

November 10, 2020

The meeting of the Board of Park Commissioners was held on Tuesday, November 10, 2020, at 5:00 p.m. This meeting was conducted by Zoom/Teleconference. The public had access to this meeting by calling the following conference line and then entering the conference code:

**Dial to join Zoom Meeting by Phone:**

1 (929) 436-2866

1 (877) 853-5257 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 949 8702 3600

Mr. Labrador stated that this meeting is being conducted with the authority issued by the Governor of the State of Connecticut and read the following:

Tonight's meeting of the Board of Park Commissioner is the regular monthly meeting for October 13, 2020 and is being conducted by electronic means as authorized by Governor Ned Lamont executive order 7B which was issued on March 14, 2020, and which the Public has electronic access to witness this meeting.

The recording and transcription of this meeting will be posted on the City Clerk's website within 7 days.

Mr. Labrador asked that everyone abide by the Governor's request and directives contained in his various executive orders: 7 through 7J, with additional orders to be forthcoming.

**OPENING CEREMONY**

**ROLL CALL**

Present: President Labrador, Vice President Brideau, Commissioners: Wade, Cotto and Hosier, Clerk Ellen M. Gerrity. Also, in attendance were, Craig A. Nadrizny, Acting Public Facilities Director, Luann Conine, Recreation Superintendent, Luis Burgos, Manager of Roadway and Parks Services, and Lee Nastu, Recreation Coordinator with Angel DePara, Database Administrator, presiding as host of the meeting.

After determining there was a quorum, Mr. Labrador called the meeting to order.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13, 2020, PARKS BOARD MEETING**

On a motion made by Mr. Brideau, seconded by Mr. Cotto, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes as presented.

**PUBLIC SPEAKING FORUM:**

\*\*\*Due to the public health emergency, public speaking will be by written testimony only\*\*\*\*\*  
Please submit written testimony to [Ellen.Gerrity@bridgeportct.gov](mailto:Ellen.Gerrity@bridgeportct.gov) by 4:30p.m.on Monday, October 12th\*\*\*

## OLD BUSINESS

1. Heather Oeschger, Project Manager, Siting & Construction Services, Eversource Energy and Shodhan Patel, Brian Alicea, and Helen Taylor, requesting to speak to the Parks Board to discuss a permanent access easement next to UI's Old Town Road Substation.

Shodhan Patel, Project Manager said that the UI Co. is building a new Old Town sub-station adjacent to the existing one which prompted Eversource's work to remove existing lattice towers and replace them with new transmission monopole towers.

He said that they will need the permanent easement for access during construction, as well as maintenance for their structures.

Mr. Brideau asked if the easement access was off Kaechele Place.

Mr. Patel said that it was.

Mr. Labrador asked if the easement was for removing trees and brush to gain access into the Roger's Park.

Mr. Patel said that they would not need to remove any trees, they will only do tree trimming, and some removal of brush would be done.

Mr. Labrador said that he read in the Permanent Access Easement Agreement Draft, that once Eversource was granted the easement, that they would be able to hand the easement over to anyone they would like?

Mr. Patel said that this is accurate, and that the underline easement rights would be given to the UI Company to only access the structures because the point of change of ownership would be defined as the new structures, and the UI may need to access the structures to perform any kind of maintenance activities.

Mr. Labrador asked if anyone else would be given permission to access the property.

Mr. Patel said that only the UI Company and Eversource would have access to the property.

Brian Alicea, Eversource Senior Right of Way Specialist said that the easement rights are would be assignable to whoever needs to have the assignment.

Mr. Labrador asked who else would need access to the easement.

Mr. Alicea said that it would be Eversource contractors who needed to clear vegetation.

Mr. Patel said that they would be working on behalf of Eversource.

November 10, 2020

He said that besides the UI Company and Eversource Energy they do not anticipate anyone using the right at this point even though they would be assignable to others.

Mr. Hosier said that the draft agreement states that if Eversource abandons the property at any time that they still have rights over the property, the City and Parks Board have none.

Associate City Attorney Tyisha Toms asked Mr. Hosier what provision in the agreement he is looking at.

Mr. Hosier said he did not have the draft agreement in front of him, but he said he read that within the draft agreement, if Eversource abandons the site, the control of the area lies within the grantee's rights.

He said that they can abandon the site within a year, and they can give it to whomever they please because for \$5,000.00 the City would be giving up any right it has to that piece of park property.

Mr. Alicea said that if it is abandoned, there could be a recorded release of the easement.

Mr. Hosier said that would be on the grantee's desire, if the grantee agrees to that we can enter into negotiations, but as it stands now, if the site is abandoned that property can be used for anything that the grantee desires it to be used for.

Mr. Labrador and Ms. Wade agreed that they did not like how this sounded.

Attorney Toms said that this would be an easy fix, she said that with regards to that provision they could change the wording to say, "with the consent of the Grantor or Grantor's heirs, successors and assigns."

She said that currently it says under (a) of the agreement: the easements and other rights granted herein are intended to be permanent rights and easements for the benefit of Grantee, its successors and assigns, and are to be fully apportionable and fully assignable or transferable, all or in part, without the need of any consent of the Grantor or the Grantor's heirs, successors and assigns.

She said that typically the City's consent is required for any transfer.

Mr. Hosier said that the important word is "intent" and the meaning of that word could mean something entirely different in a couple of years.

Mr. Hosier also said he cannot understand why the City must give permanent easement to Eversource Energy whereas we should be looking into leasing the easement.

Attorney Toms said that she does not have an objection on putting a time limit on the easement.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Hosier said he was put on the Commission to not sell park land.

He said that what we are doing is selling our rights to the park land for \$5,000.00.

He believes that a public hearing should be held due to this having an effect on the neighborhood.

Attorney Toms said that all of the things that are currently being asked for exist.

She said that she visited the site and presently there is a fence surrounding the property with a pathway and a sign on the fence that does not allow public access due to the close proximity to the substation.

She said that although the pathway is not being used for what Eversource Energy is asking for currently, it was contemplated that way because that area was fenced, and the public is not allowed in there.

She said that she did consider the idea that we would be giving away or selling parkland, but we are not doing either of those things, there is no transfer entitled here, the City still owns the property; we are giving them an easement.

Mr. Hosier asked how the City would still own the property when we are giving them permanent access to the land and giving up our rights to that land.

Attorney Toms said that we are not giving up our rights, we are giving them the right to access the land permanently since we cannot access the land either.

Mr. Hosier said that it also says that we have no rights to the land, only access.

He said that they would own the land outright forever and have the right to the land in perpetuity.

He said unless that the Grantee agrees that the Grantor does not want anything on the land.

Mr. Labrador asked Attorney Toms to explain the agreement to the Commissioners.

Attorney Toms said that the purpose of an easement is to provide someone with the ability to use your property, and if you provide them with a permanent easement, you are essentially providing them with the ability to use it in perpetuity; it does not mean that you are giving up your rights to use it.

She said that with regards to the public however, this is not someplace that we would want the public to walk considering it is so close to the substation and it would be a safety issue.

November 10, 2020

She said that we already have a gate there and it looks like we were attempting to preclude public access to the area anyhow.

She said that she does agree with the Park Boards concern that the City should not give up the right to allow them to transfer without our consent.

She said that this agreement has been revised and she did not realize in advance of the meeting that the \$5,000.00 consideration was added in, when she previously discussed this the consideration was not addressed.

She also said that an appraisal would be needed for the easement and that they could work out the amount; because for her the \$5,000.00 is arbitrary, she does not have a way of determining that it is a reasonable fee for what the ask is.

Mr. Labrador asked that they come back to the Board with clearer wording on paper as to what we are giving up and why they are doing it.

Attorney Toms said that she thinks it is clear what the ask is and there are concerns as to how far the ask is going and, in this conversation, we can resolve these concerns if Eversource Energy is willing to make some concessions.

She said that it has been made clear by the Parks Board that they do not like the idea of them being allowed to transfer the easement rights without our consent.

Mr. Patel said that they are not going to own the land, it is still going to be owed by the City of Bridgeport, they are just going to need access and the term permanent as Attorney Toms defined is just to be able to access the land at any time so they will not have to keep on going through the approval process.

He said that the gate was already in existence and it is just the access that they are requesting.

Mr. Patel asked if the Commissioners had any other questions for Eversource.

Mr. Labrador said that he does not have a problem for them to use the area for access, he would just like the wording cleaned up and brought back to the Board.

Mr. Patel asked if what the Board wanted is for them to clean up the wording on the appraisal value of the access point and clean up the wording on the resignable rights stating that they cannot do it without the Park Boards approval.

Mr. Patel ask if they clear up things with the City Attorney's Office, would they have to come back to the December 8, 2020, Parks Board Meeting.

Mr. Hosier suggested that they return to next month's meeting.

November 10, 2020

Attorney Toms asked the Board if it is possible to approve with consent or with further review by the City Attorney's Office as to the issues that are outstanding.

Mr. Brideau said that the wording should be changed to "if the property is abandoned the property would revert to the City".

Attorney Toms said that the City is not giving up the property, so if it is abandoned, the City will retain ownership of the property, they are just giving them the right to use the property, so if they abandon the right to use the property we should not give them the ability to transfer it without our consent.

She said that is the primary concern and that is the outstanding issue; if we agree to resolve that and to make sure that the fee that is being offered is in line with the appraisal value that is obtained because right now \$5,000.00 is completely arbitrary to her.

She said that then they can approve subject to an appraisal and subject to consent for transferring.

Mr. Labrador said that if there is no intent to transfer the agreement to anyone else, why is there a dollar amount on the property?

Attorney Toms said that there is a dollar value on the easement because the easement has value.

She said that the City would not allow someone to use our property without charging them for it; there is a value to the easement.

She also said that whether the \$5,000.00 is enough is beyond her area of expertise the City would need to get a real estate appraisal for that and that is what she is suggesting we get to make that determination.

Mr. Labrador thanked Attorney Toms for her clarification and said that if we can get the wording in the agreement cleared up that should be enough.

Mr. Labrador asked the Board if they had any other questions

Mr. Hosier said that based upon all the different questions and other concerns that we should table this.

He said that there is no reason to move this forward without having full and complete knowledge of its effect on the City and the park.

Ms. Wade said that if Eversource is giving the City money, that somewhere down the line they are going to say they gave us money, so the City sold it to them.

November 10, 2020

Attorney Toms said that they did not sell the property, she said that the instrument would have to be different for a sale, if they were selling the property they would be giving them a deed, and they are not, they are giving them an easement which is simply the right to use the land and is recorded on the land records because it is a permanent right, and even if it was for a time period, an easement would still be recorded on the land records.

She said that the City has many easement agreements with multiply parties across the city particularly with utility companies and usually it is overhead easements for wires and not necessarily a path through a park but it is just the placement of this particular substation that was built in 1992, so there must have been some sort of hearing at that time to even allow this substation to be built so closely to a park and residential area.

She said that someone allowed it and so now that it's there we need to allow them the ability to upgrade the facility which is what this is being used for.

She said that she does not see how we do not allow them this access easement considering that there is already a path specific for this purpose and whomever did this at the time when the UI moved in there and built this facility and contemplated the need for this path to access the power lines.

Attorney Toms asked the Board for their specific concerns outside of the price and the ability to transfer the access easement without the City's consent.

Mr. Hosier said that his first concern is why does it have to be a permanent access easement if it has existed this far, he does not see a reason for it to be permanent.

He said secondly as it says in the draft, all rights assigned to its successors and assigns forever, they are not saying they are renting it, they are paying the City \$5,000,00, for this piece of property taking control over that piece of property which is park property, and if they abandon it they still have control over the land.

Attorney Toms said that it is typically easement language and that is not going to change.

She said that it is a permanent easement because utility companies do not have to come back to the City every couple of years and request additional easements for power lines, sewer systems or gas piping; those things are permanent.

Mr. Alicea explained that the permanent easements also follow the land, so if they did happen to sell the property, they would not have to get a new easement from the new owner, they would still have those rights of access as well.

He said that it is not just for this project, it would be for the future of the maintenance of the new structures, vegetation management; it is not just for the work there.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Labrador said that he is not in disagreement of that part at all, he does not understand if they will be allowed to do whatever they want with the easement.

Mr. Alicea said that it would be whatever the language of the easement agreement is, and we can work with Attorney Toms on that language.

Attorney Toms said that this easement as far as permanency of it is in line with all easements provided to utility companies.

She said that the rights that utility companies have even in your own neighborhoods; the rights that they have to access their equipment is permanent because whether it is owned by the UI and later sold to another utility company they still need to be able to use the power lines.

She said that in previous instances of easements, consent is provided by the City and is not reasonably withheld.

Ms. Wade asked if this is a UI substation, what interest does Eversource Energy have in it.

Mr. Patel asked if the Board would like him to explain why the UI Company and Eversource Energy need the permanent easement.

Attorney Toms said that it would be helpful to clarify ownership.

Mr. Patel said that the transmission lines that are going through the existing substation are owned by Eversource including other structures, he said that the new substation on top of the hill which the UI is building will require the rerouting of the lines around it.

He said that they are replacing the old fifty-year-old structures with the new standard that they have which are called monopole towers which will be installed in the east of the existing lattice structures.

Mr. Patel said that the scope of Eversource is to install the two structures and to be able to access them and the scope of the UI Co. is to build a new substation with a similar footprint on top of the hill and these lines will tie to the new substation.

Attorney Toms said that essentially Eversource owns power lines on UI property, so they need access to the structures that the power lines will be connected to.

She said that the UI previously came before the Parks Board and received approval for a right of way for the same project subject to review by the City Attorney's Office.

She said at that time they did not address compensation at that point, but both items will have to go before the Common Council for approval of the easement, and they will address the compensation issue for UI request at that point.



November 10, 2020

Mr. Labrador said that Attorney Toms has been open and clear, and he trusts her judgement and asks that the Commissioners to make a motion on the matter.

Mr. Hosier said that his major concern is that all rights are assigned and that we are actually giving up park land and that they did not clarify the fact that we are not giving up park land forever, he would like better verbiage in the agreement.

Mr. Brideau said that the land was not used by the public anyhow and they are only asking for an access road to their equipment, the area is already fenced off with a sign to not enter.

Attorney Toms said that she agrees with Mr. Hosier in the sense that she was stuck on the issue if we were giving up park land because a permanent easement is essentially relinquishing ownership.

She said that the statute that requires you to do certain things when you give up property does not apply in this instance because of the instrument that is being used.

She said that we are providing them with an easement, if we were giving them a deed, they would be 100% correct but we are not.

She said that effectually are we relinquishing it yes, but we already have because we have already put a gate there and have asked people not to go there and that's why she had to go there to see what we are actually giving up.

She said that the area is swamp land and we have already gated the area for other reasons, and it is not safe for people to enter the property, she is okay that people cannot go there but the City will retain ownership.

Mr. Hosier asked if the language could be changed to lease over a period of time so they could have the lease revisited.

Attorney Toms said that we would be changing essentially how this is handled state and nationwide, and that is done all the time with regards to utilities.

She said that no one gets a lease, everyone gets an easement.

She said that she does not want to do that because as Mr. Alicea explained, the easement follows the land, so for instance, if the City decides at a certain point they want to transfer the property, there is no requirement that either the UI or Eversource Energy would have to come back to the City to get another easement.

She said that a lease would have expired, and it would be very difficult for the City to maintain.

November 10, 2020

Attorney Toms said some things need to be tweaked a little bit and that the language needs some clarity.

On a motion made by Mr. Hosier, seconded by Ms. Wade, it was voted to table the request and have Eversource Energy return to the December 8, 2020, Parks Board meeting with the changes requested changes in the permanent access easement Mr. Brideau voted no.

## NEW BUSINESS

1. The Stratfield Historic District Association (SHDA) is requesting to put a sign on the corner of Brooklawn and North Avenues.

They are also requesting permission to put signage in the parks such as flags to beautify it.

On a motion made by Mr. Cotto, seconded by Mr. Brideau, it was unanimously voted to table the request due to lack of representation.

2. Viceroy Cricket Club requesting to speak to the Parks Board regarding developing a Cricket Field at Seaside Park and a 99-year lease agreement, Alfredo Castillo, Councilman, 136th District, Jorge Cruz, Councilman 131<sup>st</sup> District, Christy Duffy, Shelly Nichani, and Lakshman Bennabattula.

Mr. Duffy said that they are interested in developing an amateur cricket league within the shoreline of Bridgeport specifically they are targeting the City of Bridgeport not only for the Seaside Park availability but for the commuting availability for the surrounding Valley, New Haven as well as Westchester.

He said that they are hoping to attract amateur competition.

He said that historically the sport has not been very popular in the United States, but has grown worldwide and is actually very exciting because it is one of those sports that doesn't take a lot of money to participate in as an amateur which is one of the reasons we are talking today.

Mr. Duffy said that they hope by proposing the opportunity of working in Seaside Park that they could convince the Board that they could be friends to the Commission and the City by allowing the Cricket to take root as a successful amateur sport so they could attract youth into the leagues and then grow with the youths so they could prosper with the growth of the sport which is on a growth trend.

He said they think that Bridgeport is ideally suited as a city, but for them in Bridgeport would be important for them to get favor from the Parks Board because if they were to spend the next couple of years investing in this as well as their lives they would be here quite some

time and they would hope they would have a tremendously successful friendship with the Board of Parks Commissioners and City of Bridgeport.

Mr. Duffy said that unfortunately they have to talk business even though this is sports.

He said that the business at hand is that there will be improvements of considerable expense as they meet and address the credibility of setting up an amateur league which has to get acceptance from the local inter-league conference which will require dollars that they are prepared to spend.

He said that they are encouraged that the sport is well known with older people and they would like to bridge the gap with the younger people in the local community, and if they were able to have the ability to do that at Seaside Park with a lease they would be able to gain the confidence with certain stakeholders in the league to make those improvements which are significant.

Mr. Duffy said that the improvements would include the field, parking, facilities because there is real upkeep necessary because it is a year round sport, as well as the Clubhouse which would have to be put in a certain way to invite foreign teams so they are accommodated since the sport is a long sport, it is not a two hour game.

He said that all of this would be new to the Commission and City of Bridgeport, but that is the exciting part we are all going to learn about it at no expense to the community or city other than the fact that the Board's favor to give them the confidence to put the dollars that are required to make these improvements a reality so they could be comfortable to know that they will not be in and out of here in three years.

He said that what is on the table is 1. your friendship, 2. your approval and 3. your participation in helping them to grow this league as the first city in Connecticut which means a lot to them.

Mr. Lakshman Bennabattula stated that the Viceroy Cricket League is the oldest league in the United States, and they want to make sure that they provide training to the local children in Bridgeport and make sure they participate in the league.

Mr. Duffy said that the opportunity right now is that cricket is already attractive to the West Indies and Indian population and countries around the world that support this sport and they would like to introduce the sport to Bridgeport as an amateur sport and it does require improvements that they would have to invest in and that they hopefully get the Parks Board support so they could make those improvements.

Mr. Bennabattula said that Cricket is the fastest growing sport in the world right now and they have conducted international tournaments in the past between India, Caribbean and the US. and this would allow kids to be exposed culturally and to travel to different countries playing with the cricket league.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Duffy said that it would be low cost for the children because they would be participating in allowing how to pay for the training for the cricket league.

Ms. Wade said that people have been playing cricket for years in the east end of Bridgeport at Newfield Park and they tend to take over a large portion of the park while they play.

She said they also have someone who teaches people to play the game.

Mr. Duffy said that the Cricket Leagues do not play in Bridgeport, they have local clubs, so they are trying to bring the local league in, and they have to have certain standards and that's where the improvements are.

He said that they must get approved and they do have standards.

Mr. Bennabattula said they must get approval from the International Cricket Council, and they do require certain standards and right now there is only one place in the country, and they would like to introduce the league to Bridgeport.

Ms. Wade said that she will find out more information from the local teams that play at Newfield Park.

Mr. Labrador said that if they were to play cricket at Seaside Park, he would like to see the actual game plan presented to the Board.

He said that they should submit a clear proposal of their plan with a projected timeline for when they expect things to occur.

He would also like to see the how the field will be laid out, with detail of the field dimensions and how the game is played.

Mr. Patal said that they are not like other leagues, they have done many professional tournaments in the past and must follow the International Cricket Council rules.

He said that they will bring back their proposal with a stage by stage plan as requested.

Mr. Labrador said that he would love to see cricket emerge in Bridgeport with a strong foundation and he also thinks there may be room for both soccer and cricket in the area they are looking at.

He said that he wants everything to be done properly because the park is used by everyone young and old and he wants everyone to be happy the proposal.

Mr. Hosier and Mr. Brideau agreed that they need to submit more information to the Board members.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Cotto was concerned about the beach area near the Casino Bathhouse in that it is used heavily by the people of the City of Bridgeport.

He said that the location is next to the road and that is part of the beach and he also questions if they are Bridgeport residents.

He also asked if they would be paying the entrance fee to enter the park.

Mr. Hosier questioned if the Seaside Park Casino Bathhouse is on the National Registers and if there are any restrictions.

Jorge Cruz, Councilman, 131 District said when he was younger, he was a lifeguard and worked out of the Casino Bathhouse and now has been visiting Seaside Park during the summer season practically every day so he is very familiar with the park and its layout and traffic.

He said when he met with the Viceroy Cricket Club regarding their idea of what they wanted to do, he felt that with a little more planning and open-mindedness, that this cricket league could be established.

He said that he visits Seaside Park practically every day and believes that they could co-exist with the soccer teams and does not think it would interfere with them, with proper scheduling he thinks it could be worked out.

He said that the more diversity of sports makes for a healthier and better community.

He thinks that they should meet at Seaside Park to walk through the area before the next meeting.

Alfredo Castillo, Councilman, 136th District, said that Seaside Park is a beautiful park but is not being utilized like it should be.

He said that the bathhouse has been abandoned since he was young and if the Viceroy Cricket Club is willing to come in and invest in our City, he thinks that it is important to look at their proposal.

He said that they are willing to invest dollars to put in our city.

He said that they are willing to work and teach our kids how to play cricket, attract other teams to come to Bridgeport and invest in the City of Bridgeport.

He said that the important thing is that they would like to create a partnership with the City of Bridgeport.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Labrador said that the Board should meet with the Viceroy Cricket Club at Seaside Park and walk the area with an open mind before the next Parks Board meeting

Mr. Cruz said that he would like to be included on the walk through.

On a motion made by Mr. Hosier, seconded by Mr. Brideau, it was unanimously voted to table the request and have them come back to the December 8, 2020, Parks Board Meeting with more information about their proposal.

#### REPORTS – CRAIG A. NADRIZNY, ACTING PUBLIC FACILITIES DIRECTOR

Mr. Nadrizny gave the following report:

- Perry Memorial Arch – An assessment was done; they are reviewing the assessment now and are looking to possibly get a grant to help pay for it.
- Wayne Street – The bid opens December 10, 2020, hopefully they can move forward with construction in the spring of 2021.
- Golf Course Red Course – Capital Project – A bid will be going out to upgrade the bunkers on the Red Course – The bid should be put out in the spring of 2021.
- City Wide Tennis and Basketball Courts – Resurfacing and doing crack repair, they are looking to put out a bid to either do a crack and seal or surface repair to them.

Mr. Cotto asked if the Glenwood Park tennis courts would be included.

Mr. Nadrizny said that all the courts would be looked at.

Mr. Brideau asked Mr. Nadrizny if the Parks Capital Improvement Fund could be used to purchase a roller for the golf course greens.

He said that the Golf Pro Stephen Roach said that they could get a good price through the First Tee and wants to know if it could be purchased through the Parks Capital Improvement Fund.

Mr. Nadrizny said that Attorney Skyers was going to get back to the Parks Board on how the Parks Capital Improvement Fund works.

He said that we can also utilize money through the First Tee program, and he has already signed off on it so we should be getting some equipment through the program.

Mr. Brideau said that this year has been a banner year as far as business and he thinks that they had more rounds of golf this year than ever due to the pandemic and people wanting to get out of the house.

He said that the golf course is in very good shape and the word is getting around, so we are going to get a lot more play so we're looking to make better conditions.

November 10, 2020

Mr. Nadrizny said that they have definitely improved the numbers at the golf course and there has been a lot of play.

He said that we have extended the Seasonal's to help maintain the golf course, so it continues to look great while the weather is still cooperating.

Attorney Skyers said that he did receive the request through the City Attorney's Office in regards to the Capital Improvement Fund and he is being expeditious and careful and will make sure the Board receives a response regarding the use of the fund and what its availability is to the Board of Park Commissioners.

Mr. Labrador said that Mr. Skyers has been very helpful to the Board and he appreciates everything he has done for them.

Mr. Labrador also thanked Acting Director Craig Nadrizny, Parks and Roadway Manager Luis Burgos and his workers and Recreation Coordinator Lee Nastu for making the parks look good and is hoping that the we can get new equipment in for the parks to keep them looking that way.

Mr. Nadrizny had no further business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Ms. Wade, seconded by Mr. Brideau, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Ellen M. Gerrity*

Ellen M. Gerrity  
Clerk