PARKING AUTHORITY MINUTES

October 30, 2001

ATTENDANCE: Peter Nolin, Chairman; Stephen Thomas, Planning Commission; Charles Bassos, Fairfield County Savings Bank; Edward Bowers, Common Council; Tom Smith, SoNo Corporate Center

STAFF: Bill Grumman, Dept. of Public Works; Michael Greene, Planning & Zoning; Jack Miller, Finance; Edward Musante, Redevelopment; Allan Davis, Consultant

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Nolin called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Mr. Nolin said that at the last meeting the group decided that they want a Parking Authority, that they knew what territory it will encompass, and that they were going to work on a draft ordinance. A copy of Mr. Miller's re-draft was distributed at the meeting. Mr. Miller said that this re-draft ordinance has not yet been forwarded to the Law Department and to Fred Wilms, Chairman of the Ordinance Committee. Mr. Miller commented that this re-draft includes input he received after circulating the first draft.

Changes to the draft include, in Sec. XX-1, the addition of language that allows the Council, by resolution, to amend the delineated area on the map (distributed at the meeting), rather than having to go back and revise the ordinance every time the geographic boundary needs to be changed.

In Sec. XX-5, regarding the statement that the Executive Director and other employees of the authority shall not be employees of the city, Mr. Nolin asked if this meant that, they are not also employees of the city? Mr. Miller replied that this is the intent and the language will be changed to reflect that. Mr. Miller said that the real intent is that we don't want to carry over the union to the authority. Mr. Nolin stated that, before the oridinance is formalized, the Legal Department will make sure that the language meets the criteria.

In Sec. XX-6, Mr. Nolin pointed out the addition of net revenues, which means that the city will collect and then pay itself what it needs and turn over the net proceeds to the authority. In paragraph 2, Mr. Smith pointed out that "**net revenues from the city's on-street and off-street parking facilitie**s" be replaced with:

...net revenues from the dedicated parking facilities, as defined in Sec. XX-2

Mr. Musante said that someone has to determine where the net comes from. Mr. Nolin suggested that the following be added right after paragraph 2:

The city and the authority shall agree on a formula for determination of net revenues.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the authority should receive all net revenues, including revenues from uptown. Mr. Smith pointed out that if uptown parking had a negative net revenue and the district's parking had a positive net revenue, you would be siphoning off funds that might otherwise help to fund other construction. Mr. Nolin pointed out that the revenue created has to go to the bondholders. Mr. Smith said that he had a compromise suggestion: that if you allocate a space by space share of expenses within and outside the district, you have the potential that some portion of the deficit will be funded by the Parking Authority area, but not all of it. Mr. Bowers suggested that it would be simpler not to mention uptown at all, but that it is a portion of whatever revenue is generated by the authority, excluding a percentage that is set aside for future capital needs, goes to the City; the revenue that comes in goes to General Fund. There may be a need uptown, but you're not saying it.

Mr. Nolin said that the way to solve this for now is for Mr. Miller to study this more in terms of what you can do financially. Mr. Nolin asked if this is clear enough to put this to the Ordinance Committee, and Mr. Miller said that it is clear enough.
Mr. Nolin said that after our bond indebtedness is paid, the authority gets the net revenue, and suggested that the following be added:

All revenue in the district will go to the authority. The authority will compensate the City for contracted services and other costs associated with the district.

Regarding Sec. XX-7, Mr. Miller said that he wanted to set up a process because the Council each year has to approve the budget, including any revision of rates. After some discussion, Mr. Nolin recommended deleting the phrase "including any revision of rates, rentals, fees and charges, and the transfer of excess funds to the city", and adding the following statement:

In connection with the issuance of any revenue bonds, the Common Council shall approve initial rates, rentals, fees and charges of the authority, in accordance with Statute 7207.

Mr. Thomas asked, what happens if there is a shortfall? Discussion ensued, and Mr. Miller pointed out that the City has no obligation to provide funding from taxes.

The Committee discussed the last sentence in Sec. XX-3, "No person shall be appointed or reappointed to the authority unless a resident of the City of Norwalk." Mr. Bowers said that there may be a very qualified business person in Norwalk who does not live in

Norwalk, but has paid taxes here, so we are limiting ourselves. The Committee decided to delete this sentence and replace it with the following:

Three out of five members appointed or re-appointed to the authority shall be electors of the City of Norwalk.

Mr. Bowers suggested that removal language be added. Mr. Nolin suggested the following:

A member of the authority can be removed by majority vote of the Council.

**** MR. NOLIN MOVED TO SEND THE ORDINANCE ON TO THE COUNCIL'S ORDINANCE COMMITTEE WITH THE CHANGES TO BE MADE BY MR. MILLER.**

**** MR. BOWERS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Nolin adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Zucker
Telesco Secretarial Services