PARKING AUTHORITY MINUTES

NOVEMBER 19, 2003

ATTENDANCE: Urban Mulvehill, Chairman; Stephen Bentkover, Troy Jellerette, Luis Garcia

STAFF: Kathryn Hebert, Ed Schmidt, Mayor's Assistant, Martin Overton, Paul Sotnik, Tom Hamilton, Finance Director

OTHERS: Robert Cavello, Westview Group; John Lombardi, Maritime Center; Cornelius Thompson, LAZ Parking, Frank DelMonaco, LAZ Parking

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 21, 2003

**** MR. MULVEHILL MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

DISCUSSION - STATUS MARITIME GARAGE PROJECT, REPORT by ROB CAVELLO, PROJECT MANAGER

Mr. Cavello reviewed the Milestones for Construction as follows:

Item 1 and 2 - as outlined.

Item 3 - the buoy is in Norwalk and would be in place by next weekend.

Item 4 - they are scheduled to start on November 21 to do the layout work and stud work. They will have a meeting with the contractor to go over the logistics, but he noted, they were not using the site for storage now and would just run the job from there.

Item 5 - the ticket space is bought cut and the millwork materials were released. They are looking at a completion date of December 30.

Item 12. on the agenda was taken up at this point in the meeting (see page 6).

APPROVE THE REVISED OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FOR THE MONTHS OF DECEMBER 31, 2003 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2004 FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $219,000

Account No. 21 40 95 5258

Mr. Hamilton said that everything was in order, but they projected revenues of $370k and the expenses were under $219k for the 7-month period; the numbers were consistent with those put together earlier by the consultants, but they went through the expenses and found certain items were percentages and allocations of people's times.

Mr. Bentkover asked about the dates projected. Mr. Schmidt stated the following:
· November 25 - temporary CO issued
· December 15 - soft opening, only for Spinaker
· January 9 -official opening for everyone going to the Maritime Aquarium and the general public

Mr. Mulvehill asked that even though it wasn't stated, was it an assumption that the revenue would start on January 1. Mr. Hamilton said yes.

Mr. Jellerette asked if they had a pricing schedule yet for the garage. Mr. Schmidt said there was a temporary rate schedule approved, but it was understood that the Parking Authority needed to tweak the schedule.

Mr. Jellerette asked the number of spaces to be allocated per the article in the newspaper. Mr. Schmidt clarified that revenue had nothing to do what the newspaper reported.

Mr. Garcia asked about how the number of parkers was calculated. Mr. Thompson replied that the feasibility study and data from the Maritime Aquarium were used to calculate the revenue for 6 months.

Mr. Mulvehill stated while the new construction was going he observed there was no parking behind the theatre area. Mr. Delmonaco said there was parking in that area.

Mr. Bentkover asked about the people that would be parking in the evening at SoNo and the comment that they would try to get them all in, but he questioned the fact that this wasn't included in the budget and he noted that when they actually start laying out the theory, he expected the numbers would change.

**** MR. MULVEHILL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FOR THE MONTHS OF DECEMBER 31, 2003 THROUGH JUNE 30,**
2004 FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $219,000
Account No. 21 40 95 5258
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

AUTHORIZE LAZ PARKING TO PURCHASE THE PAY ON FOOT REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FROM ITS, INC. (INDUSTRIAL TIME and SYTEMS, INC.) FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $55,000

Account No. 21 40 98 5727

Mr. Delmonaco said he talked about the ability to keep the garage open longer and the board asked for a formal proposal and cost and that is why this item was on the agenda tonight.

Mr. Schmidt commented this would be in lieu of the cashier, so they would save a lot of money in the long run.

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTIN TO AUTHORIZE LAZ PARKING TO PURCHASE THE PAY ON FOOT REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FROM ITS, INC. (INUDSTRIAL TIME and SYTEMS, INC.) FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $55,000**
Account No. 21 40 98 5727
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

AUTHORIZE LAZ PARKING TO PURCHASE A SWEEPER FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FROM TENNANT COMPANY, FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $23,000

Account No. 21 40 98 5727

Mr. Mulvehill asked if this would be an outright purchase. Mr. Delmonco said yes. Mr. Mulvehill said so they were paying for it up front. Ms. Hebert replied yes.

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE LAZ PARKING TO PURCHASE A SWEEPER FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE FROM TENNANT COMPANY, FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $23,000**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

APPROVE THE PARKING PERMIT APPLICATION AND OPERATIONAL POLICIES FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE INCLUDING THE ACCESS CARD SYSTEM, MONTHLY AND ANNUAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS AND OPERATIONAL PLAN

Mr. Schmidt referred to the attachment with the information and said the memo laid out the opening strategy that if approved, would be shared with a lot of people, they were

taking into account how it would work and what the signage would look like, but this was the first step in the operations manual.

Mr. Garcia asked what happens if a ticket is lost. Mr. Delmonaco said the all-day rate would be charged.

Mr. Mulvehill asked if an Ezy-Pass technique could possibly be implemented. Mr. Delmonaco explained they could do a couple of things, i.e., they have a lock out feature that would allow couples to use the ticket between them, although not at the same time.

Mr. Delmonaco said there is an urgency in getting this matter approved because Spinnaker will be parking in the garage as of December 15, 2003 for the soft opening which is prior to the December 17, 2003 Parking Authority meeting. LAZ will need the parking permit application completed prior to December 15, 2003. Mr. Schmidt suggested in that case, they submit a first preliminary draft to Spinaker noting it was not a finalized and approved document yet.

Mr. Bentkover asked about hourly parker's who return to the garage after hours. Mr. Delmonaco said if there is an hourly parker and they returned at 4:00 a.m., they would be able to stick the ticket in and gain entry, then the gate would roll up.

AUTHORIZE THE INTERNAL SIGNAGE PACKAGE AT THE MARITIME GARAGE AS RECOMMENDED BY LAZ PARKING (to be presented at the meeting)

This item was included in the above comments and the motion applied for both.

**** MR. JELLERETTE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PARKING PERMIT APPLICATION AND OPERATIONAL POLICIES FOR THE MARITIME GARAGE INCLUDING THE ACCESS CARD SYSTEM, MONTHLY AND ANNUAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS AND OPERATIONAL PLAN** *and to:*
AUTHORIZE THE INTERNAL SIGNAGE PACKAGE AT THE MARITIME GARAGE AS
RECOMMENDED BY LAZ PARKING
And as an addendum, it should be added that:
THIS IS BEING DONE AS A PRELIMINARY STEP IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE PROCESS
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Bentkover asked if the ticket booth would have bullet proof glass. Mr. Delmonaco said they considered it, but it hasn't been found to be a full proof method.

Mr. Mulvehill reviewed the signage further and he felt the word "Cashier" should be eliminated. He further asked that the committee see a draft of the signage first before it was completed. Mr. Delonaco said this wouldn't be a problem and said he would have samples at the next meeting.

Mr. Schmidt noted the logo should be more system wide and uniform (as is seen on the City of Norwalk's letterhead). Mr. Delmonaco said he expected they would develop uniform signage with the help of the designer.

AUTHORIZE THE RECOMMENDATION BY LAZ PARKING NOT TO INSTALL THE ORIGINAL GREETING BOOTH AT THE MARITIME GARAGE

Mr. Schmidt said there was an uncertainty as to how the public would get the information, so there was an idea of putting a booth out front as a directional booth, but LAZ thought this could potentially cause another problem, because it would inevitably block traffic. Therefore, the recommendation is that we do not need the booth for the operation of the garage. However, they need a booth at the Webster Street lot, so it may be moved there, so they were asking the Parking Authority for it **not** to be installed a the Maritime Garage.

Mr. Mulvehill asked if there should be a sign to alert customers that an information desk is located in the main lobby. Mr. DeMarco replied that it was most important to get across the information that people read quickly. He stated that the sign should say "PLEASE TAKE YOUR TICKET WITH YOU".

Mr. Schmidt said the main priority was not to stop traffic.

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTIN TO AUTHORIZE THE RECOMMENDATION BY LAZ PARKING NOT TO INSTALL THE ORIGINAL GREETING BOOTH AT THE MARITIME GARAGE**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN MULVEHILL, TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMETNT WITH DLC CONSULTING, TO PERFORM A PARKING TRANSITION AUDIT FOR THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION AND A FINAL AUDIT FOR THE TEMPORARY MARITIME SURFACE LOT FROM CENTRAL PARKING TO LAZ PARKING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO AN INVENTORY OF ASSETS AND CUSTOMER LISTS FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $7,500

Account No. 21 40 95 5258

Mr. Schmidt said there would be an operational audit rather than a financial audit; the auditors come out in December and observe the operation at the Maritime lot and the train station, they will then make a list of all assets owned by the city. He noted that this company was highly recommended.

Mr. Bentkover asked what equipment had been allocated for in the capital budget. Mr. Schmidt gave an example of having an authorization for bottles of windex, but he pointed out this wouldn't necessarily indicate what was available in the January 1, 2004 inventory.

Mr. Schmidt further explained that this would be good for the Parking Authority and LAZ, because it minimizes any potential for disputes.

Mr. Garcia asked if it would be done by December 31, 2003. Ms. Hebert said that Central would be out of the S. Norwalk railroad station as of December 31, 2003.

Mr. Mulvehill asked how DLC Consulting was. Ms. Hebert said they were well known throughout the industry.

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN MULVEHILL, TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMETNT WITH DLC CONSULTING, TO PERFORM A PARKING TRANSITION AUDIT FOR THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION AND A FINAL AUDIT FOR THE TEMPORARY MARITIME SURFACE LOT FROM CENTRAL PARKING TO LAZ PARKING INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO AN INVENTORY OF ASSETS AND CUSTOMER LISTS FOR A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $7,500**
Account No. 21 40 95 5258
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Discussion - LAZ Parking status report
a. Soft and Grand Opening of the Maritime Garage
b. ACS Revenue Collection System and Transition Update
c. Parking Enforcement Transition

These items previously discussed above.

Discussion - Maritime Aquarium Ticket Area - Purchase of IT electronic equipment, extension of telephone and security services from the main Aquarium building to the Maritime Ticket area

Discussion followed on the Funding Allocation. Mr. Schmidt said all was resolved and the city would pay the $200k to be added to the Aquarium's debt and they in turn would pick up the amount; this was agreed upon satisfactorily.

Mr. Overton gave a summary of the status of the public portion of the project for the Maritime Aquarium. He distributed ticketing information for review and discussion. He said because of the savings for the buyout and cost, he requested this item to be on the agenda for discussion and they were asking to suspend the rules to take up the action item. He continued and gave some background information regarding the contract terms that requires Klewin to bid all, but there is no increase to the GNP or approval or authorization and all is within the existing funds.

Mr. Schmidt asked if they would buy the equipment. Mr. Overton said part of the fund covered the $250k and he further explained the problem was coming up with the $250k; he said the actual cost was $96k, so they were authorizing $300kl to cover the debt, but the city would still pick up the cost and the debt would be retired like any other. The aquarium board already authorized the $300k to their debt, and this seemed to satisfy all, but it will have to go through the Parking Authority.

Mr. Garcia asked if Klewin was purchasing the equipment. Mr. Overton said they have ADP Security and they were extending their service into the new space; so the request is to waive the contractor bidding requirements and allow Klewin to purchase the equipment from the existing Maritime Aquarium vendors as an in scope change to their current contracts.

Mr. Bentkover asked about the GNP amount and said that according to the chart, they had a contingency that would be remaining and would go lower, not higher. Mr. Overton said that was correct. Mr. Bentkover further questioned the $152k contingency and if they were giving it to the aquarium. Mr. Schmidt replied no, they were spending the money in lieu of what the contingency was. Mr. Overton asked who the debt was owed to, the Parking Authority or the city. Mr. Overton said the $250k was first in line for the reimbursement. Mr. Hamilton added it becomes the Maritime debt and he thought it then comes back to the city, but the $250k is separate.

Mr. Schmidt said there was a guaranteed maximum price and subsequent to that, the Common Council authorized the city additional money of $250k. They did so because the full amount has to be appropriated, and it's on top of the original price. Mr. Bentkover commented that if it comes from the parking contingency and the debt goes back to the city, then they would be $250k over. Mr. Mulvehill explained there's an expectation it would be paid back because the city gave the Parking Authority the $250k, and they're extending it to the Aquarium and then they would be reimbursed.

Mr. Overton said it was agreed that the Maritime would pay for it out of their budget, but during the interim period, the Maritime came back and said they couldn't find the funds in their resources, so that's the reason for asking for the money up front from the city. However, the Delta is **not** part of the contingency. Mr. Schmidt noted there was no guarantee the contingency would be available due to unforeseen circumstances that may occur.

Mr. Bentkover asked if they would purchase the equipment in the meantime. Mr. Overton said if they agreed to waive the contract as it was; he added that Klewin has agreed to waive the bidding portion.

Mr. Bentkover asked if they evaluated the systems in place at the Aquarium. Mr. Overton said yes. Mr. Bentkover further asked, if when the Aquarium made the decision, was there any oversight by the city. Mr. Overton replied yes and he explained that it was not his job to tell them they couldn't use ADP services, but again, the services are only being extended.

Mr. Mulvehill stated that whether it works or not is up to the Aquarium and he clarified it would operate completely independently from the Parking Authority system.

Mr. Overton noted the $250k was all city funds.

**** MR. MULVEHILL MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCITON MANAGER, KLEWIN BUILDING COMPANY TO WAIVE THE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS AND PROVIDE ALL NECESSARY SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE EXTENSION OF ELECTRONIC AND RELATED FUNCTIONS NECESSARY TO EXTEND TELEPHONE, SECURITY AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES BETWEEN THE MARITIME AQUARIUM MAIN BULDING AND THE NEW TICKETING FACILITIES WITHIN THE MARITIME GARAGE AND NOT TO EXCEED THE AVAILABLE, APPROVED BUDGET**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr. Cavello continued with the Milestones updates as follows:

Item 6 - They are continuing to meet with LAZ Parking

Item 7 - As outlined

Item 8 - The transformer was dropped off and they expect an inspection by next Thursday. And the meter was placed and should have power by Friday.

Item's 9 through 13 - As outlined

Mr. Cavello said that after the last site walk, they found the roofer went out of business, they are 60% done with the roof, but the materials were scattered, so the bonding company jumped in and a new contractor (Barrett Roofing) took over the work on November 11, who is a very good firm and they were working diligently to meet the deadlines.

§ He further stated that as of tonight, they had an elevator inspection scheduled for next week. He noted they also have the electricians and the site contractors working on the

weekends.
§ He said they were hoping to go for a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (CO) on November 25 that was the target date, but they still need to have permanent power and more site work done, so they may not meet that date.
§ The exterior masonry should be completed by the end of the week.
§ The next goal is to start commissioning the facility with LAZ around December 15, so they expect all would be in better shape by then.

Mr. Garcia asked what happens should there be additional costs for overtime. Mr. Cavello said that's what the contingency was for.

Mr. Garcia asked about the work on Marshall Street. Mr. Cavello explained there were problems with the steel, but the work was completed last week.

Discussion - Catenary work at the South Norwalk Railroad Station

Mr. Sotnik displayed the revised plans for the South Norwalk Railroad Station Catenary Tower Improvement Project on behalf of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (DOT).

Mr. Mulvehill asked when the work was in progress, where would the contractor park. Mr. Sotnik said they should stay within the temporary working easement areas on the eastbound / Henry Street side of the railroad station.

Mr. Sotnik stated that based on the last presentation at the October, 2003 Parking Authority meeting, the Department of Transportation was asked to make several revisions to the plans and that he was here to present the revised plans to the Parking Authority. He pointed out the proposed Catenary Tower that would be going closest to the railroad station on the westbound side, tower 519A; he also pointed out the generator and air conditioning units. He said the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the closest face of the column of the parking garage was 13 ft. and the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the back of the platform was 6 ft. He stated that DOT basically made the revisions requested. Mr. Sotnik stated that DOT would need a temporary working easement as well as a permanent property taking at this location to install the foundation on what is now City property. He went on to explain that there was an additional change to the time frame for the temporary working easement area. It will be required for 6-months now, not 4-months as DOT previously explained. He explained that the Contractor would come in and dig the hole for the foundation and then come back to pour the concrete at a later date.

Mr. Bentkover asked if the proposed Catenary Tower was replacing something else. Mr. Mulvehill said they were installing new wires, but they were leaving the old towers up.

Mr. Sotnik said they would have two new towers now as well as the old towers due to the additional weight of the new wires. He noted their approval would impact two DOT

projects within the City as well:

The Rowayton railroad bridge
The Monroe Street railroad bridge

Mr. Sotnik stated that in order to replace the bridges, a track would have to be taken out of service as they worked across the bridges. He went on to state that DOT / Metro-North would not take a track out of service for bridge repairs unless the bridge needed emergency repairs and was deemed to be falling down, to avoid the service interruptions that a track closure causes up and down the New Haven line. These bridges are in need of repairs, but they are not in that condition at this time. He stated that the only time that DOT will take a track out of service is for a Catenary Tower project, and that they would have to take a track out of service for this project. He stated that this Catenary Tower project would provide an opportunity to have the two bridges repaired while the tracks were out of service.

Mr. Sotnik moved on to proposed Catenary Tower 518A on the on the westbound side. He pointed out the temporary working easement area that would be required, the right of way line, footbridge that is owned by the Department of Transportation (DOT) / Metro-North as well as the parking garage. He said the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the closest face of the column of the parking garage was 10 ft. and the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the back of the platform was 4 ft. Mr. Jellerette commented that this entrance is always locked. . Again, DOT made the revisions requested.

Mr. Sotnik reviewed the area for the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and said that it would be on railroad property. He stated that a temporary working easement would be required at this location. He noted that the construction of both Catenary Towers on the westbound side would done at night to avoid any disruption in railroad service. He also stated that the temporary working easement at this location would be required for six months, not 4-months as DOT previously explained. Mr. Sotnik explained that even though the easements would be acquired for six months, the Contractor would not be working for six months straight. He stated that both of the proposed Catenary Towers on the westbound side would be installed by means of hand digging a hole for the foundation, returning to pour the concrete at a later date and then returning again at an even later date to install the tower.

Mr. Mulvehill asked if there were any numbers for the appraisal at this time. Mr. Sotnik said no, DOT would not have an appraisal value until approximately December 1, 2003.

Mr. Sotnik moved on to point out the changes that were made on the eastbound / Henry Street side of the project. He indicated a crosshatched easement area that would provide ingress and egress to the proposed Catenary Towers from Monroe Street as well as to the at-grade track for future construction, reconstruction and maintenance as required. Mr. Sotnik indicated that this area would be a permanent easement to DOT / Metro-North. He stated that this is currently City property and the easement area would be limited to travel

only and is not to be used for storage of materials or equipment nor impede the use of the public and private parking spaces or normal traffic flow in the train station. He indicated that the easement area crosses a portion of one of the eight parking spaces for police vehicles at the Police Substation.

Mr. Sotnik addressed the crosswalk located on the Police Substation side of the site within the proposed permanent easement area and said it would be kept open for pedestrians. Mr. Bentkover commented that it is never used by the public anyway.

Mr. Mulvehill asked about the current location of the driveway and the possibility that it might be relocated in the future if the adjacent lot were to become City property. He wanted to know if DOT would consider the possibility of an easement where the ingress and egress could be relocated if this type of project was done in the future. Mr. Sotnik said it's possible that they would consider this as an option as long as they would have access to their property, but he suggested leaving it as is for now to allow the negotiations for the currently proposed easement area to move forward. Mr. Sotnik stated that compensation from DOT for easement areas is based upon square footage, and having a variable square footage for an easement area based upon a project that may happen in the future would muddy the waters for the current negotiation process.

Mr. Mulvehill asked about the triangle piece of land covered with grease and oil in the permanent easement area. Mr. Sotnik referred to a picture and said there was currently a lot of oil and grease in that area, but he thought it would be good if the DOT would compensate the City for the area. Mr. Sotnik stated that the piece of property was probably in this condition due to past use by Metro-North.

Mr. Sotnik moved on to the area around proposed Catenary Tower 519A on the eastbound / Henry Street side. He pointed out the opening in the chain link fence and the revised parking spaces. He said the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the back of the platform was 2.5 ft. Again, DOT made the revisions requested. Mr. Sotnik stated that DOT would need a temporary working easement as well as a permanent property taking at this location to install the foundation on what is now City property. He went on to explain that there was an additional change to the time frame for the temporary working easement area. It will be required for 6-months now, not 4-months as DOT previously explained. He explained that the Contractor would come in and drill the hole for the foundation and then come back to pour the concrete at a later date. He noted that the construction for both of the proposed Catenary Towers on the eastbound / Henry Street side would be done during the day. Mr. Sotnik explained that even though the temporary easements would be acquired for six months, the Contractor would not be working for six months straight. He stated that both of the proposed Catenary Towers on the eastbound / Henry Street side would be installed by means of drilling a hole for the foundation, returning to pour the concrete at a later date and then returning again at an even later date to install the tower. He indicated that DOT has stated that they will compensate the City for five spaces for the temporary easement, two spaces for the permanent property taking area and seven spaces due to the loss of use (commuters will not be able to back out due to the location of the temporary

work easement) at the location around proposed Catenary Tower 519A. He stated that the handicap ramp would be accessible in this area as he pointed out an at-grade concrete curb on the drawing.

Mr. Sotnik pointed out the temporary easement area required to get to proposed Catenary Tower 518A on the eastbound /Henry Street side. He stated that the proposed Catenary Tower 518A was on railroad property, but DOT would need a temporary easement from the end of the permanent easement providing ingress and egress from Monroe Street to get to the proposed Catenary Tower. He said the distance between the center of the proposed Catenary Tower foundation and the back of the platform was 4 ft. Again, DOT made the revisions requested. He went on to explain that there was an additional change to the time frame for the temporary easement area. It will be required for 6-months now, not 4-years as DOT previously explained. He explained that the Contractor would come in and drill the hole for the foundation and then come back to pour the concrete at a later date.

Mr. Sotnik explained the details of the process that this project would go through as follows. He said that DOT had already bid this project, but was waiting to award the project pending the signature of the Right of Entry agreement. He explained that the Right Of Entry agreement allows the DOT to award the project and allows the Contractor to begin work on the property on behalf of DOT. He stated that if the Right of Entry is granted, DOT would award the contract on December 31, 2003. Next, an Appraiser will complete the appraisal during the week of Thanksgiving (by no later than December 1, 2003). Then, an Acquisition Agent will make an offer for compensation to the City in writing. If the City is not satisfied with the offer it can negotiate with the Agent and present a case for higher compensation with the appropriate documentation. Once negotiations are completed, a voucher is created and the City can either accept or deny the offer. At the same time, a release from the Condominium Association is signed by the appropriate Agent for the Condominium Association. This item is required by State Law for any Condominium. If the City accepts the offer, the file goes to the Title Division of DOT and the Title documents are prepared and filed in the Land Records in the Town Clerks office in Norwalk after being reviewed by the City Law Office. If the City declines the offer, the City is sent what DOT calls a "7 step letter" that explains the Eminent Domain procedure. Then DOT prepares the Eminent Domain Legal Documents. The City will then receive a letter of Condemnation for the required property from the Superior Court in Norwalk on behalf of DOT. The property may only be used for Transportation purposes by DOT.

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN MULVEHILL TO EXECUTE TWO (2) RIGHT OF ENTRY DOCUMENTS BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK PARKING AUTHORITY AND THE CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION CATENARY TOWER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Action on any item discussed herein

None.

Next Parking Authority Meeting:
Wednesday, December 17, 2003; 7:30 p.m., Public Works Conf. Room

ADJOURNMENT

**** MR. BENTKOVER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN**
**** MR. JELLERETTE SECONDED**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Diane Graham
Telesco Secretarial Services