons (6:50 p.m.), Warren Blunt (8:30 p.m.)  
Bridgeport Landing Development: Daniel Pfeffer, President; Michael E. Stone, AIA, Vice President; Bruce Cutright, Director of Infrastructure & Planning; William Lopez, Community Relations

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:14 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing Development relating to Steel Point.**

Ms. Curran asked for further explanation of the TIF bonds.

Mr. Stafstrom said that the state legislation allowed for the creation of a special assessment district and that assessment district, not the City of Bridgeport would be the entity to issue the bonds which would be repaid by a special tax assessment on the district that would be added to the district's regular assessment.

*Mr. dePara arrived at 6:25 p.m.*

Mr. Pfeffer further explained how the Bonds would be repaid by taxes generated by the properties in the special assessment district and that the full cost of the project would be born by the Developer.

Ms. Curran then asked what would happen and how the taxpayers would be affected if the developer failed and was incapable of making the special assessments or defaulted on their bonds.

Mr. Stafstrom answered that the bonds would be issued under a trustee and in the event that the debt service on them could not be paid, the trusty would deal with that, but since the City was not the issuer of the bonds they would not be affected if the bonds were not repaid.

Ms. Curran asked if there were any termination rights for this project and if they existed who they were held by.

Atty. Pacacha answered that they were termination rights for both the City and the Developer prior to the bond closing and property transfer and following that, the termination rights would be held by the bond trustee.

Ms. Curran asked who the bond trustee would be.

Mr. Stafstrom answered that a major bank would likely be the bond trustee.

Ms. Curran said that she was curious as to why the developer's partnership with RexCorp had not been mentioned yet, and wondered how much they would contribute to the Steel Point Project.

Mr. Pfeffer said that the partnership with RexCorp was a recent development and that they shared values and ethics and as one of the largest real estate owners and developers in the tri-state area, RexCorp would serve to strengthen Bridgeport Landing Development.

Ms. Curran said that Exhibit F, the Tallmadge stipulation referred to a lease term of 300 years and asked if this was a typo.

Mr. Pfeffer said that it was not a typo and this was to prevent any inappropriate businesses from being operated on the property.

Ms. Curran asked if for any reason, the Developer failed if the City would then take over that lease agreement.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that if the Developer failed, the property would be foreclosed on by the bond trustee and a new developer would take over and be made to honor all of the agreements of the current developer.

Ms. Curran said that exhibit R was mentioned in the index as having to do with legal proceedings, but it was blank.

Atty. Pacacha said that there were no pending legal proceedings to list.

Ms. Curran said that page 43 of the LDA referred to a transferee and asked who that transferee would be.

Atty. Pacacha answered that it referred to a new developer, should a new developer have to take over the project for any reason or to a developer or purchaser of a particular parcel within the development.

Ms. Curran then referred to the report by the PFM Group which was submitted at the previous meeting and signed by Ms. June M. Matte. She said that the report was a review of MuniCap's analysis and that MuniCap was the developer's consultant and the City had wisely asked PFM to review their analysis and in reading this document if she understood it correctly Ms. Matte had three significant areas of concern. She said that Ms. Matte's first concern appeared to be that the appraisal methodology and that the appraisal was the underpinning of the project's liability. She said that the second concern was real estate values for component development units and the market's ability to absorb additional units and the costs of the units. Ms. Curran said that those prices were supplied by the Developer and Ms. Matte saw that as a conflict of interest. Ms. Curran thought that the City Council should have some sort of disinterested third party conduct a follow-up assessment to double check the appraisal methodology, the pricing and the absorption rate for the residential units. She then went on to say that Ms. Matte's third concern seemed to be the long-term projection of tax revenues which assumed the City's current mill rate to be constant throughout the 30 year life of the Bonds associated with the project. Ms. Curran said that Ms. Matte's final remark was to "urge the City to either require the Developer to undertake the additional due diligence or have the City undertake these studies directly" Ms. Curran said she wanted to see a market study that would take on these concerns.

Mr. Lavernoich said that these concerns would all be addressed before bonds could be issued.

*Mr. Paoletto excused himself at 7:10 p.m. at which time Mr. dePara took over as Chair.*

Mr. Walsh recognized and thanked the Developers for certain concession that they'd made. He went to say that he'd read on the internet about one or two class action suits filed in Miami by potential condo owners saying that the Developer had failed to meet the required timeline of the construction.

Mr. Pfeffer explained that what happened in those cases was that investors in properties who were afraid that they would lose money on their investments used the two-year construction limit as an excuse to back out of the investment and that the two-year construction limit was not met because of acts of god, namely 12-14 hurricanes that hit the area and because of a tremendous labor shortage in the area. He said that the parties who'd filed suit had applied for class-action status but that it had not been granted.

Mr. Walsh said that his next question was with regard to the legal entity known as Rex-Midtown and he was asking because it was his understanding that the City was facing a lawsuit in the following year from Alex Conroy concerning the same property and that the City had taken away the development rights for Mr. Conroy because he had lost his financial backing. He said that the City questioned Mr. Conroy's bringing on of new entities and it seemed as though they were now dealing with the third entity in a series of entities on this project and he feared that this could be used against the City if Mr. Conroy's suit went to trial the following year because it would show that the City had treated this development team differently from Conroy. Mr. Walsh said that if this was not the case, he wanted to know what the differences were.

Atty. Pacacha said that the remedy that Conroy was seeking from his lawsuit did not involve Steel Point at all but covering damages for lost profits and opportunities and if there were any lawsuits concerning Steel Point itself, the City would be bound from doing anything with that property. He went on to say that the developer entity had not changed since the beginning of these dealings. Rather, it had remained Bridgeport Landing Development LLC, but had a number of different members including RCI Marine from Miami and Midtown Equities and would likely add more members. He then added that the agreement with Alex Conroy had been extended several times by the Council but based on his performance was terminated by the City, at which point Alex Conroy decided to sue saying that the deal was unfairly taken away from him while in fact it had been terminated after several extensions were granted.

Mr. Walsh asked if it was true that once the Developers had ownership of the property they could sell development rights with the City's permission.

Atty. Pacacha clarified that they could transfer development rights so long as Bridgeport Landing Development retained control over the transferee and the developer could not sell to a third party until several strict benchmarks had been met.

Mr. Walsh asked the Developers how much of the development in Miami had been sold off and how quickly.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that prior to getting all of their approvals from City Council, roughly 10% of the development was sold to avoid going through a two-year review process mandated by Florida state law and this was an idea the Developers came up with the City of Miami in order to expedite the development.

Mr. Walsh said that Exhibit H.1 on original construction referred to approximately 750,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of nonresidential use space that was permitted and 500 residential units that would have to be built on the site. He said that this seemed lopsided to him and he wondered if the plan was to sell off the portion of the property north of Stratford Ave. to a retail developer and let them fulfill that obligation.

*Mr. Paoletto returned and resumed as Chair at 7:25 p.m.*

Mr. Pfeffer said they had no plans whatsoever to sell off the retail portion of this development and that the most they would do, if anything would be to partner with someone they believed could add value to the project.

Mr. Walsh asked why the City didn't require a detailed development feasibility study prior to the approval of the LDA considering it was something that was going to have to be done prior to the bonds being issued anyway. He said that if something could come up in that study that could put into question this whole project then it should be discussed sooner rather than later.

Mr. Lavernoich explained that the Developer had spent a great deal on analysis for this project thus far and wanted to secure the development before spending more money on further analysis.

Atty. Stafstrom referred Mr. Walsh to page 1 of the Executive Summary included within the PFM Group report under Scope of Analysis, where worst case scenarios were listed as presented by MuniCap and undisputed by the PFM Group.

Mr. Walsh asked why all of the agreements including the Interlocal Agreement were not being submitted in their final forms prior to the Council being asked to approve them.

Atty. Pacacha said that those documents were constantly changing and would change somewhat between the time the agreement was approved and when it was actually executed and explained that when the phrase “substantially in the form” was used, it meant that no material changes could be made to those documents without that change being approved by the Council. He said that the Interlocal Agreement could not currently be negotiated because the district was not yet established and the agreement would have to be negotiated with the district.

Atty. Stafstrom added that the Interlocal Agreement would come back to the Council for approval.

Mr. dePara asked on behalf of Councilwoman Colón if there was any definite breakdown of one or two bedroom units and what their possible price ranges and expected locations were.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that the units would be interspersed throughout the district and that the people with market rate units shouldn't know if their neighbors were in workforce units or not. He said that there should be equal representation across the board with regard to numbers of bedrooms for the units and he deferred to Mr. Lavernoich for the question on the cost of the units.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that the affordable housing units would cost a maximum of \$215,000 to \$225,000 depending on fluctuations in Area Median Income.

Mr. dePara said that he'd spoken to Mr. Lavernoich earlier in the day and wondered if he'd been able to get the information he'd requested regarding the Area Median Income and if that could be distributed to the Committee Members.

Ms. Hunter reviewed the Bridgeport Rent and Sales Affordability Analysis (attached) while Mr. Lavernoich distributed copies to the Committee and other Council Members who were present

*Mr. Paoletto called for a recess at 7:50 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 8:06 p.m.*

Mr. McCarthy asked for the time line and requirements for the workforce housing construction to be explained in further detail.

Mr. Lavernoich said that 50 units of on-site workforce housing were part of the initial construction requirements within the text of the agreement and that at least 150 offsite workforce housing units must be completed within 6 years. He said that the remaining 100 units would then have to be constructed within the following 3 years and if the units were not completed, the Developer would be required to pay the City \$100,000 for each off-site workforce housing unit not completed and \$200,000 for each on-site workforce housing unit not constructed.

Ms. Valle said that she was concerned because people had lost their homes as a result of previous developments and asked how this development would affect businesses that were currently on East Main Street.

Mr. Pfeffer said that East Main Street would be a major focal point for the project and that pedestrian traffic would be increased there. He hoped that neighborhood associations could be started there to spruce up the area.

Ms. Curran addressed the resolution, saying that the language in first paragraph on the last page was open ended and she hoped that this Committee or the Council would amend it to make it less so.

Atty. Pacacha explained that from a legal standpoint the resolution was actually not open ended but rather allowed the City to do what was necessary in furtherance of the agreement, adding that any changes to that agreement would be brought back to the Council.

Ms. Curran said that she'd been trying to pass a resolution that the City Council would retain its own disinterested third party independent consultant to review this document and it appeared to her after reading the document from the PFM Group that they'd provided some of that overview and had taken a further step of urging the City to get a

market study. Ms. Curran said that she didn't want to this project, which had so much promise and such a good developer and development team behind it not go forward because something was missed in the market study. She asked the Committee to consider asking Ms. June Matte, the City's Financial Advisor to attend a meeting of this Committee to address some of the issues that were raised at this meeting so that the Council could not only have their questions answered sufficiently but also so they could move forward in support of it.

Mr. dePara said that he'd also planned to ask that Ms. Matte speak before this Committee.

Mr. Lavernoch said that he would try to have Ms. Matte at a meeting in the following week.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED FOR A CONTINUANCE.**  
**\*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was continued at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OCTOBER 2<sup>ND</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Maria Valle; Tom McCarthy; Angel dePara, Jr.; Richard Bonney; Tom Mulligan

**STAFF:** Ed Lavernoich, Deputy Dir., OPED; Alanna Kabel, Deputy CAO, Housing & Community Development; Ron Pacacha; Associate City Attorney; John F. Stafstrom, Jr.; Bond Counsel; Tom White, Legislative Services Director

**OTHERS:** June M. Matte, PFM Group; Council Members: Donna Curran, Bob Walsh, Carlos Silva, Warren Blunt, Elaine Pivrotto (6:35 p.m.), Leticia Colón (7:30 p.m.)

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:12 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing  
Development relating to Steel Point.**

Ms. Matte opened her presentation, saying that the PFM Group had shared a long standing relationship with the City of Bridgeport as Financial Advisors to the City. She then reviewed the document she'd prepared and submitted to the City via Atty. Stafstrom, dated September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007 which had been submitted to the members of this Committee and to other Council Members who were present at this Committee's Special Meeting held September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the TIF Bonds would create a hazard for the City's Board of Education by skewing tax revenues for the City and in turn decreasing the amount of money that could be given to the City based on tax revenues generated.

Atty. Stafstrom said that it was his understanding that funding awarded to the City for education was not based on the City's tax revenues but on social service indicators, such as the socio-economic levels of the students.

Mr. Mulligan said that he didn't want to set a precedent with this development that any time there was a property within Bridgeport that required environmental remediation it would be entitled to TIF Bonds.

Atty. Stafstrom said that this was a special consideration for this project and didn't foresee that it would become a standard as state legislation had been passed for this project only.

Mr. dePara referred to MuniCap's long-term projection of tax revenue generated by this Development and asked Ms. Matte if she thought that projection was too conservative or too liberal.

Ms. Matte said that this was very difficult to predict. She said that the methodology used in that report provided a relatively large amount of generated tax revenue compared to cost of debt service on the bonds but that even with large fluctuations in the market, the tax revenue was still likely to be sufficient.

Ms. Curran referred to the PFM Group document prepared by Ms. Matte where it said "...we urge the City to either require the Developer to undertake the additional due diligence or have the City undertake these studies directly" and said that the use of the word 'urge' impressed her. She said that Ms. Matte had referred to both a market study and a formal study and asked what the material difference was between the two.

Ms. Matte said that a formal study would include research of demographical data and would have to be done prior to the issuance of the bonds for this project.

Ms. Curran asked if there was a flowchart available that would show the relationship of time, development and funding.

Atty. Pacacha said that such a chart could be provided to this Committee.

Ms. Curran said that the Council was unaware of what the Interlocal Agreement included but was being asked to approve this LDA relating to it before having that information. She asked if the Council would have the opportunity to reject the Interlocal Agreement.

Atty. Stafstrom answered that the Interlocal Agreement would be reviewed and approved or rejected separately from the LDA.

Mr. Walsh noted that MuniCap's study was submitted on August 31<sup>st</sup> and PFM's report on that study was submitted on September 12<sup>th</sup> and asked Ms. Matte if she'd been given only 12 days in which to complete her report.

Ms. Matte said that PFM had been working with MuniCap and developing their report while MuniCap was still conducting their study.

Mr. Walsh asked Ms. Matte if she believed that the plan as submitted by the Developer was feasible.

Ms. Matte said that she believed that the methodology that they used to determine the feasibility of the Development was reasonable.

Mr. Walsh asked if Ms. Matte could speak to whether the financial progress of this project would be in synch with its physical development.

Ms. Matte said that she could not.

Mr. Walsh asked Ms. Matte if when she was reviewing the MuniCap study she'd also been looking at the LDA.

Ms. Matte answered that she had not.

Mr. Walsh asked Ms. Matte if it would bother her to know that the LDA only required the construction of 500 housing units and 750,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of non-residential space by the end of six years.

*Mr. dePara left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.*

Atty. Stafstrom asked why that was relevant.

Mr. Walsh answered that the financial analysis before them was projecting revenues based almost completely on what the Developers said they would do and there was an LDA that required a lot less of that Developer.

Atty. Stafstrom suggested that the LDA also contemplated that the bonds on this project would likely not be issued all at one time but rather just as the construction would be done in phases, the bonds would be issued in phases and by the time the bonds were issued, there would be updated feasibility studies based on the phase of the project being financed.

Mr. Walsh said that the construction of the public esplanade and bulkhead were not required within six years but the financial impact study said that properties would be built on the bulkhead in less than six years.

Mr. Lavernoich stated that the City had multiple protections in the agreement that dealt with penalties on the Developer for not developing the property on the most aggressive schedule possible including an enforcement mortgage and minimum revenue guarantees.

Mr. Walsh said that "supertankers can't stop on a dime" and this project, once it was started would not be easily stopped if some component of it failed. He felt that there should be a much stronger correlation between the financial impact studies and the LDA for this project with regard to the requirements of the Developer.

Mr. Lavernoich reiterated the mechanisms in place to protect the City as stated in the LDA.

Mr. Walsh stated that he found no consolation in those protections.

Mr. Lavernoich said that there was a level of risk in any such development.

Mr. Walsh believed that there were ways to better manage and minimize those risks.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the City had been trying to do just that.

Mr. Walsh referred to the second bullet point in Ms. Matte's letter where it said that the City should require that the Developer conduct a market study to ensure that Bridgeport's market would be able to absorb 3,500 units sold at an average market price of \$350,000 and asked why the City shouldn't require that study before signing the LDA.

Atty. Stafstrom said that there'd been feasibility studies conducted which would be updated at the issuance of the bonds for this project and all of those economic issues would go back through the City Council with the Interlocal Agreement.

Mr. Walsh asked if it was correct that the Interlocal Agreement would be before the Council in nine months time.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the Developer Agreement gave the Developer nine months in which to reach an agreement with the City on a form of the Interlocal Agreement and 12 months after that to have bonds issued. He added that the City had a unilateral right to cancel the project any time before the issuance of the bonds.

Mr. Walsh noted that there would not be a full market study done and therefore the City would not know if this project was feasible for 21 months.

*Mr. Paoletto left the meeting at 7:15 p.m. at which time Mr. dePara resumed as Chair.*

Mr. Lavernoich said that at the time of her study, Ms. Matte was unaware that the City would be retaining the deed to the property until after the bonds for the project were issued.

Mr. Walsh asked about the effects of this project on the City's budget.

Atty. Stafstrom said that no one on the negotiating team was qualified to answer that.

Mr. dePara suggested that they could have someone qualified to answer that attend a meeting.

Mr. Walsh said that perhaps they need not attend if they could submit something in writing whether that person thought that this project would cause a real problem or not. He then referred to Table 1 on page 2 of the Executive Summary within the PFM Document where it indicated that the estimated full development of the 732,400 ft.<sup>2</sup> of retail space would be completed by 2009 and asked if that was a reasonable estimation given that it would be 21 months before bonds were even issued.

Mr. Lavernoich said that it was.

Mr. Walsh said that if the retail space was expected to be fully developed by 2009, the Developer should have signed letters of intent from major retailers who would be located in that space.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he saw no reason to ask to see letters of intent as they'd conducted retail feasibility studies that gave them confidence that the retail space would be filled.

Mr. dePara offered that perhaps the Developers could speak to that.

Mr. Walsh referred to Schedule II: Development Costs on page 6 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis contained within the PFM Document where it showed the total estimated development cost and asked how the bond money related to that and what parts of that breakdown the bond money would be used for.

Atty. Stafstrom said that the bonds would be used for public structures such as roads, public parking garages (not residential parking garages) and the esplanade.

*Mr. Paoletto returned at 7:30 p.m. and resumed as Chair.*

Mr. Walsh asked for a clearer breakdown of the funding of those outlined estimated costs. He then referred to Schedule IV: Assessed Value on page 8 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis and said that all that was required in the LDA was for 750,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of retail space to be completed by the end of six years and this schedule showed 732,000 ft<sup>2</sup> completed by the end of 2009.

Atty. Stafstrom said that the Fiscal Impact Study was separate from and was never meant to mirror the LDA.

Mr. Walsh referred to Schedule VI: Annual City Personal Property Tax Revenues on page 10 of the Fiscal Impact Analysis and said that he found the average depreciation rate of 50% to be unrealistic particularly when one considered that computer equipment such as retail cash registers became obsolete within 3 years. He suggested that the City's own Tax Assessor could provide a more accurate figure. Mr. Walsh then referred to Schedule IX: City of Bridgeport Service Population (Current and Projected) on page 13 where it said that the projected increased real property tax revenues to City of Bridgeport were

\$37,707,029 and the current real property tax revenues to the City of Bridgeport were \$206,743,254 which was an 18% increase in revenues and said that it was a foolish assumption to continue to use the current mill rate. He then referred to Table 2: Projected Additional Revenues to City of Bridgeport under Schedule X: Additional Revenues to the City of Bridgeport on page 14 (mislabeled as page 16) where it said that the current City revenues for fines, forfeits and penalties were \$5,750,000. He said that it was projected that there would be an additional \$1 million in fines, forfeits and penalties for unpaid taxes and hoped that the City would not be selling off tax liens and other such things to the tune of \$1 million per year. Mr. Walsh moved onto Schedule XI-B: Projected Additional Costs Increase – 30 year Projection and said that the Board of Education costs did not take into account any increase in number of students over the full 30 years.

Ms. Matte said that the projection was based on the number of bedrooms constructed to predict how many families would live in the units and residents were not expected to be families with children.

Mr. McCarthy distributed copies of a Labor Peace Agreement for the Committee's review before a discussion at the following meeting.

Ms. Curran asked if the City would be responsible for costs associated with relocating Tallmadge.

Mr. Lavernoch answered that it would not.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED FOR A CONTINUANCE.**

Atty. Stafstrom asked Mr. McCarthy if he wanted the negotiating team to discuss the proposed Labor Peace Agreement with the Developer.

Mr. McCarthy said that he would appreciate that and would be happy to be part of that discussion.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was continued at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OCTOBER 9, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Angel dePara, Jr., Co-Chair; Maria Valle; Tom McCarthy; Richard Bonney; Tom Mulligan (6:20 p.m.)

**STAFF:** Ed Lavernoch, Deputy Dir., OPED; Ron Pacacha; Associate City Atty.; John F. Stafstrom, Jr.; Bond Counsel; Tom White, Legislative Services

**OTHERS:** City Council Members: Amy Marie Vizzo-Paniccia Robert Curwen, Donna Curran, Leticia Colón  
Bridgeport Landing Development: Daniel Pfeffer, President; Michael E. Stone, AIA, Vice President; Bruce Cutright, Director of Infrastructure & Planning; William Lopez, Community Relations

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing Development relating to Steel Point.**

Mr. Bonney asked if there were any individuals or groups identified as being first source hiring, what categories they would be in and of that group who, if anyone was earmarked for training and when that training would take place.

Mr. Lopez said the Developers had been in the community for two years and in that time had been networking and meeting with groups such as Career Resources, OIC and Community Solutions. He said it was already decided that they'd have a networking program to find and identify everyone in Bridgeport who was interested in construction or other jobs to make sure no one was left out. He went on to say that they'd met with Rufus Wells who'd been hired by the Council as a Minority Business Enterprise Consultant and who indicated to the Developers that he not only wanted to be involved with finding minority contractors but also with one on one hiring. Mr. Lopez promised that the Developers would do everything in their means to ensure that Bridgeport residents would get first pick at jobs created by this development. He said that when the construction site was underway there would be 2,000 to 2,500 construction workers

working there at any given time for a possible total of 10,000 to 15,000 people working there through the course of nine years. He said that the project would generate 4,000 permanent jobs to the residents of Bridgeport and the Developers would do everything in their power to make sure that those jobs went to Bridgeport residents.

*Mr. Mulligan entered at 6:20 p.m.*

Mr. Lopez continued, saying that the Developers would have an office open 5 days a week, 8-9 hours per day with an information center and they would continue to meet with nonprofit organizations, the State, the Mayor's office and Rufus Wells to ensure that they were doing the right thing. He said people could visit that office to pre-apply for jobs and there would be staff available to assist in that process.

Mr. Bonney asked when the Developers anticipated a training program for those that needed it.

Mr. Lopez said that training and workshops would be held once the Development was ready for groundbreaking. He went on to say that the construction companies and sub contractors working for the Developers would be made to sign an agreement saying that they would not deny a person employment based on criminal record.

*Mr. Mulligan left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.*

Ms. Valle said she was glad to hear that the Developers would be hiring Bridgeport residents and asked if they had met with unions within the City.

Mr. Pfeffer said that they'd been approached by some of the unions and had told them that they'd be happy to talk with them about the project once there was a project to talk about. He said that they would never exclude anyone from employment, whether they were union members or not. Mr. Pfeffer further stated that at the appropriate time, the Developers would meet with the unions and ask them what they planned to do about people who were not members of a union but were residents of the City of Bridgeport and how they intended to make sure that union members would be provided with the training programs that the Developers planned to provide them with.

Ms. Valle asked if workers would have the ability to unionize if they so chose.

Mr. Pfeffer said that it was not a question of unionizing because they were currently only talking about construction jobs. He said that if they were referring to service workers then unionization would be up to the hotel management that would come in but no one could say at this time who that would be.

Mr. McCarthy said that the Steel Point project was a good deal and he looked forward to voting in favor of it. He said that his father was in a union and that his father's union membership provided him with benefits and the ability to go to school and he wanted to

give the same type of opportunity to the residents of the City of Bridgeport. He said that while he didn't want to force anyone into unions, it was important that Steel Point be open and embrace union philosophy.

*Ms. Vizzo-Paniccia, Mr. Curwen, Mr. Silva and Atty. Pacacha left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.*

Mr. McCarthy continued, saying that he'd submitted a proposed amendment to the LDA the previous week and that contrary to what people were saying, the Labor Peace Agreement did not say that the Developer had to take unions. He further explained that it did not dictate that a union would have to be started or that the Developer would have to do anything in particular with any union. He said that the Labor Peace Agreement stated that the Developer would have to meet with Unions to negotiate labor peace. He explained that all that it was asking was that the Developers not be union busters and instead remain neutral to the formation of unions. Mr. McCarthy stated that he didn't expect the Developers to be union busters and felt that this was a relatively easy thing to ask of them. He went on to say that the agreement centered on hotel and service workers and while Bridgeport Landing Trust would not be the developers of the hotels themselves, they would be the major overarching developers.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO AMEND THE LDA TO INCLUDE THE LABOR PEACE AGREEMENT.**

**\*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.**

Mr. dePara presented the Labor Peace document to the Developer for review.

Mr. McCarthy noted that he'd distributed copies of the document to all City Council Members and staff that were present at the previous meeting.

Mr. Lavernoich reported that the document had been sent via email to a member of the Development team.

Mr. Pfeffer said that when the Developers first came into the City of Bridgeport people told them that they were crazy and that there was a reason why Bridgeport had not seen any development over the past 20 years while the surrounding area continued to prosper. He said that people pointed to all of the scandals and other issues and to all of the industry that had left the City and said that there was a reason that when people were on I-95 they accelerated when they passed Bridgeport. Mr. Pfeffer said that the Developers believed in Bridgeport and had been a huge supporter of the City. He said that what the Committee was doing by requiring the Developer to reach an agreement with anyone at this early stage was killing the project. He said that the City had put 100% of the burden on the Developer and taken away every subsidy possible for this project that had been promised in the original development agreement. Mr. Pfeffer stated that they were prepared to accept 100% of the responsibility for any environmental cleanup and for all of the infrastructure development. He said that they were prepared to guarantee that the

\$190 million that it would take just to get the property ready for development and provide a great public amenity would be paid but at some point they would have to draw a line. He said that he didn't know what the proposed amendment meant other than it would allow an outsider the possibility of holding up this project because it said that the Developer must come to an agreement with an outside party. He said that his group had invested \$8 million into the City of Bridgeport to solve the City's problems but that there was no way that they would ever go forward with this project if an outsider had the right to hold it up if they were to become unreasonable. Mr. Pfeffer said that having read just the first few lines of the amendment, he could see that it said that a labor agreement would have to be reached and he could not agree to that. He said that his board would never allow him to invest another nickel in the City of Bridgeport if the Developers had to undertake such an onerous requirement and no developer in their right mind would ever agree to this. He urged the Committee to allow the free market to take over in Bridgeport and ultimately increase the City's tax base. He said that they'd seen the same economic situation in Miami and that since they'd developed there the free market took over and the mill rate decreased four times in the past four years. Mr. Pfeffer urged the Committee to allow the Developers to start this project. He understood that people were nervous about it but said that it had been 25 years that people had been talking about this site and if the City, kept putting more and more on the Developers, eventually they would reach their limit. He said that the Developers had provided \$19 million in revenue guarantees, \$190 million worth of debt, full environmental liability and affordable housing restrictions and requirements but it didn't make any sense after a while for a developer. He said that there were other options for them and while he wasn't saying that they would walk out, he did feel that it was time to reach the next step.

Atty. Stafstrom said it seemed to him that a Labor Peace Agreement would prevent the union from striking but wondered what exactly it would require of the Developer or their assignee.

Mr. McCarthy stated that it would simply require the Developer to negotiate a deal with the union and agree not to interfere with the formation of a union if 50% of their workers plus one wanted to be part of the union.

Atty. Stafstrom asked how that would affect the Developer or his assignee's rights under the federal labor laws.

Mr. McCarthy explained that the agreement would prevent the Developer from actively pursuing antiunion activity including the hiring of union busting law firms to prevent the formation of unions. He said that the agreement did not dictate what the Developer or their assignee had to do or not do but rather it dictated that they would have to come to an agreement to not be union busters and in return, they would not have project delays, strikes or picketing that would result in bad PR and bad press. He said that the agreement would allow for a smooth development.

Mr. Ayala asked what the estimated salary range of the 4,000 permanent jobs created by the Development would be. He also assured the crowd in attendance that this process was designed to protect them and the future of Bridgeport.

Mr. Lopez said that the question was not totally fair to the Developers because the retailers, restaurants and hotels that would occupy the Development would determine the rates of pay they would provide.

Mr. Ayala said that the Committee was not trying to force people to unionize, but rather they were trying to ensure that workers would have the option of unionizing if they wanted to. He said that he was pro-development but wanted to get the right development, which was not to say that this was not the right development but he wanted to ensure that the City was not signing off on 4,000 jobs that would only pay \$7.50 per hour. Mr. Ayala went on to say that the comment about people accelerating past Bridgeport had been true several years before but was not true at this time. He said that the City had Remington Development and Magic Johnson coming to the City of Bridgeport. He said that residents sometimes had a terrible image of Bridgeport and needed to stop thinking of Bridgeport so negatively so that they would begin to realize that they could expect more for their City.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH ONE OPPOSED: MR. DEPARA AND ONE ABSTENSION: MR. MULLIGAN.**

Mr. Ayala said that some people were under the impression that the Council was promoting that public housing authority units be put in the Development and that was not the case. He said that the Council had been discussing the creation of workforce housing which would be housing that would go to people who work and make a certain amount of money. Mr. Ayala said that at this time, Bridgeport residents would be able to work within the Development and perhaps shop there but they were not guaranteed to be able to live in the Development. He assured those in attendance that when the Council said that they wanted more affordable housing in this Development it was because they were looking out for Bridgeport's residents. He said that he couldn't say the number of affordable housing units that would be at the Development but he could say that the City was not being unreasonable in their request.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO RECESS.  
\*\* MR. BONNEY SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting went into recess at 6:55 p.m. and reconvened at 7:05 p.m.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO GO INTO CAUCUS.  
\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Committee entered caucus at 7:05 p.m. and returned at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. Paoletto said that this was a matter that everyone in attendance obviously found to be very important whether they were in favor of or opposed to it. He said that in the caucus the Committee had tried to work out some of the issues that were still on the table. He stated that no issues had been finalized at this time and believed that this would be a work in progress.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED FOR A CONTINUANCE.**  
**\*\* MS. VALLE SECONDED.**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was continued at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
*of the* CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
TUESDAY - OCTOBER 16, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

ATTENDANCE: Council members: Paoletto, Mulligan, Valle,  
Bonney, de Para

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBER(s): Council member Mojica

OTHERS(s): Attorney Trachtenburg, Attorney Liskov, Ed Lavernoich,  
Alanna Kabel, Brian Williams

Council member Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:22 p.m.

Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of September 18, 2007  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of September 27, 2007  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Approval of Committee Meeting Minutes of October 2, 2007  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Council member Paoletto stated that item **268-06 Redevelopment of Cherry Street/Railroad Avenue** wasn't on the agenda and that Mr. Coleman was expected to be present to address it. Mr. Lavernoich said the item should be tabled until Mr. Coleman appeared at the meeting.

Council member Paoletto decided to add the item to the agenda anyway, so it could be addressed if Mr. Coleman showed up.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ADD ITEM 268-06 TO THE AGENDA**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

*see below for remaining discussion regarding this item.*

**168-06** Sale of City owned Vacant lots to the Bridgeport Land Trust (BCLT).

Council member Paoletto updated that this item was tabled pending a legal review an analysis per the last meeting, but they haven't received the legal opinion yet. He noted the requests were made at the September 18, 2007 meeting.

Council member Valle said that at the last city council meeting, a document was circulated regarding the request for a legal opinion. She stressed that she was annoyed that a month has gone by and the information still hasn't been submitted. She added that when the committee requested the information from the person that presented the resolution, they were adamant about getting the additional information, but now it seemed to be okay with the delay from the city attorney not submitting his legal opinion. She said she was upset about this because now the matter is being delayed once again.

Council member Paoletto clarified that he wasn't okay with the delay in the legal opinion being submitted. However, at this point, he said it was up to the committee to decide what they wanted to do. Council member Valle commented that Attorney Trachtenburg was present to possibly address the matter. Attorney Trachtenburg stated the information was submitted to the city attorney and assigned to Mark Anastasi, so she didn't feel it was appropriate for her to address the matter in uninformed manner and render a decision.

Council member Valle stated that the BCLT received a grant from the governor and she thought that sent a message. She noted a concern about the BCLT buying properties, but again, the area that is affected by blight is on the east side. And although they are moving in making improvements, it's not as fast as she would like it to be. She further relayed the concern of the gardens that the city was trying to sell to the highest bidder, and thought it was a shame. She showed a picture of a garden that had been operating on the east side, noting that the city knew it was a garden, but they still put it up for auction and now the garden sits fenced in. She explained her point was, that it was once where a garden once stood and now there is an organization trying to do something for the area and do something good. Overall, she felt there was a big mountain between the BCLT and certain individuals in the city, and now the matter couldn't be resolved, because the person that needed to address it wasn't there to do so. She asked the committee to move forward with a decision anyway. She also questioned what those who lived in the suburbs would want for their neighborhood if they were in the same position.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 2 of 19

Council member Paoletto read the minutes back regarding the DEP getting involved to address the issue of perpetuity. He repeated that a legal opinion wasn't available and a request was made to the city attorney. He emphasized it wasn't the intent of anyone on the committee to delay the matter. He repeated that he thought the one key issue was with the perpetuity matter. He stated that someone could make a motion if they wanted to, although he was concerned about not having the legal opinion.

Council member Valle asked if Mr. Halsted could report on what has been done to date. Council member Paoletto said he didn't have a problem with him doing that, but once again, he reminded them there was no legal opinion.

Mr. Halsted, of the Bridgeport Land Trust said he talked to the state DEP and he received language back regarding the perpetuity issue (*he submitted copies of the language that was outlined in bold*). Council member Paoletto read the bold text contained in the letter that pertained to a grant of \$159k and the matter of keeping the gardens as open space. He further read the text that outlined that the City of Bridgeport would agree to keep the parcels as open space. And if they were sold in the future, the city would relocate them with adequate improvements made. Council member Paoletto thought the text indicated another topic to the matter.

Council member de Para asked what the changes require the city to do. Mr. Halsted said it would be worked out on a case-by-case basis, like it would be for selling a property for a school or other. Then they would need a good faith effort on the part of the city and bear the costs for comparable improvements.

Council member de Para asked then if the DEP had to make a good faith effort to maintain the gardens the city has, and if they dispossess from a garden, will they then need to find another adequate location and invest in it to bring it up to the same standards as the one sold off. Mr. Halsted acknowledged that was correct.

Lydia of the BCLT said they were thrilled that the DEP was interested in Bridgeport and that they had faith in the city. She said they would do their best with the money to create a positive environment for the people of Bridgeport. She added that Bridgeport was now poised to be in a position to do great things to turn around some of the problems the city is facing. She said she viewed the gardens not only as open space, but as a moral booster and social bridge to better the community, because now they're just blighted parcels.

Council member Mulligan asked how long the city was obligated to replace a parcel with a comparable location and how long they were committing to remaining open space. Mr. Halsted repeated it would be a good faith effort that was likened to the approval of a park and necessary.

Council member Paoletto asked about the original resolution and the sixteen (16) properties that were contained in that resolution and now there were only ten (10)

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 3 of 19

properties. The response was that only ten of the properties were found to be buildable. Council member Valle recalled that the parcels on Park Street, Maple Street were auctioned off. And the City Hall Committee added parcels on Arctic Street and Stillman Avenue.

Council member Paoletto said the original resolution also had some discrepancies regarding an Arctic Street address and whether the correct address was 122 or 126; he noted the new resolution now read 509 Arctic Street and there wasn't a parcel for Barnum Avenue indicated at all. He further noted that Charles Street was on both lists and Clinton Avenue was on the original list, but not on the new list. Mr. Halsted explained those discrepancies were because of the different resolution.

Council member Bonney asked if they would vote on the new resolution. Council member Paoletto clarified the problem with voting, was that they were expecting to get a legal opinion on the original resolution that was submitted, not the new resolution.

Council member Mulligan asked about the Pequonnock Street property and if it was buildable. Mr. Halsted said that property wasn't that deep or big. Council member Mulligan thought it appeared big enough to build on. Mr. Halsted said he thought a variance would be needed to build on.

Council member Mulligan asked if auctioned properties go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval. Attorney Liskov said yes, it becomes a matter of how the developer chooses to develop.

Mr. Halsted noted that that the Hollow area was the most congested area and without any parks. And the DEP wouldn't approve a plan to give them money unless a community garden was started.

Council member Valle recommended that they continue this matter so that the committee could aggressively request the same information they requested before from the city attorney.

Council member Bonney asked if the item left the committee, when would it be heard by the full city council. Council member Paoletto said the next city council meeting was scheduled on November 5, 2007.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AS SUBMITTED**

Council member de Para asked if the question about perpetuity was now gone. Mr. Halsted said that was correct. Council member de Para asked then, as long as the city followed the good faith effort, he questioned why the city just doesn't keep the gardens. Council member Paoletto read the text that outlined that the city will remain as the owner of the gardens.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 4 of 19

Council member Valle stated that since the DEP granted the monies to the BCLT, she offered to contact the governor since she indicated that she believed in the gardens. However, she still thought that the committee was still chipping away from resolving the matter.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE SECONDED**

Council member Mulligan said he didn't have any objection to the gardens. And as for the matter of the city attempting to find another parcel and relocate it with adequate improvements was a concern. He said he didn't want to commit the city to replacing a garden at a comparable location. He felt that if a community stopped using a garden, then it should be replaced or if it could be developed, then it should be.

**\*\* MOTION FAILED WITH TWO VOTES IN FAVOR AND THREE VOTES IN OPPOSITION (COUNCIL MEMBERS: MULLIGAN, de PARA AND PAOLETTO)**

**216-06** Resolution Proposing clean energy commitment.

Council member Paoletto stated the representative for this item wasn't present to address it.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA MOVED TO TABLE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**230-06** Tax abatement for the property located at 1095 South Avenue.

Attorney Trachtenburg recalled that at the last meeting there was some discussion and a request to add an enforcement mortgage and a description of the development to be laid out with the costs. She referred to the copy of the resolution with the changes made in tracking format. She noted the resolution would be in same form, but easier to read. *The council members took a few minutes to review the changes.*

Council member Paoletto asked Council Mojica that since he was the sponsor of the resolution, did the changes address his concerns. Council member Mojica replied yes, he said the way it read would protect the city and it also addressed quality of life issues.

Council member Mulligan asked how the request works out money wise. Mr. Lavernoich said the total liens on the property equaled \$677k and the developer will pay \$370k; he noted that information was distributed at the last committee outlining the information.

Council member Mulligan asked the reason they were cooperating with the developer. Mr. Lavernoich said the developer has owned the property for some time, and although there were environmental problems, he has the ability to fix up the property without outside City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 5 of 19

financing. And he agreed to significant deed restrictions that were outlined in the resolution. He further clarified this item wasn't submitted to the city council by his office, but Council members Colon and Mojica sponsored the resolution.

Council member Mulligan asked if he felt the negotiated price was as close to a good payment the city could receive. Mr. Lavernoich said it was the appraised value of the Tax Assessor's price that was \$395k, and they were satisfied with a minimum of a six figure exposure on the development. So they recommended the amount of \$300k as a pay off amount.

Council member Mojica pointed out that the property sat for years and city didn't want to incur any costs to clean it up, so he hoped to get it done through taking this avenue. He expressed that the developer was a good will person and has worked with the city before where he showed good results. There were never any problems associated with his projects and overall, he thought this was a win-win situation for everyone.

Council member Mulligan asked what the property was purchased for. Mr. Lavernoich said he didn't have that information available at hand, but he said he could check on it.

Council member Mulligan asked what would be built on the property. Council member Mojica said it would be a fenced in warehouse.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION AS  
SUBMITTED BY ATTORNEY TRACHTENBURG  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AS  
AMENDED  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Council member Mojica left the meeting at 6:35 p.m.*

**240-06** Request to sell City-Owned HUD Disposition Property.

Alanna Kabel recalled that years ago, the city purchased properties from HUD and subsequently they found out the city owned the properties, so they were asked to come up with a strategy for their use, so they came up with a first time homeowner lottery. Council member Paoletto interjected to state that for any city owned properties, all of them were now subject to the new law of the House Act 07-218 re: Municipal Property; so all properties are now subject to having a public hearing scheduled.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 6 of 19

Ms. Kabel continued to speak about the first time homebuyer properties (*she submitted a listing of the properties – see attached*). She noted that they renovated the properties using HOME dollars and they needed to make sure people were eligible and can afford the property, and that they won't be subject to predatory lending practices. They also have a threshold criteria, but they gave preference to Bridgeport residents that can be approved upon specific conditions. She mentioned that they already held a lottery and pulled the names of Mr. & Mrs. Buella (*Mr. Buella was present*). She said they met all the criteria for first time homeowners and the property received a favorable 8-24 referral from the Planning & Zoning Commission. So she was here tonight looking for approval. She further expressed that Mrs. Buella was so excited when she found out their names were chosen, she dropped to her knees in prayer!

Ms. Kabel said the sale was \$211k for a single-family, 1 ½ bath off of Main Street near St. Vincent's Hospital. They paid HUD the amount of the mortgage they foreclosed on, which was \$50k, so all the costs were recovered.

Council member Mulligan asked where the \$211k received goes. Ms. Kabel said it comes back to the city council for re-appropriation as a new grant for funding money.

Council member Paoletto reminded the committee that approval was contingent upon City Hall Committee approval and the scheduling of a public hearing. Attorney Trachtenburg said time constraints were favorable with prompt action. And a public hearing should take place before the next city council meeting.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA MOVED TO APPROVE CONTINGENT UPON ALL CITY HALL COMMITTEE APPROVALS AND A PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING BEFOR THE NEXT CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**241-06** Request to transfer City-Owned Properties to Pequonnock Housing Residential.

Alanna Kabel updated on another five (5) HUD properties that were being transferred to the Bridgeport Housing Authority to satisfy the Pequonnock housing obligation. There five properties comprised of 10-units, so approval was needed to transfer the five properties to the Housing Authority (*she read the addresses that applied*) and noted the properties City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 7 of 19

received approval from the Bpt. Housing Authority and a 8-24 referral approval. She further noted that all sites will be identified by year end.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA SECONDED

Council member Mulligan asked how the properties were obtained. Ms. Kabel said they were foreclosed upon by HUD and then turned over to the city. They passed all the inspections and they have families on the waiting list. She added that the properties were fully renovated.

Council member Mulligan asked how many units were left to be done after these properties. Ms. Kabel said there were approximately (34) units left to be done that would be scattered throughout the city.

Council member Mulligan asked where they got the money to make the renovations. Ms. Kabel said it came from the HOME Program block grant.

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

#### 247-06 Disposition of City-Owned Properties (Columbus Street)

Attorney Liskov said this item pertained to the ongoing foreclosed properties. He said \$15 million has been collected to date from the foreclosure program and \$4.2 million in properties will be auctioned and sold. *He reviewed the list of properties to be auctioned.* He commented about the widths of the lots and pointed out that nothing was ever done to the properties, so the city now owns them and they will try to auction off for development of single or two-family homes. He further reviewed the properties included on the list distributed and noted the reasons why these properties were viable for auctioning.

(1) Offer the following properties to members of the community through a transparent public auction process, accepting the highest and best price for each property at the following locations.

104 Columbia Street, and 1 17- 119 Park Terrace, Auction as one parcel.

518-520 Gregory Street, Auction.

519- 520 Gregory Street, Auction

131 Dekalb Avenue Auction

634 Newfield and 630 Newfield, Auction as one parcel.

327- 329 Carroll Avenue, Auction

179 Wilmot Avenue, Auction

611 Carroll Avenue, Auction

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 8 of 19

441 Pembroke Street, Auction

99- 101 Sanford Place, Auction – *noted this property was previously approved and shouldn't be on the list, it sold for \$60k*

85 Lee Avenue, Auction

916 Pond Street, Auction

443 William Street Auction

974A William Street, Auction

781 Shelton Street, Auction

685 Barnum Avenue, Auction

38 Luther Street, Auction

339 Park Drive, Auction

Attorney Liskov also mentioned that there were three (3) other properties that were deemed to be disaster properties. He explained it was previously a condominium complex, but they would have to excavate a tunnel to get to it, so it was recommended to be sold to an interested party and it was estimated they would get approximately \$300k from the transaction.

(2) Transfer the following small un-buildable lots to the adjacent property owner(s), accepting the best and highest offer.

560 North Washington Avenue, Sell to Abutter

560 North Washington Avenue, Sell to Abutter

560 North Washington Avenue, Sell to Abutter

721 Park Street, Sell to Abutter

(3) Authorizes the Mayor and/or his designee to sign the deed and related documents transferring the above-identified properties.

Attorney Liskov ended and stated the recommendations were as noted.

Council member Valle asked what could be done to put restrictions on a property to avoid an abutter from building or putting certain things on the property. She brought up the issue about a community garden again and how it was auctioned off - *she showed a picture of how the property looked now, that appeared to be in disrepair with trucks and*

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 9 of 19

*garbage in front of the property.* Attorney Liskov responded that a zoning violation would apply in a case like this.

Council member Paoletto asked if the proper department was contacted to address the problem on the property. Council member Valle said no, because there are people that get paid to do that job. Attorney Liskov thought that if there were illegal vehicles or other on a property, then the zoning department should be called. And if there are unregistered vehicles, zoning can also address that problem. He emphasized that if there appears to be a problem with a property, then zoning should definitely be notified.

Council member Valle showed another picture where a property was auctioned and how it appeared there was an illegal repair shop operating. Attorney Liskov repeated that the zoning department should be contacted.

Council member Valle questioned what measures could be taken to stop things from happening on a property before it gets out of hand. Brian Williams mentioned there were already restrictions in place, where certain things can't be done on a property. Again, the zoning department should be contacted to look into a possible violation.

Council member Valle asked about 685 Barnum Avenue. Attorney Liskov clarified this property abutted Caroline Street to the left and Hallet Street to the right; each lot is 50 ft. wide.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER BONNEY SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**254-06** Preparation of 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan for Housing & Community Development Request to Retain Services of the Shreve Group, LLC.

Ms. Kabel said that every municipality was entitled to federal funding that is required to put together a consolidated plan for housing and community development. She explained that this laid the table for how the city will spend the federal funding. The purpose of the plan was to get the people less likely to be involved. And once they have a 5-year plan, the city submits a 1-year action plan showing how they will achieve the objectives and meet the priorities identified in the 5-year plan. She said an RFP was issued to develop the plan and they had four firms respond and the Shreve Group came out on top, so she felt comfortable with them; they also went before the Board of Purchasers. The scope of services will not exceed \$84,750.00 as outlined in the contract.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 10 of 19

Council member Mulligan asked if there were any lower bids. Ms. Kabel said they received a bid from a firm in Pennsylvania for \$47,500 and the highest bid was Pulsar Research at \$99k. She pointed out that the price was one of the ranking factors in determining the highest ranking firm.

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO APPROVE

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA SECONDED

\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

\*Consent calendar

### 268-06 Redevelopment of Cherry Street/Railroad Avenue

Mr. Coleman of the City Economic Office addressed the committee. Garfield & Rebecca Spencer were also present to talk about the item.

Mr. Coleman explained this was a pilot request to facilitate the redevelopment of a building located in Council member Mulligan's district. It's a red brick U-shaped building and has been vacant for ten to fifteen years. He further explained there was a portion of the building occupied by NEST artist's loft. He said they worked on this project for three years to try to figure out how to satisfy the needs of the neighborhood. He further relayed the involvement of an Asian company where some concessions were made to accommodate them. He went on to say that the Spencer's have been successful in converting other buildings in the area and they indicated that they wanted to develop in the west end. They found the company next door had some problems associated with their property, so they figured out a way to save the building that could be used for residential use. They worked with the company Label Systems and some requests were made as follows:

- They were asked to give up land - *where he pointed out on the plan and* they will now provide spaces for 10 to 12 parked cars
- They asked the Spencer's to create an internal circulation flow, so everything is on the inside
- They asked them to agree to a covenant not to sue with the thought that this would make it harder for residents who might make it hard on the existing industry

Mr. Coleman pointed out one building that cluttered the U-shaped area, noting that it was where the boiler building is and there is a pipe that runs through to the building, so they plan on helping to modernize that building. He reviewed that the committee was being asked to look at the PILOT that will run for eight years, and people that buy the units will pay \$1.00 per square unit for 5 years; then this graduates over the next 3 years; so during the last 3 years of the PILOT, the increments will get stepped up and when they hit 9, they're at full tax.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 11 of 19

Council member Paoletto expressed that everyone was aware of what the Spencer's have done in the city. He noted that he liked the escalator with the tax that he thought would be more of a selling point to the city council than a flat fee. He also commented that the Spencer's were known for putting out good projects.

Council member Mulligan asked if Label Systems were in agreement with the arrangement. Mr. Coleman said yes.

Council member Mulligan asked where the new system would go. Mr. Spencer said the boiler doesn't take up the entire building and it's quite small. He explained that when they engaged Label Systems, they were told they would pay for the new HVAC system in return for the property, but that wasn't agreed to. So they did a heating analysis and found they needed a 10x15 room to put in a series of boilers together, so as a result, they can do a new heating system for a lot less. So they will opt to spend \$100k to put in a series boilers.

Council member Paoletto asked if they were also taking down the smoke stack. Mr. Spencer said definitely, because it couldn't be saved.

Council member Mulligan asked if Label Systems owned another building that he pointed out on the plan in red brick. Mr. Coleman noted that they use 65,000 sq. ft. for their business.

Council member Mulligan asked about another building between the tall building. Mr. Coleman said that building was vacant.

Council member Mulligan asked if O&G had any objection to the project. Mr. Coleman said they were supportive of the project, however, they had to come up with some accommodations to make the site more compatible for better circulation – *he pointed out how this would be on the plan*; and in return, he said O&G gets more land in the area he pointed out.

Council member Mulligan asked if the covenant that was drafted not to sue; will run with the land. Mr. Coleman said the language hadn't been crafted to read that yet, but he thought it was a good point to consider.

Council member Mulligan asked about the West End Business Association and what they thought about the project. Mr. Coleman said there were some mixed opinions. He noted that he attended some of the meetings and he has stated to them that everything concerning the project will be above board as far as what's going to happen. But he said some folks were opposed due to potential noise and odor problems.

Council member Mulligan asked if the PILOT was similar to what was granted for Lafayette. Mr. Spencer said only the life of the PILOT was similar in that it would be for 8 years, but the flat fee of \$1.00 goes up for this project to \$1.00 per square foot. He further explained the nature of the area is quite different than that on the south end and may concessions have been made to accommodate all parties involved.

Council member Mulligan asked if any of the property involved was owned by the city. Mr. Coleman said no.

Mrs. Spencer commented that they were incurring the risk of losing money because their name will be associated with the project, even though the \$50k in taxes will still be paid.

Council member de Para asked about the construction time from taking ownership to occupancy. Mr. Spencer said they would start being sold in approximately 18-months.

Council member de Para asked if there were an environmental issues on the property. Mr. Spencer said they did a study on their site and Label Systems was clean and exceeded the Connecticut criteria on two points; they were only over by a very small percentage, but the boiler room is extremely messy.

Council member de Para asked if the building would basically be for housing. Mr. Spencer said that was correct.

Council member de Para asked about the covenant and the possibility of a law suit. Mr. Coleman said that even with a covenant in place, someone could still sue.

Council member de Para asked if they were going to soundproof the building. Mr. Spencer said yes, they explored a few options of how to do that.

Council member de Para asked how much he envisioned the units selling for. Mr. Spencer estimated the units would be sold for between \$120k and 160k per unit. Mr. Coleman gave some information to back up the price of the units.

Council member de Para asked about the environmental issue and if they would have a green friendly elements incorporated into the project. Mr. Spencer said absolutely, they also explored some measure for a green friendly heating system etc.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER de PARA MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBR BONNEY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

ADJOURNMENT

\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ADJOURN  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER dePARA SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

Bridgeport

MAYOR'S HOMEOWNERSHIP LOTTERY

A homeownership opportunity for first-time homebuyers

What s the Mayor's  
Homeownership Lottery?

It is a home purchase program for first-time homebuyers for houses that were purchased and rehabilitated by the City. Potential homebuyers are eligible for down payment assistance and closing costs from the City and/or your Homebuyer Counseling Agency, along with a loan from a participating lender enables you to become a homeowner. As the rehabilitation of these homes is completed, prospective homebuyers will be able to enter their names in a lottery. If your name is selected you will be entitled to purchase the home.

**General Qualifications  
Requirements**

- o Purchaser must be a Bridgeport resident.
- o Purchaser must have completed a homebuyer education counseling program and certified by an approved homeownership counseling agency
- o Family must meet HUD occupancy requirements.
- o The purchaser must intend to occupy the property as their principal residence for at least three years.
- o There is a 15-year resale restriction for the property if it is sold or the owner ceases to occupy the property as a permanent residence.
- o The purchaser must be pré-qualified for a mortgage.
- o The purchaser must be a first-time homebuyer of a property. (No ownership interest in a principal residence at any time in the last three (3) years
- o Multi-family dwellngs must be owner-occupied
- o If a multi-family house is purchased, the purchaser is required to complete a landlord training program
- o Household income cannot exceed 80 of median income for

Bridgeport

HOUSEHOLD SIZE	
MAX-ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME	
1	\$41,700
2	\$47,700
3	\$53,650
4	\$59,600
5	\$64,350
6	\$69,150
7	\$73,900
8	\$78,650

Lottery

1. Once the City has verified the information you submitted from your counseling agency the City will notify you of the time and date of the lottery.
2. A lottery drawing will occur to select a winner and two alternate buyers per house. The lottery will be public and drawn by an unbiased representative of the City. You will be notified of the date, time and location of the drawing. Three names will be drawn. The first will be the winner and the second and third names will be that of the alternates.



## **How to apply**

- Come to the open houses to view the homes and receive a pre-application.
- You can also get a copy of the pre application from your homeowner- ship counseling agency.
- If you are interested in purchasing one of these homes, complete the pre-application and submit with a letter or certificate of completion from your homeownership counseling agency and verification from your lender that you qualify for a mortgage.

- Send this information to  
Ms. Cathy Santossio or  
Ms. Kathleen Hunter

[santocO@CI.BRIDGEPORT.CT.US](mailto:santocO@CI.BRIDGEPORT.CT.US)

Tel: 203 576-8022 or 7734

Fax: 203 332-5568

Department of Housing and

Community Development

City Of Bridgeport

999 Broad Street

Bridgeport, CT 06604

- If you are interested and qualify for more than one home, you may include as many homes as are available on the pre-application.

## **Special Conditions**

1. Once the winner is selected through the lottery process, 60 days are allowed to complete the purchase of the home. If the winner is unable to complete the purchase of the home, the person selected as the first alternate will have the opportunity to purchase the home.

2. Amendment Process - Program  
Guidelines are subject to revision by  
Bridgeport staff and approved by the  
Deputy Director of the Department of  
Housing and Community Development.

3. A Deed of Trust will ensure the affordability period and principle residence requirement.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment

Committee

October 16, 2007

Page 18 of 19

4. Conflict of interest Staff or the immediate family of the staff of the Department of Housing and Community Development or any City official or employee of the City of Bridgeport who exercises policy, decision-making functions or responsibilities in connection with the planning and implementation of the Mayor's Homeownership Lottery shall not directly or indirectly benefit from this program.

5. Grievance Procedures In the event you feel you have been discriminated against or unfairly treated during the application process, you may appeal the decision to Ms. Alanna Kabel, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Housing and Community Development for the City for consideration. The appeal must be received in writing and postmarked within five (5) calendar days of the discrimination. The City will then act to support or overturn the action within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the appeal.

**Current Homes Available**

60 Pleasant Street	3 bedrooms
156 Robert Street	3 bedrooms
66 Englewood	3 bedrooms

Department of Housing and Community Development  
City Of Bridgeport  
999 Broad Street  
Bridgeport, CT 06604  
203 576-8144

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Angel dePara, Co-Chair; James Holloway; Tom McCarthy; Tom Mulligan

**STAFF:** Ron Pacacha; Associate City Atty.; Ed Lavernoich, Deputy Dir., OPED; Alanna Kabel, Deputy CAO, Housing & Community Development

**OTHERS:** Council Members: Donna Curran, Bob Walsh, Carlos Silva, Elaine Pivirotto, Leticia Colón (6:20 p.m.); Michelle Lyons (6:20), Warren Blunt (6:45), Andre Baker (6:55 p.m.)  
Bridgeport Landing Development: Daniel Pfeffer, President; Michael E. Stone, AIA, Vice President; William Lopez, Community Relations

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing Development relating to Steel Point.**

Mr. Lavernoich opened by reading aloud paraphrased questions from Councilman Walsh and answers to those questions (attached).

Mr. Holloway referred to the second question and asked if in the case of a default on a loan and failure to pay taxes, the property would be foreclosed upon by the lending institution in six months.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that in that case, the lending institution in order to secure their position would pay the City.

Mr. Holloway asked if such a scenario had happened before.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that to his knowledge it was fairly common. Moving on, he said that there'd been numerous concerns voiced from members of the Council, particularly the Black and Hispanic Caucus regarding workforce / affordable housing components of the Development. He stated that those concerns had been presented to the Developer and discussion had been held to reach a comfortable solution. Mr. Lavernoich then submitted for the Committee and the Council's consideration a proposed amendment to Resolution 249-06 that referred to a housing compromise. Copies of the Amendment

to Resolution by the Bridgeport City Council Regarding a Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development (attached) were distributed and Mr. Lavernoich read the amendment aloud.

Mr. Holloway referred to Section C of the Amendment, Timing of Development of Workforce Units and asked when the Development would be purchased, assuming this Resolution passed at this meeting, and was carried on to the full Council.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that there were outside limits to that timeframe. He said if the interlocal agreement was not reached within nine months, then both sides would have the unilateral ability to terminate the agreement. He went on to say that after the interlocal agreement was reached the Developer and the Special Taxing District would have 12 months to issue the bonds and if the bonds were not issued then either side had the unilateral ability to cancel this agreement. He stated that the Developer had asserted that they planned to move much more quickly than that and so the City was hopeful that the Bonds could be issued and the property purchased in the coming spring or early summer of 2008 and development could start in fall of 2008.

Mr. Pfeffer confirmed this.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the Developer were to develop the Pequannock Apartments that would then satisfy the City's legal obligation with regard to Pequannock Apartments.

Ms. Kabel said that they could not because the City was under a separate agreement with HUD, Pequannock Apartments residents and Connecticut Legal Services to identify 60 separate units of housing. She added that the City had currently identified 57 of the 60 units.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was foreseen that those 57 units would be developed before closing on the Steel Point property.

Ms. Kabel said that all units were expected to be identified with development underway by the end of the current calendar year and she expected development on those units to be completed within 12 to 15 months from the date of this meeting. She was confident that this would occur before the City came under any obligation through the proposed Steel Point LDA.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO  
RESOLUTION BY THE BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL REGARDING A  
DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT RELATING TO  
THE STEEL POINT HARBOR DEVELOPMENT.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

Mr. Mulligan asked if this was a matter that the Minority Caucus had been involved in and found to be acceptable.

Mr. Holloway spoke as a member of the Caucus and said that he believed the compromise was acceptable and that the Caucus felt the same.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. McCarthy stated that at the previous meeting, he'd put forward an amendment to the LDA to include a Labor Peace Agreement and that the amendment had passed in this Committee and was currently part of the LDA. He said that he intended to propose a compromised substitute to that amendment because the existing language, according to the City's and the Developer's attorneys could not work in terms of the TIF bonding. He said that the point of including the language was to get a conversation started between certain labor organizations and the Developers which had happened and which would continue to happen. Mr. McCarthy believed that the Developers were making good faith efforts and through extensive discussion with the Developers he felt that significant progress was being made. Mr. McCarthy stated that because of this he was comfortable with making his proposed change. He said that the Steel Point Development would be a great development for the City of Bridgeport and some people had interpreted that he was trying to block it or that he didn't think it would be a good development and that was not the case. Rather, he said that he simply wanted to make sure that there was a discussion held on the idea and there had been and he would encourage further discussion going forward.

Mr. Pfeiffer read his prepared statement aloud (attached).

Mr. McCarthy read aloud the proposed Amendment to Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development (attached) which he intended to replace his previously passed amendment with.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO WITHDRAW HIS PREVIOUSLY PASSED LABOR PEACE AGREEMENT AMENDMENT.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE STEEL POINT HARBOR DEVELOPMENT WITH THE REVISED COMPROMISE REGARDING LABOR PEACE.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

Mr. Holloway stated that in his 14 years on the Council he'd been trying to get labor unions, minority workers and women to participate in the American dream and while he didn't feel that this new compromise had a lot of substance, he was in favor of it with the hope that the Developers would not turn their backs on Black and Latino workers as past developers had.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he was confident, following extensive discussion on the topic that the Developers would fulfill their obligation to local and minority businesses and labor.

Mr. McCarthy stated that he was very proud of what happened in this meeting and hoped that it would provide benefits going forward in terms of good, well paid jobs for Bridgeport residents. He said that if the Developer failed to create those good jobs, there were plenty of avenues for the City to force the creation of them and that he'd learned that the Developers truly understood the importance of labor unions and good paying jobs in the state of Connecticut.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Walsh stated that he was offering amendments having seen the compromise for affordable housing which he believed to be inadequate. He said that he'd just written the amendments down tonight and would get them to the Committee Members and to the City Attorney's office and OPED the following day. He said that his first amendment was that 50% of any guaranteed tax payments made by the Developer to the City of Bridgeport must go into a separate housing fund to be used to develop additional affordable housing units in the City and that 50% contribution was to continue until all the Developer's requirements for affordable housing were met. He stated that the idea behind this amendment was that if the Developer was not going to do more for affordable housing than the City of Bridgeport should and taking the guaranteed payments was not asking too much of the City. Furthermore he said that if this amendment was appropriate, the LDA would be the appropriate document to insert it into.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he would wait to respond to that until he'd seen the amendment in writing.

Mr. Mulligan disagreed with Mr. Walsh's proposed amendment on the grounds that it decided for future Councils what the priority for the allocation of those funds would be instead of the usual annual process of allocation from the City's general budget.

Mr. Walsh said that the Council was committing by a conservative estimate \$300 million of taxpayer money to be used to retire the bonds for this project and in comparison the additional commitment he proposed was a pittance.

Mr. Mulligan stated that this property was not currently producing any tax revenue and felt that those funds could be better used for Lighthouse Programs, Pre-Kindergarten and keeping school gymnasiums open for supervised activities.

Mr. Holloway said that without affordable housing, there may not be enough children in the City to justify those programs and anything the City could do to provide affordable housing and keep people in the City was a good thing.

Mr. Lavernoich suggested that the allocation of funds generated by tax payments from the Development be part of a separate City Council action and not part of the LDA.

Mr. Walsh said that the Developers had stated many times that they had no intention to sell off any part of the Development to another party and instead intended to develop the property themselves. He said that given that, we wanted language included in the LDA stating that if the Developer were to sell any land prior to the completion of the affordable housing requirement being met, 50% of the profit must go to the City's affordable housing fund with profit being defined as selling price minus original purchase price and any cost of improvements by the Developer.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the Developer would not be allowed to sell off portions of the property according to the LDA until they completed a significant portion of the overall project as defined in the LDA without approval by the City Council.

Mr. Walsh added that the requirement was the building of 500 housing units.

Mr. Pfeffer said that there were mechanisms that would allow them to sell certain portions of the property once a minimum threshold was met. He said that if they could sell portions of the property to other developers, the project could be completed several years earlier and the bonds could be paid off that much faster.

Ms. Lyons said that there was currently a trend toward more upscale retail in the area and asked what kinds of retailers would operate in the Development.

Mr. Pfeffer said that they planned to have a mixture of national chains such as Target and Best Buy and local businesses.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 249-06 AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**

Mr. Mulligan asked if Stratford Avenue would remain a thoroughfare as planned.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that it would.

Mr. Mulligan asked what was planned for Pembroke Street.

Mr. Stone answered that the area of Pembroke Street between Ann Street and Stratford Ave would be an area of major retail concentration.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was the intent of the Developers to save the building at 375-379 East Main Street.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that to the extent they could save the building, they would and it was in their best interest to do so.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the infrastructure improvements that would be made and paid for by TIF bonds would be owned by the City or the District.

Mr. Pfeffer said that that was currently undecided but there would probably be a mixture.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the City's obligations to Pequannock and Tallmadge would be met with State funding.

Atty. Pacacha answered that they would

Mr. Mulligan referred to the MuniCap analysis and asked if it assumed the previous year's mill rate.

Mr. Lavernoich said that it assumed the current mill rate which was the best possible assumption they could make due to long-term fluctuations without being able to predict future mill rates.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was true that the TIF bonds could not be used toward the purchase of the land for this Development from the City.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that this was correct.

Mr. Mulligan asked what the financial reporting requirements of the Special Taxing District would be and if they would be similar to the City's.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that the District's financial reporting processes would be similar to those of the City and that the bond holders would require additional reporting above and beyond that, adding that the reporting process would be very open.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the Board of Directors of the District would be Bridgeport residents.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that he would have to defer to Bond Council to answer that but unfortunately Bond Council was not in attendance.

Mr. Mulligan asked if there was allowance in the bonds for early payment without penalty.

Mr. Pfeffer said that it would depend on the market and the eventual underwriters.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the \$10 million environmental insurance purchased for the benefit of the City was an estimate of the cost of the environmental remediation of the property.

Mr. Stone answered that the insurance would cover the cost of the environmental remediation if it exceeded an as yet undetermined cap.

*Mr. Holloway left the meeting at 8:40 p.m.*

Mr. Mulligan said that the security of the City if the Developer did not comply with the terms of the LDA was the property itself and asked what the City's security would be if the Developer were to transfer a portion of the project to another party.

Atty. Pacacha answered that before the Developer could sell any portion of the property to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party developer that it did not control there would be a set of standards in place for the approval of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party developer and the City would have the right to prevent that transfer until the City was satisfied with the terms of the transfer.

Mr. Walsh asked if the Developer would be required to abide by the City of Bridgeport's Minority Business Enterprise Ordinance and prevailing wages according to the LDA.

Mr. Lavernoich read Section 7.5 of the LDA which referred to the first source hiring and non-discrimination agreements and added that the private improvements done on the property would not be bound by the City's minority hiring ordinance but any work done using TIF bonds would.

Mr. Pfeffer stated that it was difficult to say whether they would be in compliance with the City's prevailing wages because they didn't know what their subcontractors would pay their laborers and the Special Taxing District would be required to take the lowest bids on projects.

Atty. Pacacha added that purchasing related ordinances and ordinances that applied to the City government would not apply to the District just as they did not apply to the Bridgeport Port Authority but that ordinances that applied to Bridgeport citizens would apply to the District.

Mr. Walsh asked if there would be a public hearing on this matter in compliance with the new State statute.

Atty. Pacacha said that he'd just received a copy of the statute and could not yet determine if it applied to this situation since it had been brought before the Committee before the law was passed.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**Councilman Walsh questions, received October 12th:**

**Q:** Other reputable large scale developers have said that they do not see more than \$110 Million of TIF being spent on permitted uses. Why does this developer need so much more?

**A:** The developer has provided the City and its advisory team with substantial justification for the types and costs of projected district expenditures. The City's engineering consultant, TPA Design Group has found the preliminary estimates to be reasonable. Ultimately, the Bond markets would not view the project favorably if the cost of improvements was not justified and the project could not support those costs and the commensurate debt service.

**Q:** The revenue projections in the Muni Cap model appear to assume a 100% tax collection rate. Is this a reasonable assumption?

**A:** The assumption is considered reasonable based on new construction, and the likelihood that owners of newly constructed buildings are generally more likely to pay their property taxes, and in the event they don't, a lending institution will step in and pay those taxes.

**Q:** Is the 50% assumption on personal property depreciation reasonable? Has anyone conferred with the tax assessor?

**A:** Muni Cap spoke with the Assessor, and I have spoken with the Assessor. The Assessor was not inclined to support a particular percentage of depreciation, but does support the general assertion that newer buildings are more likely to have newer personal property, which makes the 50% depreciation assumption a conservatively defensible assumption.

**Q:** Where did the estimated student population ratio come from?

**A:** The National Multi Housing Council, in Washington DC. ([www.NMHC.org](http://www.NMHC.org)). Muni-Cap did discuss the likely increase of the student population with the Board of Education. Since the housing type is atypical to the current Bridgeport residential base, the Board of Ed. did not have any comparable data to estimate the student impact of the project.

**Q:** If this property sale does not occur in this fiscal year, what is the budgetary impact?

**A:** If all other factors in the budget were to remain static, the result would be a \$4.5 million operating deficit. However, it should be noted that no budget in Bridgeport or any other community predicts revenues and expenses with 100% accuracy.

Amendment to Resolution by the Bridgeport City Council Regarding a Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Agreement be revised in a manner consistent with the "Proposed Compromise" concepts herein:

## **Proposed Compromise regarding Workforce Housing Requirements**

### **A. Issue: On-Site Workforce Housing**

#### **Current Agreement:**

50 units of workforce housing limited to buyers or renters @ or below 105% of Area Median Income (AMI). Requirement not tied to total number of housing units (estimated between 2000-3500) that might eventually be developed On-Site. Developer must pay \$200,000 for each Workforce On-Site unit that is not developed within six years of closing (purchase of property)

#### **Proposed Compromise:**

Requirement is unchanged unless total number of units On-Site exceeds 2500. On-Site Workforce requirement increases by one (1) unit for every additional 30 housing units on site ("On-Site Bonus Units") above 2,500 total units. Developer must pay into a Housing Trust Fund, \$200,000 for each On-Site Bonus Unit that is not developed.

#### **Illustrative Scenarios:**

2000 Total Units On-Site; 50 On-Site Workforce units are required. 2500 Total Units On-Site; 50 On-Site Workforce units are required. 2650 Total Units On-Site; 55 On-Site Workforce units are required. 3250 Total Units On-Site; 75 On-Site Workforce units are required. 3500 Total Units On-Site; 83 On-Site Workforce units are required.

### **B. Issue: Affordability of Off-Site Workforce Housing Units**

#### **Current Agreement:**

250 units of workforce housing limited to buyers or renters @ or below 85% of Area Median Income (AMI). Developer must pay \$100,000 for each Workforce Off-Site unit that is not developed within prescribed timeframe (six years to complete 150 units, three additional years to be granted to complete all 250 units).

#### **Proposed Compromise:**

Total Number of Units is unchanged, but may be reduced on a 1 for 1 basis by the number of On-Site Bonus Units the Developer builds or makes a Trust Fund contribution for. Developer must demonstrate good faith effort to make 50 of the Off-Site units affordable for renters at LIHTC limits (renters @ or below 60% of AMI) provided that housing subsidies, tax credits or grants are obtained or made available for each of these units to offset any additional cost to Developer. City pledges cooperation in Developer's applications for LIHTC.

### **C. Issue: Timing of Development of Workforce Units**

#### **Current Agreement:**

On-Site requirements must be completed within six (6) years of the date of closing. 150 units of the Off-Site requirement must be completed within six (6) years of the date of closing. If 150 or more Off-Site units are created within the six (6) year period, the Developer will have 3 additional years to complete the remaining units called for in the Off Site requirement.

**Proposed Compromise:**

Developer will be required to purchase and commence construction of Off- Site units on the East Main Street Property within one year of the purchase of the Steel Point property. The Developer must demonstrate Good faith efforts to maximize development potential (# of Workforce units) of East Main Street Property, and in no event can develop less than 16 (note: 16 units were in the building previously.) Workforce units on the East Main Street Property. The Developer must demonstrate Good Faith efforts to complete all Off-Site Requirements within 6 years of the date of closing, and must have commenced construction of the entire Off-Site requirement (250 units) within six years of closing, or the Developer must pay \$100,000 for every unit not yet under construction.

**D. Issue: Off-Site Requirement Site Opportunities**

**Current Agreement:**

The City is obligated to cooperate with and assist the Developer in the development of the Off-Site Workforce units. The City is not obligated to sell, contribute, or lease properties to the Developer, but is not prevented from doing so on a case by case basis.

**Proposed Compromise:**

The City would grant the Developer the right of first refusal on all foreclosed and tax lien properties that the City intends to sell. The property would be sold by the City to the Developer at Fair Market Value, determined by independent appraisal. The City shall also cooperate with and assist the Developer in identifying properties and housing assistance programs for Developer to satisfy the Off-Site Workforce Housing requirements.

Statement read by Mr. Daniel Pfeffer

Midtown Equities, the managing member of Bridgeport Landing Development LLC (BLD) has a reputation and history of being honest and fair in its hiring and labor related practices in its development properties (i.e. New Jersey, Baltimore, Miami, Long Island). Midtown always follows the precepts of a free marketing economy combined with the characteristics of regional and local labor.

In Bridgeport and specifically for the Steel Point Harbor development, we intend to adhere to these same principles. We have already met with key representatives of SEIU & HERE and are scheduled to meet with key representatives of the regions' Building Trades Council. We expect this dialogue to continue with these groups and other labor groups with interest in this project.

The LDA is the first step, not the last, before any work can commence on Steel Point.

The PDD Zoning must be proposed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Special Taxing District must be formed and Interlocal Agreement created and approved by the City Council and the TIF Bonds must be sold to private institutional investors before the Developer can purchase the land from the City. This will take at least six months. There is ample and appropriate time to continue the dialogue with labor leaders during that period.

Our adamant stance regarding any labor peace provisions in the LDA are in no way representative of our position toward organized labor. Conversely, it is solely because such language makes it impossible to sell the TIF Bonds or attract third party developers/operators in a Free Market economy and therefore would kill the project and afford Bridgeport and its residents no new jobs, no economic benefits, no Steel Point Harbor.

The LDA clearly provides for First Source Hiring practices to ensure jobs are made available to Bridgeport residents first. It also requires Interlocal Agreement to include the key concepts and intent of the MBE ordinance within its language since the Special Taxing District is not a governmental body and therefore cannot make a wholesale adoption of the ordinance.

We have, in fact, prior to the execution of the LDA or purchasing a single piece of property hired locally for site work, printing & marketing materials, video production services and ice cream vendors to provide for the hundreds of kids attending the Officer Friendly Drug Free Basketball Camp programs which we have exclusively funded for two consecutive years. All of them local minority businesses.

We make promises that we keep and usually exceed. The Midtown Miami project by reference, because of its parallel size and program, has successfully exceeded the same standards sought for the Steel Point Harbor development.

Again, we intend to and look forward to a continued dialogue with the labor unions, but need these agreements in place to move the project toward construction commencement, otherwise, everyone's time and efforts would be for naught.

#### Amendment to Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Agreement be revised in a manner consistent with the following:

#### **Proposed Compromise Regarding Labor Peace**

The developer, Bridgeport Landing Development LLC, will use its best reasonable efforts to keep open lines of communication with building trades organizations, other organizations representing organized labor, and representatives of workers seeking union affiliation in order to mutually foster the participation of unionized labor in the Steel Point Harbor Project and seek similar benefits for Bridgeport residents on terms mutually agreeable between each such organization and the developer.

**BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Committee Members: Richard Paoletto, Chair; Angel dePara, Co-Chair; James Holloway; Tom McCarthy; Tom Mulligan

**STAFF:** Ron Pacacha; Associate City Atty.; Ed Lavernoich, Deputy Dir., OPED; Alanna Kabel, Deputy CAO, Housing & Community Development

**OTHERS:** Council Members: Donna Curran, Bob Walsh, Carlos Silva, Elaine Pivrotto, Leticia Colón (6:20 p.m.); Michelle Lyons (6:20), Warren Blunt (6:45), Andre Baker (6:55 p.m.)  
Bridgeport Landing Development: Daniel Pfeffer, President; Michael E. Stone, AIA, Vice President; William Lopez, Community Relations

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mr. Paoletto.

**249-06 Development and Acquisition agreement with Bridgeport Landing Development relating to Steel Point.**

Mr. Lavernoich opened by reading aloud paraphrased questions from Councilman Walsh and answers to those questions (attached).

Mr. Holloway referred to the second question and asked if in the case of a default on a loan and failure to pay taxes, the property would be foreclosed upon by the lending institution in six months.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that in that case, the lending institution in order to secure their position would pay the City.

Mr. Holloway asked if such a scenario had happened before.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that to his knowledge it was fairly common. Moving on, he said that there'd been numerous concerns voiced from members of the Council, particularly the Black and Hispanic Caucus regarding workforce / affordable housing components of the Development. He stated that those concerns had been presented to the

Developer and discussion had been held to reach a comfortable solution. Mr. Lavernoich then submitted for the Committee and the Council's consideration a proposed amendment to Resolution 249-06 that referred to a housing compromise. Copies of the Amendment to Resolution by the Bridgeport City Council Regarding a Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development (below) were distributed and Mr. Lavernoich read the amendment aloud.

**Amendment to Resolution by the Bridgeport City Council Regarding a  
Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor  
Development**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Agreement be revised in a manner consistent with the "Proposed Compromise" concepts herein:

**Proposed Compromise regarding Workforce Housing Requirements**

**A. Issue: On-Site Workforce Housing**

**Current Agreement:**

50 units of workforce housing limited to buyers or renters @ or below 105% of Area Median Income (AMI). Requirement not tied to total number of housing units (estimated between 2000-3500) that might eventually be developed On-Site. Developer must pay \$200,000 for each Workforce On-Site unit that is not developed within six years of closing (purchase of property)

**Proposed Compromise:**

Requirement is unchanged unless total number of units On-Site exceeds 2500. On-Site Workforce requirement increases by one (1) unit for every additional 30 housing units on site ("On-Site Bonus Units") above 2,500 total units. Developer must pay into a Housing Trust Fund, \$200,000 for each On-Site Bonus Unit that is not developed.

**Illustrative Scenarios:**

2000 Total Units On-Site; 50 On-Site Workforce units are required. 2500 Total Units On-Site; 50 On-Site Workforce units are required. 2650 Total Units On-Site; 55 On-Site Workforce units are required. 3250 Total Units On-Site; 75 On-Site Workforce units are required. 3500 Total Units On-Site; 83 On-Site Workforce units are required.

**B. Issue: Affordability of Off-Site Workforce Housing Units**

**Current Agreement:**

250 units of workforce housing limited to buyers or renters @ or below 85% of Area Median Income (AMI). Developer must pay \$100,000 for each Workforce Off-Site unit that is not developed within prescribed timeframe (six years to complete 150 units, three additional years to be granted to complete all 250 units).

**Proposed Compromise:**

Total Number of Units is unchanged, but may be reduced on a 1 for 1 basis by the number of On-Site Bonus Units the Developer builds or makes a Trust Fund contribution for. Developer must demonstrate good faith effort to make 50 of the Off-Site units affordable for renters at LIHTC limits (renters @ or below 60% of AMI) provided that housing subsidies, tax credits or grants are obtained or made available for each of these units to offset any additional cost to Developer. City pledges cooperation in Developer's applications for LIHTC.

**C. Issue: Timing of Development of Workforce Units**

**Current Agreement:**

On-Site requirements must be completed within six (6) years of the date of closing. 150 units of the Off-Site requirement must be completed within six (6) years of the date of closing. If 150 or more Off-Site units are created within the six (6) year period, the Developer will have 3 additional years to complete the remaining units called for in the Off Site requirement.

**Proposed Compromise:**

Developer will be required to purchase and commence construction of Off- Site units on the East Main Street Property within one year of the purchase of the Steel Point property. The Developer must demonstrate Good faith efforts to maximize development potential (# of Workforce units) of East Main Street Property, and in no event can develop less than 16 (note: 16 units were in the building previously.) Workforce units on the East Main Street Property. The Developer must demonstrate Good Faith efforts to complete all Off-Site Requirements within 6 years of the date of closing, and must have commenced construction of the entire Off-Site requirement (250 units) within six years of closing, or the Developer must pay \$100,000 for every unit not yet under construction.

**D. Issue: Off-Site Requirement Site Opportunities**

**Current Agreement:**

The City is obligated to cooperate with and assist the Developer in the development of the Off-Site Workforce units. The City is not obligated to sell, contribute, or lease properties to the Developer, but is not prevented from doing so on a case by case basis.

**Proposed Compromise:**

The City would grant the Developer the right of first refusal on all foreclosed and tax lien properties that the City intends to sell. The property would be sold by the City to the Developer at Fair Market Value, determined by independent appraisal. The City shall also cooperate with and assist the Developer in identifying properties and housing assistance programs for Developer to satisfy the Off-Site Workforce Housing requirements.

Mr. Holloway referred to Section C of the Amendment, Timing of Development of Workforce Units and asked when the Development would be purchased, assuming this Resolution passed at this meeting, and was carried on to the full Council.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that there were outside limits to that timeframe. He said if the interlocal agreement was not reached within nine months, then both sides would have the unilateral ability to terminate the agreement. He went on to say that after the interlocal agreement was reached the Developer and the Special Taxing District would have 12 months to issue the bonds and if the bonds were not issued then either side had the unilateral ability to cancel this agreement. He stated that the Developer had asserted that they planned to move much more quickly than that and so the City was hopeful that the Bonds could be issued and the property purchased in the coming spring or early summer of 2008 and development could start in fall of 2008.

Mr. Pfeffer confirmed this.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the Developer were to develop the Pequannock Apartments that would then satisfy the City's legal obligation with regard to Pequannock Apartments.

Ms. Kabel said that they could not because the City was under a separate agreement with HUD, Pequannock Apartments residents and Connecticut Legal Services to identify 60 separate units of housing. She added that the City had currently identified 57 of the 60 units.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was foreseen that those 57 units would be developed before closing on the Steel Point property.

Ms. Kabel said that all units were expected to be identified with development underway by the end of the current calendar year and she expected development on those units to be completed within 12 to 15 months from the date of this meeting. She was confident that this would occur before the City came under any obligation through the proposed Steel Point LDA.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION BY THE BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL REGARDING A DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE STEEL POINT HARBOR DEVELOPMENT.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

Mr. Mulligan asked if this was a matter that the Minority Caucus had been involved in and found to be acceptable.

Mr. Holloway spoke as a member of the Caucus and said that he believed the compromise was acceptable and that the Caucus felt the same.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. McCarthy stated that at the previous meeting, he'd put forward an amendment to the LDA to include a Labor Peace Agreement and that the amendment had passed in this Committee and was currently part of the LDA. He said that he intended to propose a compromised substitute to that amendment because the existing language, according to the City's and the Developer's attorneys could not work in terms of the TIF bonding. He said that the point of including the language was to get a conversation started between certain labor organizations and the Developers which had happened and which would continue to happen. Mr. McCarthy believed that the Developers were making good faith efforts and through extensive discussion with the Developers he felt that significant progress was being made. Mr. McCarthy stated that because of this he was comfortable with making his proposed change. He said that the Steel Point Development would be a great development for the City of Bridgeport and some people had interpreted that he was trying to block it or that he didn't think it would be a good development and that was not the case. Rather, he said that he simply wanted to make sure that there was a discussion held on the idea and there had been and he would encourage further discussion going forward.

Mr. Pfeffer read his prepared statement aloud (attached).

Mr. McCarthy read aloud the proposed Amendment to Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development (below) which he intended to replace his previously passed amendment with.

**Amendment to Development and Acquisition Agreement Relating to the Steel Point Harbor Development**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Agreement be revised in a manner consistent with the following:

**Proposed Compromise Regarding Labor Peace**

The developer, Bridgeport Landing Development LLC, will use its best reasonable efforts to keep open lines of communication with building trades organizations, other organizations representing organized labor, and representatives of workers seeking union affiliation in order to mutually foster the participation of unionized labor in the Steel Point Harbor Project and seek similar benefits for Bridgeport residents on terms mutually agreeable between each such organization and the developer.

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO WITHDRAW HIS PREVIOUSLY PASSED LABOR PEACE AGREEMENT AMENDMENT.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE STEEL POINT HARBOR DEVELOPMENT WITH THE REVISED COMPROMISE REGARDING LABOR PEACE.**

**\*\* MR. HOLLOWAY SECONDED.**

Mr. Holloway stated that in his 14 years on the Council he'd been trying to get labor unions, minority workers and women to participate in the American dream and while he didn't feel that this new compromise had a lot of substance, he was in favor of it with the hope that the Developers would not turn their backs on Black and Latino workers as past developers had.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he was confident, following extensive discussion on the topic that the Developers would fulfill their obligation to local and minority businesses and labor.

Mr. McCarthy stated that he was very proud of what happened in this meeting and hoped that it would provide benefits going forward in terms of good, well paid jobs for Bridgeport residents. He said that if the Developer failed to create those good jobs, there were plenty of avenues for the City to force the creation of them and that he'd learned that the Developers truly understood the importance of labor unions and good paying jobs in the state of Connecticut.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Walsh stated that he was offering amendments having seen the compromise for affordable housing which he believed to be inadequate. He said that he'd just written the amendments down tonight and would get them to the Committee Members and to the City Attorney's office and OPED the following day. He said that his first amendment was that 50% of any guaranteed tax payments made by the Developer to the City of Bridgeport must go into a separate housing fund to be used to develop additional affordable housing units in the City and that 50% contribution was to continue until all the Developer's requirements for affordable housing were met. He stated that the idea behind this amendment was that if the Developer was not going to do more for affordable housing than the City of Bridgeport should and taking the guaranteed payments was not asking too much of the City. Furthermore he said that if this amendment was appropriate, the LDA would be the appropriate document to insert it into.

Mr. Lavernoich said that he would wait to respond to that until he'd seen the amendment in writing.

Mr. Mulligan disagreed with Mr. Walsh's proposed amendment on the grounds that it decided for future Councils what the priority for the allocation of those funds would be instead of the usual annual process of allocation from the City's general budget.

Mr. Walsh said that the Council was committing by a conservative estimate \$300 million of taxpayer money to be used to retire the bonds for this project and in comparison the additional commitment he proposed was a pittance.

Mr. Mulligan stated that this property was not currently producing any tax revenue and felt that those funds could be better used for Lighthouse Programs, Pre-Kindergarten and keeping school gymnasiums open for supervised activities.

Mr. Holloway said that without affordable housing, there may not be enough children in the City to justify those programs and anything the City could do to provide affordable housing and keep people in the City was a good thing.

Mr. Lavernoich suggested that the allocation of funds generated by tax payments from the Development be part of a separate City Council action and not part of the LDA.

Mr. Walsh said that the Developers had stated many times that they had no intention to sell off any part of the Development to another party and instead intended to develop the property themselves. He said that given that, we wanted language included in the LDA stating that if the Developer were to sell any land prior to the completion of the affordable housing requirement being met, 50% of the profit must go to the City's affordable housing fund with profit being defined as selling price minus original purchase price and any cost of improvements by the Developer.

Mr. Lavernoich said that the Developer would not be allowed to sell off portions of the property according to the LDA until they completed a significant portion of the overall project as defined in the LDA without approval by the City Council.

Mr. Walsh added that the requirement was the building of 500 housing units.

Mr. Pfeffer said that there were mechanisms that would allow them to sell certain portions of the property once a minimum threshold was met. He said that if they could sell portions of the property to other developers, the project could be completed several years earlier and the bonds could be paid off that much faster.

Ms. Lyons said that there was currently a trend toward more upscale retail in the area and asked what kinds of retailers would operate in the Development.

Mr. Pfeffer said that they planned to have a mixture of national chains such as Target and Best Buy and local businesses.

**\*\* MR. DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 249-06 AS AMENDED.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.**

Mr. Mulligan asked if Stratford Avenue would remain a thoroughfare as planned.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that it would.

Mr. Mulligan asked what was planned for Pembroke Street.

Mr. Stone answered that the area of Pembroke Street between Ann Street and Stratford Ave would be an area of major retail concentration.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was the intent of the Developers to save the building at 375-379 East Main Street.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that to the extent they could save the building, they would and it was in their best interest to do so.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the infrastructure improvements that would be made and paid for by TIF bonds would be owned by the City or the District.

Mr. Pfeffer said that that was currently undecided but there would probably be a mixture.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the City's obligations to Pequannock and Tallmadge would be met with State funding.

Atty. Pacacha answered that they would

Mr. Mulligan referred to the MuniCap analysis and asked if it assumed the previous year's mill rate.

Mr. Lavernoich said that it assumed the current mill rate which was the best possible assumption they could make due to long-term fluctuations without being able to predict future mill rates.

Mr. Mulligan asked if it was true that the TIF bonds could not be used toward the purchase of the land for this Development from the City.

Mr. Lavernoich answered that this was correct.

Mr. Mulligan asked what the financial reporting requirements of the Special Taxing District would be and if they would be similar to the City's.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that the District's financial reporting processes would be similar to those of the City and that the bond holders would require additional reporting above and beyond that, adding that the reporting process would be very open.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the Board of Directors of the District would be Bridgeport residents.

Mr. Pfeffer answered that he would have to defer to Bond Council to answer that but unfortunately Bond Council was not in attendance.

Mr. Mulligan asked if there was allowance in the bonds for early payment without penalty.

Mr. Pfeffer said that it would depend on the market and the eventual underwriters.

Mr. Mulligan asked if the \$10 million environmental insurance purchased for the benefit of the City was an estimate of the cost of the environmental remediation of the property.

Mr. Stone answered that the insurance would cover the cost of the environmental remediation if it exceeded an as yet undetermined cap.

*Mr. Holloway left the meeting at 8:40 p.m.*

Mr. Mulligan said that the security of the City if the Developer did not comply with the terms of the LDA was the property itself and asked what the City's security would be if the Developer were to transfer a portion of the project to another party.

Atty. Pacacha answered that before the Developer could sell any portion of the property to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party developer that it did not control there would be a set of standards in place for the approval of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party developer and the City would have the right to prevent that transfer until the City was satisfied with the terms of the transfer.

Mr. Walsh asked if the Developer would be required to abide by the City of Bridgeport's Minority Business Enterprise Ordinance and prevailing wages according to the LDA.

Mr. Lavernoich read Section 7.5 of the LDA which referred to the first source hiring and non-discrimination agreements and added that the private improvements done on the property would not be bound by the City's minority hiring ordinance but any work done using TIF bonds would.

Mr. Pfeffer stated that it was difficult to say whether they would be in compliance with the City's prevailing wages because they didn't know what their subcontractors would pay their laborers and the Special Taxing District would be required to take the lowest bids on projects.

Atty. Pacacha added that purchasing related ordinances and ordinances that applied to the City government would not apply to the District just as they did not apply to the Bridgeport Port Authority but that ordinances that applied to Bridgeport citizens would apply to the District.

Mr. Walsh asked if there would be a public hearing on this matter in compliance with the new State statute.

Atty. Pacacha said that he'd just received a copy of the statute and could not yet determine if it applied to this situation since it had been brought before the Committee before the law was passed.

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**\*\* MR. MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**\*\* MR. DEPARA SECONDED.**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Schroder  
Telesco Secretarial Services

**Councilman Walsh questions, received October 12th:**

**Q:** Other reputable large scale developers have said that they do not see more than \$110 Million of TIF being spent on permitted uses. Why does this developer need so much more?

**A:** The developer has provided the City and its advisory team with substantial justification for the types and costs of projected district expenditures. The City's engineering consultant, TPA Design Group has found the preliminary estimates to be reasonable. Ultimately, the Bond markets would not view the project favorably if the cost of improvements was not justified and the project could not support those costs and the commensurate debt service.

**Q:** The revenue projections in the Muni Cap model appear to assume a 100% tax collection rate. Is this a reasonable assumption?

**A:** The assumption is considered reasonable based on new construction, and the likelihood that owners of newly constructed buildings are generally more likely to pay their property taxes, and in the event they don't, a lending institution will step in and pay those taxes.

**Q:** Is the 50% assumption on personal property depreciation reasonable? Has anyone conferred with the tax assessor?

**A:** Muni Cap spoke with the Assessor, and I have spoken with the Assessor. The Assessor was not inclined to support a particular percentage of depreciation, but does support the general assertion that newer buildings are more likely to have newer personal property, which makes the 50% depreciation assumption a conservatively defensible assumption.

**Q:** Where did the estimated student population ratio come from?

**A:** The National Multi Housing Council, in Washington DC. ([www.NMHC.org](http://www.NMHC.org)). Muni-Cap did discuss the likely increase of the student population with the Board of Education. Since the housing type is atypical to the current Bridgeport residential base, the Board of Ed. did not have any comparable data to estimate the student impact of the project.

**Q:** If this property sale does not occur in this fiscal year, what is the budgetary impact?

**A:** If all other factors in the budget were to remain static, the result would be a \$4.5 million operating deficit. However, it should be noted that no budget in Bridgeport or any other community predicts revenues and expenses with 100% accuracy.

Statement read by Mr. Daniel Pfeffer

Midtown Equities, the managing member of Bridgeport Landing Development LLC (BLD) has a reputation and history of being honest and fair in its hiring and labor related practices in its development properties (i.e. New Jersey, Baltimore, Miami, Long Island). Midtown always follows the precepts of a free marketing economy combined with the characteristics of regional and local labor.

In Bridgeport and specifically for the Steel Point Harbor development, we intend to adhere to these same principles. We have already met with key representatives of SEIU & HERE and are scheduled to meet with key representatives of the regions' Building Trades Council. We expect this dialogue to continue with these groups and other labor groups with interest in this project.

The LDA is the first step, not the last, before any work can commence on Steel Point. The PDD Zoning must be proposed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Special Taxing District must be formed and Interlocal Agreement created and approved by the City Council and the TIF Bonds must be sold to private institutional investors before the Developer can purchase the land from the City. This will take at least six months. There is ample and appropriate time to continue the dialogue with labor leaders during that period.

Our adamant stance regarding any labor peace provisions in the LDA are in no way representative of our position toward organized labor. Conversely, it is solely because such language makes it impossible to sell the TIF Bonds or attract third party developers/operators in a Free Market economy and therefore would kill the project and afford Bridgeport and its residents no new jobs, no economic benefits, no Steel Point Harbor.

The LDA clearly provides for First Source Hiring practices to ensure jobs are made available to Bridgeport residents first. It also requires Interlocal Agreement to include the key concepts and intent of the MBE ordinance within its language since the Special Taxing District is not a governmental body and therefore cannot make a wholesale adoption of the ordinance.

We have, in fact, prior to the execution of the LDA or purchasing a single piece of property hired locally for site work, printing & marketing materials, video production services and ice cream vendors to provide for the hundreds of kids attending the Officer Friendly Drug Free Basketball Camp programs which we have exclusively funded for two consecutive years. All of them local minority businesses.

We make promises that we keep and usually exceed. The Midtown Miami project by reference, because of its parallel size and program, has successfully exceeded the same standards sought for the Steel Point Harbor development.

Again, we intend to and look forward to a continued dialogue with the labor unions, but need these agreements in place to move the project toward construction commencement, otherwise, everyone's time and efforts would be for naught.

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING  
OCTOBER 18, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletto, Chair; James Holloway, Thomas McCarthy;  
Thomas Mulligan, Angel de Para

**STAFF:** Alanna Kabel, Deputy CAO, Housing

**OTHERS:** Tim Barrett, Bridgeport YMCA; Erin Mooney, Bridgeport YMCA;  
Janice Wood, Safe Neighborhood; Audrey Gains, Bridgeport  
Health Department; Sabine Kuczo, BLFF; Phil Guzman, Child  
Guidance Center; Amanda Harmon, Greater Bridgeport APP, Inc.;  
Kimberly Ford, Bridgeport Housing; Natasha Gordon, Bridgeport  
Housing, George Stowell, BAYM; Maureen Linderfelt, United  
Cerebral Palsy Southern Connecticut; Phoebe Tucker, Montano  
Assistive Technology Center; Tom Corso, CED/NRZs; Rina  
Bakalar, Central Grants Office, Dawn Twistol, Central Grants  
Office, Angie Staltero, NRZ Office, Tanya Lewis, Paul Barnum,  
East Side NRZ; Susan Schwitzer, Center for Women; Jim  
O'Donnell, Bridgeport Library; Bernard Brantley, Academics and  
Athletics; Ted Meekins, East End Community Council; Stephen  
M. Nelson, Second Stone Ridge; Debra Caviness, Mayor's Office,  
Frank McCarthy, Marrakech; Council Member Leticia Colon

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF  
BRIDGEPORT CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT**

Chairman Paoletto called the hearing to order and requested that if there were numerous people present to present a request that they all come up to speak at one time rather than separately. He also requested that the groups keep their presentations short in order to allow everyone to have an opportunity to address the Committee.

*Let it be noted that the following remarks by all the speakers have been summarized and are not necessarily verbatim.*

Mr. Barrett, the Executive Director, came forward to speak on the three applications for the YMCA. The first request is for the South End Community Center. The Center provides after school, summer camp programs and many other services.

The second program is “Y Nights in the City”, where the Y is closed to the regular membership and open only to the teens. Basketball, swimming and other activities are available to the teens.

The third program is designed for Youth Unemployment. There were a number of drownings this past summer. This program offers Life Guard training to Bridgeport youth and hopefully will insure that there are enough lifeguards to prevent drownings next year.

Mr. Mulligan asked about 650 Park Avenue. Mr. Barrett gave the location of the center. Mr. Mulligan then asked how many kids turn out on for the Y Nights. Mr. Barrett said that during the warm months, he often will have between twenty and thirty teens at the Y, but during the colder months, it can go up to a hundred or more.

Ms. Wood and Fire Chief Rooney came forward to speak about Safe Neighborhood Americorp program. Ms. Wood spoke about the intern program and explained that the youth do the installation of the smoke detectors. She stated that the request was for installing smoke detectors. Ms. Wood said that the office fields between fifty and sixty calls a day with requests for smoke alarms.

Chief Rooney greeted the Committee and then gave an overview of Safe Sleep. There were 14 fatalities in Bridgeport before the program commenced. At all of the residences with the exception of one, there were no working smoke alarms in the buildings. Since then 11,000 alarms have been installed. The Fire Department cannot do the installation. Americorp handles that end of it. Since the program has started, there have been no serious injuries or fatalities. The alarms also help protect the firefighters because if everyone is out of the building, then the firefighters do not have to perform search and rescue operations.

Mr. McCarthy asked about the amount of \$75,000 and what would happen if the CBGF was unable to give the program the full amount. Ms. Wood said that \$50,000 is minimum that the program requires in order to run. A discussion about the number of staff and the details of the program followed. Ms. Woods explained that the Safe Sleep program has never asked for CDGB funds before. Now the stipulations by the State have changed.

Chairman Paoletto then explained that there was a numbering error on the listings of applications that the Committee had received. He indicated on the list that #9 should be #10 and forward to #35. #36 is actually #9.

Ms. Gaines from the Bridgeport Health Center and Ms. Kuczo came forward to speak about their request for matching funds. The City has been approved for 3 million dollars, but need to matching funds for staffing. If the funding is not approved for \$60,000, then four staff positions will end on November 30th. In order to get the grant funding, the City must approve the funding. Chairman Paoletto reviewed the details of the request and the details regarding transfer of some funding from one program to another.

Mr. Guzman from the Child Guidance Center of Greater Bridgeport came forward and greeted the Committee. Mr. Guzman reviewed some of the financial history for the programs that deal with high risk youth. The impact of the program has been so remarkable, there is a movement to take the program to a national level. He said that if the request could remain at \$20,000, he believed that the program could locate other sources of funding.

Ms. Harmon, Program Manager for GBack, Housing for Success, addressed the Committee next. This is a transitional program for girls ages 18 to 21. The program teaches them tangible life skills and helps them maintain their independence. The house is located at 18 Mill Hill Avenue. The clients are mothers with up to two children. This is the class of clients that DCYF has the most difficult time locating housing for.

The request is for the funding to remove a tree stump because the roots have torn up the sidewalk and to also trim back the bushes for safety reasons.

Ms. Ford and Ms. Gordon from the Bridgeport Housing Authority came forward. Ms. Ford said that she would be addressing public facilities.

First is the North End Social Services and the request is for purchasing computers to collaborate with the Citywide Youth Center. There are between 30 and 40 students during the day using the computers. There is also a request for new security doors to prevent vandalism. The Family Self Sufficiency Program continues to provide assistance to those Section 8 families in order to help the families become independent.

Mr. Mulligan asked about the computer program that the Center was requesting. The Federal grants cover the software but not the hardware.

Ms. Gordon, the Senior Planner, then came forward and reviewed the request for \$150,000 to match the project for 30 units of town house style housing units on the East Side. 10 of the units would be strictly ACC units for those earning 25% or below the

median income and the remaining units for the residents earning 50% or below the median income. HUD has actually frozen the funding until some of the matching funds are realized. At least 10 of the units would be counted towards the City replacement of the units from Father Panik Village.

Mr. Stowell, the Executive Director, from BAYM that teaches youth to build computer and instructs young people how to use computers. The demand is so strong that the adults are now being offered classes. To use another classroom, an HVAC system is needed for cooling the upper floor of the building and this would cost \$25,000. Currently about 200 students pass through the program a year.

Ms. Linderfelt, Executive Director from United Cerebral Palsy Center came forward and explained that the UCP was asking for a one-time request. The Center now has to develop a business plan. The CDBG funding would be used for this.

Ms. Tucker, the program coordinator for the United Cerebral Palsy Center greeted the Committee. She described the various programs and explained that under No Child Left Behind the program can be expanded into the schools. One computer program costs \$70,000. The second program is for those who are more severely challenged. There are a number of grants applications in process. Ms. Tucker gave out brochures with DVDs for the Committee to review.

*Mr. Holloway left the meeting at 6:55 p.m.*

Mr. Corso for the CED/NRZ, came forward to present the application for \$184,000 to fund six NRZs already located in the City. There are three existing NRZs in the City and there will be three new NRZs forming in the City. If the funding for the full amount is not available, work will be done with the City to locate additional funding. The Mill Hill, Madison Avenue and one other area have requests in to be come NRZs. Mr. Corso said that he felt it was a good plan for Bridgeport and that there have been a few NRZs that have approved plans.

Ms. Bakalar from Central Grants came forward along with Ms. Twistol to speak on the Compassionate Capital Grant awarded 1.5 million through the Federal government. This is a highly competitive grant. This will provide technical training and mini grants to faith based and smaller organization to deliver housing for the community. \$300,000 of the funding will be leverage back out to the community each year. Ms. Bakalar said that Ms. Kabel had met with her and reviewed how the funding could be utilized to produce more funding. The program will require the City to provide \$100,000 a year for the next three years. If the funding is not available, then the grant funds will not be accessible. CDGB is a partner with this program.

Mr. Mulligan asked about the focus of the program. Ms. Bakalar said that the focus was homelessness and housing. It could also go with the service side of housing. The actual match amount required by the Federal Government is \$125,000, but \$25,000 has been pledged by the United Way. Ms. Kabel reviewed the details of the grant calendar year with the Committee.

Mr. de Para asked if the funding was granted to Central Grants, would the funds be available for the other CDGB applicants. Ms. Bakalar reviewed the details and emphasized that the focus was on the smaller community based organizations.

Ms. Bakalar reviewed the fact that the Parent Center has been in the process of relocating from the University of Bridgeport. There was also a commitment of \$175,000 from the City under a different administrator. The goal is to have the Parent Center relocated by June, 2008. This will complete a project and locate the Parent Center in a part of town that does not have services like this available. The Center provides services for parents and children and refers many parents to additional agencies. The request is for \$125,000 to help relocate the Center. Without the funding, the Parent Center relocation will stop cold.

Ms. Staltaro was there to speak about anti-blight and said she also would be speaking about the McGiveney Center.

Ms. Staltaro explained that Karen McIntosh was not able to be present and Ms. Staltero said that the McGiveney Center has a very strong after school and teen program. This helps with homework assignments, a night recreation, along with mentors from various universities.

Ms. Staltaro then addressed the anti-blight requests. Black Rock and the South End have small websites. It would help to have a consolidated websites for all the NRZ participants. It would be supervised by the NRZ office staff. There is also a request for an extension of the Park Suite program. There were 200 volunteers this past Saturday working on projects in and around the City from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Ms. Staltero said that the NRZs are working closely with the Parent's Center. This will be matched by in-kind gifts program

The PUMP program was then mentioned. There have been numerous properties where clean ups have been done. The amount of work that is being done with the limited funding is amazing.

Another program that is being supported is the Trash Buster program. They have been very active during the last 12 years. At every single meeting for the East Side, the Trash

Busters have been in attendance. Ms. Staltero then gave a brief overview of the various programs.

In the Hollow, an NRZ has been formed. One of residents said that she had lived there for 20 years and she believes that it has been one of the most neglected parts of the City. Another resident said that she had been working with the implementation of the planning. This plan was then reviewed by Tanya Lewis, the consultant to the Hollow NRZ. Now it is time to start the supportive work for the various businesses and residences in the area she said. The Hollow was the first NRZ to be approved without contention. There is a plan to increase the number of tax payments by local residents. The local residents are ready to work on their community. The Hollow is a committee of the CDC.

### **RECESS**

A recess was called at 7:40 p.m. The public hearing reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

Ms. Schwitzer came forward to speak about the Center for Women, which provides assistance for domestic abuse victims. The request is to expand the staffing hours because the staff has to leave the site at 11 p.m. and the women are on their own until the next morning.

Also there are some baseboard heaters are missing their covers, which means that three of the bedrooms are off limits. The total project cost is between \$14,000 to \$15,000. The request is for \$10,000, and the remaining funds will come from private donations.

Mr. McCarthy, the Executive Director of Marrakech, came forward to speak about the Marrakech program. The request for \$76,000 is only part of the project. \$100,000 has already been spent to repoint the bricks because it was discovered that the water was coming through the walls, not the roof. Mr. McCarthy said that the group is committed to provide affordable housing to Bridgeport. Many of Marrakech's other programs were for disabled adults. Due the number of liens that were on the building, much of the initial funding was reduced. The \$76,000 would cover renovations that became evident after an inspection by the City of Bridgeport.

Mr. O'Donnell came forward to speak about the Library. Mr. O'Donnell said that originally there had been a bookmobile that had become available in Seattle. Due to a number of complications, this purchase is not longer feasible. Mr. O'Donnell said that the request was being made to have the computers where residents could access the stacks via the computer and the book would be delivered to the resident. The library mini-van outfitted with a computer would be utilized to deliver the books to the residents. This would reduce the request from \$40,000 from \$289,000. Like the parks, the library is a quality of life service that people respond to.

Mr. Mulligan asked where the stops would be. Mr. O'Donnell explained that the mini-van would target the large housing projects and developments.

Mr. Brantley said that he was the coordinator for the Academics and Athletics, which is a program to bring the youth of Bridgeport to nightly seminars and nightly events. It is determined to show the residents how to better their lives by academics to get their GEDs. This program will be located in the Cardinal Sheen Center where it rents space from the Center.

Mr. Meekins came forward and said that he was the president of the East End Community Council. This is a 501(c)(3) organization to enhance the quality of life for the residents in the East End. The request is for \$30,000 for the various programs. The theater group of the East End has helped tremendously and there is now a police academy established in the East End. The Community Council also helped with the location of the new school. The residents and the group is involved in environmental issues, safety issues, and crime related violence issues. The East End Council is providing role models, a food pantry and various other services. The funding will help the community to stabilize and grow.

Mr. Nelson came forward to speak about Second Stone Ridge and said that he was a member of the Board. He explained that the group is one of the only remaining affordable housing units in the City. The development is a cooperative and has 190 units. The community room is in dire straits. Mr. Nelson asked for some assistance to repair it. Mr. Nelson said that he would match the funding request of \$45,000. Whatever the City can do to assist, will be appreciated. A number of the residents at Second Stone Ridge are senior citizens. When community meetings are held, the residents have to go to another facility and pay for the use of their community room. Mr. Nelson then gave a quick overview of the market amount and requirements for residency.

Ms. Caviness from the Mayor's Office, former Minority contractor for the Mayor's Office. The program is designed to assist the City. Ms. Caviness then read the following statement to the Commission.

“In 2005, the City of Bridgeport commissioned a Disparity Study to determine statistically if there was a disparity between the number of minority firms willing and able to do business with the City and the actual percentage of the City contracts awarded to the MBE firms. The results of the Disparity Study concluded that a disparity did exist. The City Council recently passed an amended MBE Ordinance to correct historical disparities and level the playing field for minority businesses.

The City of Bridgeport is currently seeking start-up funds in the amount of \$200,000 to implement a Minority Business Enterprise Program. This program is designed to assist the City in meeting its MBE goals through the adoption of Best Practices to ensure that the MBE firms have access to and participation in the award of city contracts, and to neutralize the barriers that currently impede access and participation. Additional funding is pending from the State of Connecticut in the amount of \$125,000 to implement the Construction Job Funnel. This funding will provide job training and contracting opportunities for local contractors with a focus in downtown development which is listed as a high priority in the City's Consolidated Plan: Economic Development, Public Facilities and Infrastructure Strategies.

If funded, the MBE program will provide services to over 300 companies who have had difficulty obtaining City contracts through related capacity building workshops, such as: How to Prepare a Bid Package, Scope Review and Pre-construction Preparation, Financial Literacy, Understanding the Billing and Payment Process, Certified Payrolls and Monthly Reporting, etc. The MBE program will review the city's current bid process to ensure that the goals and objectives of the MBE Ordinance are being met; conduct informational workshops to assist MBEs in the registration process on the city's new computerized program, RFP Deport; will provide training and oversight to city personnel; develop a certified MBE Directory in English and Spanish and implement a customized training program for contractors.

The Minority Business Enterprise Program meets HUDs National Eligibility Activities guidelines by providing and expanding economic opportunities to low and moderate income residents.”

Ms. Caviness then explained that Hall Neighborhood House director, Reggie Walker, was not able to be present because Mr. Walker was involved with Hall Neighborhood annual meeting. She said that she would like to support the application for \$125,000 for physical improvements for the building. Money is needed to replace the damaged floor and basement.

Chairman Paoletto asked if there was anyone else present who wished to speak.

Council Member Colon came forward to speak about the NRZs and said that she supports their requests. This is positive for the City. It is important to continue to support them.

Chairman Paoletto asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. There was no one else who wished to address the Committee. Chairman Paoletto then closed the public hearing at 8:24 p.m.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* MR. DE PARA MOVED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* MR. MCCARTHY SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Services

ECONOMIC and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
of the CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
WEDNESDAY - OCTOBER 24, 2007  
6:00 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE:** Council members: Paoletto, McCarthy, Bonney, dePara, Mulligan

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Alanna Kabel; Deputy CAO/ Housing & Community, Development, Rina Bakalar; Central Grants, Audrey Gaines; Lead Prevention Program, Tom Corso, NRZ Program  
Deborah Caviness; Chief of Staff

Council member Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**242-06** Community Development Block Grant Program.  
Proposed Amendment to the City of Bridgeport's *Consolidated Plan for Housing & Community Development (2003-2008)*.

Council member Paoletto reviewed the *City of Bridgeport Proposed Substantial Amendment as of 8/29/07*. He went down the list and indicated the amounts allocated to each program.

	<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Amount allocated</u>
1.	Athletics and Academics	0
2.	Bpt. Hous. Auth. No. End. Soc. Serv.	0
3.	Bpt. Hous. Auth. Self Sufficiency	0
4.	Bpt. YMCA SECC	0
5.	Bpt. YMCA Y Nights	0
6.	Bpt. YMCA LifeGuard Tr.	0
7.	Ctr. For Women & Families	0
8.	CoB Public Library	0
10.	Child Guidance-SIHRY	0
11.	East End Comm. Coun.	0
12.	HEROES-Leadership Tr.	0
13.	McGivney Ctr. Youth Prg.	0
14.	RYASAP Safe Neigh.	0
15.	Unit. Cerebral Palsy-Tech. Center	\$10,000
	ABCD Weatherization Tech. Correct*	\$5,250

16.	CoB Housing & CD Lead Free Fam.	\$67,000
17.	Bpt. Neighborhood Trust- Lead Prg.	0
18.	CoB Bd. Of Educ. Parenting Ctr.	\$125,000
19.	Comm. Capital Fund – Loan Rebuild	0
20.	Bpt. Housing Authority	0
21.	Marrakech-renovations/afford. Hous.	\$40,009
22.	Bridgeport Area Youth Ministry(BAYM)	\$25,000
23.	Ctr. For Women & Family Shelt. Ren.	0
24.	CoB Public Facilities – Sidewalks	0
25.	CoB Parks Revital. PT Barnum	\$25,000
26.	GBAPP – Housing for Success	0
27.	Hall Neighborhood House-renovations	0
28.	Bpt. Housing Auth. TG improvements	0
29.	North End Little League-field imp.	<b>Withdrawn</b>
30.	Sec. Stone Ridge- Comm. Room	0
31.	Bpt. Neigh. Trust-NRZ websites	0
32.	CoB-OPED neigh. Beautification	0
33.	CoB OPED – PUMP	0
34.	Comm. Econ. Dev. Fund – NRZ Proj.	\$30,000
35.	Hollow Development Corporation	0
36.	Trashbusters-Mill Hill beautification	0
9.	CoB Central Grants/Compassion Cap	\$65,818
37.	CoB CAP-Minority Businesses	\$100,000

Council member Paoletto commented that Council member DePara didn't agree with the allocation for item #37 Minority Businesses for various reasons, but the item was approved before the full city council and it's contingent upon getting the funding.

Council member Paoletto commented on other items, such as item #9 that he said is used for a lot of leverage, he suggested that they don't touch it.

Council member Paoletto mentioned the lead program for \$67k and commented that a lot of money comes in because of this program, so he highly suggested not to touch it.

Council member Paoletto commented that the \$125k for the parent's center to be relocated was inherited from a former city employee. Ms. Bakalar explained that \$175k was promised, but it was lowered to \$125k, because they need to come up with \$50k to match it.

Council member McCarthy asked if all the categories were interchangeable. Ms. Kabel said with program money coming in, they can add to their caps and still won't go over. Council member Paoletto clarified what was reviewed didn't reflect the year's totals, they

are amounts indicated reflect a reallocation to do what they could, in view of some programs that got cut off such as the lead prevention program.

Council member Paoletto stated they already allocated \$500,000 and they had \$5,000 left over, if they wanted to allocate monies to another program.

Council member DePara asked about **item #7 Ctr. For Women & Families**. Ms. Kabel said that item pertained to public facilities to renovate a public bathroom.

Council member Paoletto said he wasn't sure where some committee members would be next year in terms of serving on the committee, but over the years, he said they tried to find a balance of which programs were more important. And although they are all good causes, he expressed that he was glad they were able to reallocated some additional money.

Council member McCarthy asked about **item #21 Marrakech-renovations**. Ms. Kabel updated that when Marrakech purchased the property, they initially projected utilizing \$75k for repairs to the building, they already had a HOME funding. But to protect their investment, when they go to the actual closing, liens were significantly increased. So what happened is that some of the money was set aside to do repairs that went into satisfying the liens and they asked the city to fund a grant for the repairs. Council member McCarthy asked if they needed a certain dollar amount to complete the project. Ms. Kabel said the debt coverage ration was tight and they borrowed all the funds they could. She thought it would be difficult to borrow funds for the repairs.

Council member McCarthy asked if giving them \$40,000 would help. Ms. Kabel said yes and noted that they will have to find a means to match that. The representative present from the program said that amount will take care of what needed to be done. He noted they already put \$100k into the first floor, but the apartments were in dire need of repair.

Council member Paoletto stated there was never a year that the building hasn't come before the committee with a request and not receive money. He relayed there were some committee members that had an issue with the project, because the matter of repairs keeps resurfacing. The representative said what was going into the program was definitely going towards repairs. Council member Paoletto said he understood that, but he reiterated that it gets a little old seeing the same projects.

Council member Mulligan asked the amount they were working with for the reallocations. Ms. Kabel said the amount was \$518,077.

Council member Mulligan said he would be more supportive of allocating additional funds to youth programs like the YMCA. Council member Paoletto responded that in his opinion, all the programs were worthy. And at least they had an extra \$518k to give away, although there were mixed feelings about it, good and bad.

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

Special Meeting

October 24, 2007

Page 3

Council McCarthy commented that **item #22 BAYM** was a great program. He asked if they needed the entire \$25,000. Council member Paoletto said yes and noted that they only gave them \$2,000 last year.

Council member DePara stated he would like to do something for **item #14 RYASAP Safe Neighborhoods**. He asked that they consider any money that might come available be allocated to this program. He expressed how said it was when anyone loses a home to fire, recalling the number of fires there have been in the city over the last year. Council member McCarthy said he loved that program, but he recalled it was stated that if they didn't have \$50k, they couldn't do anything. Ms. Bakalar spoke to this item. She explained they received a \$750k grant from the CDC (Centers for Disease Control) at the federal level and when they received a pledge match that worked out good. But the government changed the AmeriCorp Program and they were no longer allowed to count things towards their match. So this resulted in a domino effect, in that they were pledged in as a match from the CDC program. She further noted the program is a national model, but they are in a quandary because they have to come up with \$50k, but the fire department doesn't have the capacity to install the number of fire detectors needed, so if the partnership breaks up, it won't happen. Council member Paoletto read some notes regarding the item. He verified that \$50k was the bare minimum needed to run the program. He further noted that he was sure they would apply next year.

Ms. Kabel added that one of the few sources of funds to match was through CBG funding.

Council member Mulligan asked if they needed \$50k to get the match. Ms. Bakalar said if they could get a small amount to them to get them through the next cycle, and if they don't need the \$50k for 12-months, she thought perhaps \$15k could be manageable. And if they could get a solid commitment for the remainder, that may be acceptable to them. She said she wrote to the CDC to request them to work with them on this until the matter was worked out, but they were denied the request.

Council member Mulligan asked about the BOE Parent Center. He noted that he didn't recall anyone showing up at the meeting to address the committee. Ms. Bakalar said she was at that meeting.

Council member DePara returned to the matter of #21 RYASAP. He said they shouldn't look at giving them all or nothing, noting that any bit could help. He expressed that if they made a good investment in the program, luck would shine on them and they can get enough to get them through the year.

Council member McCarthy clarified that his problem was that they would only allocate a limited amount, wherein they might not be able to operate fully. Otherwise, he said he didn't have a problem allocating a portion of the money.

Council member Mulligan asked again about the parent center. Ms. Kabel explained the previous director committed \$175 in writing, but they came up with \$50k.

Council member DePara asked about item #25-Parks Revital. PT Barnum. Ms. Kabel said that item concerned space outside of PT Barnum where there is a small park; there was a request to put in a playground. Council member DePara asked when construction was planned. Ms. Kabel said they received approval, but it won't be until January when they go out to bid and then construction is due to begin in April or May.

Council member Paoletto mentioned item #25, he read the request was for two tennis courts used by PT Barnum residents. Ms. Kabel said the budget also included a playground and staff recommended the item.

Council member DePara asked about the request for \$25k for the playground and how much that would cover. Ms. Kabel said it will cover a small portion of the playground. Council member DePara asked if they were expected to come back for the upcoming program year. Ms. Kabel said they may come back for additional funding. But if they come back, it will have to be a non-CBG request to advance through the process.

Council member DePara asked about taking some of the money and putting it with the other funding into the smoke alarm program.

Council member Mulligan returned to item #14 RYASAP, said he thought they needed to find out if they actually needed \$50k first. Council member McCarthy said if \$50k wasn't an absolute necessity, then he would be in support of giving them less. Council member Paoletto asked if that was the only question they had of whether they needed \$50k. He said if that was the case, maybe Ms. Kabel or Ms. Bakalar could find out an answer. Ms. Kabel checked her documentation and Ms. Bakalar made a phone call to try to get an answer. Ms Caviness also made a call to try to get an answer.

*A brief recess was taken.*

Council member Paoletto asked if there were any other items to discuss. Council member McCarthy said if the question about the smoke alarm program was satisfied, he wanted to consider item #4- Bpt. YMCA SECC.

Ms. Caviness got back to the committee after making a call and relayed that Chief Rooney didn't have the telephone number to contact the person they needed to speak to about the \$50k needed.

Ms. Bakalar contacted Bob the Director of the smoke detector program via cell phone (*he was put on speaker phone for the committee to ask questions*). Ms. Kabel recalled that the last public hearing, there was the matter of the money needed to run the program and the answer given was that they needed \$50k, so she asked him given the reallocation of funds, did he need the full funding of \$50k to run the program from now until June 2008, or

was he able to operate with a lower amount of funding. Bob said they just did the budget for the program and they originally asked for \$75k, but then cut it back to \$50k, however, he thought they needed closer to \$40k from now until June 2008. Ms. Kabel asked him if the committee allocated \$10k, would he be able to make up the difference needed. Bob said no.

Council member DePara asked if they allocated \$10k now and then looked towards an additional amount in the next program year in July 2008, was that doable. Bob said between now and June, they will have a \$30k gap to fill, but they received \$20k-\$25k, they could work with that and possibly fill the shortfall with two other sources for \$10k or \$15k.

Council member Mulligan asked if they allocated \$25k, would they be able to continue with the program. Bob said they could continue the Safe Homes Program and another program.

Council member Mulligan said he was agreeable to reducing another program by \$5,000 to allocate to the program, because it seemed like a good program.

Council member Paoletto referred to item #10-Child Guidance SIHRY. Council member Mulligan noted that was a good program. Council member Paoletto said he was willing to go down to \$15k for that program. And down to \$20k for item #25-Park Revival PT Barnum.

Someone asked about item #35-Comm. Econ. Dev. Fund NRZ Projects. Mr. Corso said there were six NRZ's and they can make adjustments as needed. But said they would put emphasis on NRZ's that were already created, rather than starting new ones.

Council member DePara asked how much it would take to focus on the current NRZ's. Mr. Corso said there were three NRZ's for implementation; in the south end, west end and part of Black Rock.

Council member DePara commented said it was better to wait until the following program year to start up future NRZ's. Mr. Corso repeated they would concentrate on the three NRZ areas mentioned.

Council member McCarthy brought up the matter of Marrakech again. He thought they could possibly take a little off the top of their allocation.

Council member Mulligan asked about the lead prevention program. He questioned whether they needed \$67k, or \$60k. Ms. Kabel clarified that the request was for \$67k, because they needed a full staff to implement the program properly. Council member Mulligan said he didn't have a problem with that, because he didn't want to jeopardize the program.

Council member DePara said if they allocated \$20,000 to the smoke detector program, he thought the Central Grants Office could find an additional \$5,000. He emphasized the importance of the program. Council member Mulligan said he didn't want to chisel the program too much. Ms. Bakalar said she would do what she could to get the other \$5,000. She further commented that when programs don't get fully funded, it would be good to coordinate more between her office and Ms. Kabel's office, she thought debriefing on this matter would be beneficial and allow them all to keep apprised of the programs requests.

Council member Mulligan said rather than leave RYASAP up in the air he suggested taking \$5,000 from the NRZ program and \$5,000 from Marrakech to meet the \$25,000 funding they need. All the committee members agreed with the suggestion.

*Council member Paoletto recapped the programs requests reallocation amounts:*

	<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Amount allocated</u>
1.	Athletics and Academics	0
2.	Bpt. Hous. Auth. No. End. Soc. Serv.	0
3.	Bpt. Hous. Auth. Self Sufficiency	0
4.	Bpt. YMCA SECC	\$10,000
5.	Bpt. YMCA Y Nights	0
6.	Bpt. YMCA LifeGuard Tr.	0
7.	Ctr. For Women & Families	0
8.	CoB Public Library	0
10.	Child Guidance-SIHRY	\$10,000
11.	East End Comm. Coun.	0
12.	HEROES-Leadership Tr.	0
13.	McGivney Ctr. Youth Prg.	0
14.	RYASAP Safe Neigh.	\$25,000
15.	Unit. Cerebral Palsy-Tech. Center	\$10,000
	ABCD Weatherization Tech. Correct*	\$5,250
16.	CoB Housing & CD Lead Free Fam.	\$67,000
17.	Bpt. Neighborhood Trust- Lead Prg.	0
18.	CoB Bd. Of Educ. Parenting Ctr.	\$125,000
19.	Comm. Capital Fund – Loan Rebuild	0
20.	Bpt. Housing Authority	0
21.	Marrakech-renovations/afford. Hous.	\$35,009
22.	Bridgeport Area Youth Ministry(BAYM)	\$20,000
23.	Ctr. For Women & Family Shelt. Ren.	0
24.	CoB Public Facilities – Sidewalks	0
25.	CoB Parks Revital. PT Barnum	\$20,000
26.	GBAPP – Housing for Success	0
27.	Hall Neighborhood House-renovations	0
28.	Bpt. Housing Auth. TG improvements	0
29.	North End Little League-field imp.	Withdrawn

City of Bridgeport

Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee

Special Meeting

October 24, 2007

Page 7

30.	Sec. Stone Ridge- Comm. Room	0
31.	Bpt. Neigh. Trust-NRZ websites	0
32.	CoB-OPED neigh. Beautification	0
33.	CoB OPED – PUMP	0
34.	Comm. Econ. Dev. Fund – NRZ Proj.	\$25,000
35.	Hollow Development Corporation	0
36.	Trashbusters-Mill Hill beautification	0
9.	CoB Central Grants/Compassion Cap	\$65,818
37.	CoB CAP-Minority Businesses	<u>\$100,000</u>
	>TOTAL	\$518,077

\*Ms. Kabel calculated the amounts reallocated. She announced the total was \$518,077.00

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DEPARA MOVED TO APPROVE AS AMENDED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

Council member stated that he was grateful that they all worked together on this matter. He said he planned on making a statement at the next city council meeting regarding the item. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MULLIGAN MOVED TO ADJOURN**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER McCARTHY SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services

City of Bridgeport  
Economic and Community Development and Environment  
Committee  
Special Meeting  
October 24, 2007  
Page 8

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT  
REGULAR MEETING  
NOVEMBER 19, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:** Richard Paoletto, Chairman, Richard Bonney, James Holloway, Angel dePara, Thomas McCarthy, Marie Valle, Thomas Mulligan (6:09 p.m.)

**OTHERS:** Mark Anastasi, City Attorney; Andre Baker, Council Member; Leticia Colon, Council Member; Mr. Halstead

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**168-06 The Sale of City Owned Vacant Lots to the Bridgeport Community Land Trust.**

Council Member Valle asked committee to consider having the Bridgeport Community Land Trust obtain these lots. She then referred to 10/16/07 minutes of October 16, 2007 on page 3, paragraph 3. Council Member Valle said that the City had agreed to keep the parcels as open space, but nothing about the Land Trust owning the parcels. A few individuals did not like the wording because the word "sale" was used. Bridgeport Land Trust would not own the parcels and there would be no taxes involved.

Council Member dePara then asked for clarification regarding the issue of if the Land Trust did not own the parcels and that the City would be the fiduciary, why the Commission had this before them.

Council Member Holloway asked why the Committee had decided to bring this back up, since it had been denied by the Council. Council Member Holloway also said that someone from the City for the Land Department should be present.

Atty. Anastasi said that there were issues, but one of the concerns was the usage in perpetuity, which would impact taxes.

Council Member McCarthy said that the main discussion at the council centered around whether it was a sale or not. If it is not a sale, then the committee could discuss it. Chairman Paoletto said that there were some concerns about the amount of land involved. Atty. Anastasi said that the title documents referred to it as a sale. He said that there were a number of procedural issues along with other concerns.

Council Member Mulligan then read the resolution that had been drafted at a later date. He pointed out that the City would retain ownership, but said that he was reluctant to

allow the City to have the obligation of replacing the plots if they were later sold. A discussion then followed on what the Council had done at the last meeting.

Council Member Valle said that it would be sad to lose the grant funding but she was willing to table the issue. A question arose as to why the City Attorney's office never received a copy of the latest resolution. Chairman Paoletto said that the latest copy of the resolution was never given to the City Clerk or the Legal Office because it had been denied during the Council meeting. If the item had been tabled, the paper work would have been sent to the appropriate offices.

Council Member McCarthy said that he did not wish to lose the grant funding and asked if someone knew if there was a time frame. Mr. Halstead was asked if there was a time frame and he said that there was not a timeframe but that it would not be able to continue indefinitely. McCarthy suggested that perhaps a sunset clause could be added regarding the length of time that the land was set aside. Chairman Paoletto said that it was contingent upon the City going into contract.

Council Member Bonney said that this went out to full council and the council sent it back to the Committee for reconsideration. Chairman Paoletto explained that this was why the matter was being reconsidered.

Council Member dePara said that he did not want to lose the money either but needed to clarify the details. He suggested waiting until the next meeting of the ECDC meeting for further discussion.

Council Member Holloway suggested that Council Member Valle resubmit this resolution to the City Clerk's Office for the first meeting of the month and request that someone from the Land office be present at that meeting.

Council Member Mulligan said that the delay has been with the City Attorney's office. Atty. Anastasi explained that the prior version had been referred to his office and there was some question about whether applying for this without involving the Grants Office would be effective.

Council Member Mulligan said that this resolution has been in the works for a few months and that the members of the Executive Branch have not been efficient in taking care of this issue.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VALLE MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEM 168-06  
THE SALE OF CITY OWNED VACANT LOTS TO THE BRIDGEPORT  
COMMUNITY LAND TRUST.**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY SECONDED.**

**\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Council Member Mulligan asked Atty. Anastasi to see that when it was submitted to the City Clerk's Office the Grants Office also be notified. Atty. Anastasi said that when he

received the paper work, he would do so. Mulligan requested that Atty. Anastasi then let the Grants office know about this informally now to allow them to begin the work on the resolution.

### **RECESS**

A recess was declared at 6:35 and the session came back into order at 6:37 p.m.

### **271-06 Johnson Creek Development**

Atty. Anastasi said that the resolution has a statement about the interviewing committee. Then later in the document, there is no recommendation from Selection Committee. He then suggested the Committee refer the item back to the Selection Committee.

Council Member Holloway said that if there was no recommendation from the Selection Committee, then the issue was functionally dead because there was a new Mayor and new appointments to be made.

Atty. Anastasi said that he believes that the Selection Committee would continue after December. Council Member Holloway replied that the current Mayor appointed this Selection Committee. Atty. Anastasi agreed but added that it was a competitive bid and that the City could be open to legal charges by changing the issue.

Copies of the Request for Development Qualifications for the Johnson Creek Site were then distributed. Chairman Paoletto said that this was the first time he had seen the RFDQ for the project.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEM  
271-06 JOHNSON CREEK DEVELOPMENT  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MCCARTHY MOVED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLOWAY SECONDED.  
\*\* THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes  
Telesco Secretarial Service