PARKING AUTHORITY MINUTES

PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 25, 2006

ATTENDANCE: Urban Mulvehill, Chairman; Stephen Bentkover, Vice Chair; John Federici, Victor Cavallo

STAFF: Kathryn Hebert, DPW Administrative Service Manager; Frank DelMonaco, LAZ Parking; Hal Alvord, Public Works Director (7:40 p.m.)

OTHERS: Jackie Lightfield, SONO Business Association Parking and Security Committee Co-Chair; Lewis Avrick, SONO Business Association Parking and Security Committee Co-Chair; Megan Alfen, Chase Bank Manager; Nick Pacella, Richard Erlinger, SONO Business Owner; Mark Wilson, SONO resident; Timothy Sheehan, Redevelopment Agency; Munro Johnson, Redevelopment Agency; Robert Koch, The Hour

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mulvehill called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

Public Hearing on the Proposed Fee Schedule Changes

Chairman Mulvehill opened the public hearing on the Proposed Fee Schedule Changes. The first subject under discussion would be the proposed changes to the Webster Street Parking Lot.

Let it be noted that the following comments and remarks by all speakers have been summarized and are not necessarily verbatim.

Webster Street Parking Lot

Ms. Lightfield introduced herself to the Parking Authority members and stated that she was a Norwalk resident and the SONO Business Association Parking and Security Committee Co-Chair. Ms. Lightfield then reviewed her email dated October 18, 2006 for the Authority members and strongly encouraged them not to eliminate the grace period until after 7 p.m. rather than the proposed 6 p.m. Ms. Lightfield pointed out that there are a number of take out restaurants on North Main Street that would be adversely affected by this change. She also emphasized that the merchants would be comfortable the elimination of the grace period if there were loading zones available. Ms. Lightfield went on to say that the SONO Business Association Parking and Security Committee felt that the 15 minute grace period would create pricing confusion. She thanked the Authority for their time and consideration.

Mr. Pacella spoke next and thanked the Authority members for the addition of parking meters on Marshall and North Water Street. He then went on to express his concern that the restaurant owners who have take out food may not be able to adjust to a fifteen minute grace period and also requested that the elimination of the grace period not be enacted until after 7 p.m. He also reiterated Ms. Lightfield's point that a two-tiered pricing system was confusing.

Ms. Lightfield then reiterated that her organization was requesting that the 45 minute grace period be continued before 7 p.m., but discontinued after 7 p.m.

Mr. Pacella commented that if the businesses adjacent to the Webster Street Lot are either forced to move or close, parking will no longer be a problem at Webster Street.

Mr. Avrick, SONO Business Association Parking and Security Committee Co-Chair and owner of Avrick Furniture, then addressed the Authority. He reiterated the request that the elimination of the grace period occur after 7 p.m. He also commented that there was a problem with the strong smells from the dumpsters behind the Cold Stone Creamery. Ms. Hebert stated that she had spoken with the Health Department and that the offending businesses had been cited. Mr. Avrick suggested a daily inspection with immediate citations for a period of time until the problem is corrected. Ms. Hebert explained that the enclosed dumpster area behind the theater had recently been corrected and that this type of planning will be included in the Capital Budget in September. She encouraged those who were present and concerned about this to come and support that issue when the Capital Budget was presented.

Mr. Avrick felt that the lowering of the rates would be newsworthy. Ms. Hebert replied that there was a reporter from The Hour present. Mr. Avrick asked if flyers could be handed out. Ms. Hebert replied that they could. She also stated that there would be a press conference in the future.

Ms. Alfen, the Chase Bank branch manager, addressed the Authority next. She stated that the bank business traffic was down 40% since Webster Street had begun charging. Ms. Alfen stated that the bank's lease will be up for renewal in May and that the bank may not be able to stay at that location because of the decreasing customer base. She also reminded the Authority that it take times for the elderly to get into the building after parking and that 15 minutes may not be enough for them to complete their business. Ms. Alfen strongly recommended that the grace period remain at 45 minutes. She also commented that sometimes it takes 15 minutes just to exit the lot.

Mr. Erlinger introduced himself to the Authority and stated that he was a SONO business owner. He commented that when customers come into his store, they are constantly glancing at their watches rather than shopping. He also stated that since he is disabled, he would not be able to exit his vehicle, do his banking and return to his vehicle in 15 minutes. Because of this, he uses the drive up window, but this often takes more than 15 minutes. Mr. Erlinger stated that he felt the constant fee changes were confusing and that there seems to be beta testing going on, particularly with those new to the area. He also observed that the parking on the street outside his business appears to be empty between the hours of 10 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Mr. Bentkover commented that the Authority is attempting to balance the needs of the many against the needs of the few. Unfortunately, he felt that the Authority was no closer to the answer to having the answers that will satisfy everyone than they were when they were initially formed.

Mr. Erlinger responded that he was aware of the difficulties for the Parking Authority but also aware of the perceptions of the visitors. He also commented that the meter collectors are a bit too vigilant and sometimes wait at a particular vehicle until the meter clicks off and then issue a ticket. Once someone gets ticketed a few times, they will not come back. SONO was created to be a mix of both large businesses and smaller businesses. If the smaller businesses disappear, then SONO will cease to be the attraction it currently is.

Chairman Mulvehill explained that the Crown Theaters believe they are entitled to free parking under the LDA that was made with the City many years ago. He stated that Corporation Counsel is currently reviewing this situation and that there does not appear to be a time limit regarding the issue of free parking. At the beginning of the negotiations, the Theaters were agreeable to having some of the free parking at the Maritime Garage. Chairman Mulvehill commented that the Theaters seemed to be insisting that the rates be lowered to $2.00 an hour or the Theater will insist on the return of the free parking for their patrons. Portions of that agreement have expired and the dynamics have changed. A reduction in rates will result in a financial shortfall. In order to cover the shortfall, the grace period is being reduced.

Ms. Lightfield said that she would be negligent in her duty if she failed to remind the Authority again about having the grace period extend to 7 p.m. The SONO Business Association is opposed to eliminating the grace period during the day.

Chairman Mulvehill stated that the Authority was considering a 15 minute grace period throughout the day.

Chairman Mulvehill then asked if anyone else wished to speak on this issue.

Mr. Wilson, who resides at 137 Washington Street, addressed the Commission next. He expressed concerns that the shortfall would fall on the residents. He commented that he had attended the public hearings before the Parking Authority was formed and that the SONO Business Association under the leadership of Tom Becker was strongly supporting the Maritime Garage. Now the Theaters want free parking. Mr. Wilson felt that the Theaters were not necessarily good neighbors and that parking should be factored into the business plans. He commented that he was not necessarily happy when the Haviland Street lot fees went up, but he pays them. Everyone should pay their fair share.

Chairman Mulvehill asked if there was any other member of the public who wished to speak on the issue of the Proposed Webster Street Parking Lot Fee Changes. Seeing that there were no additional members of the public who wished to speak on this issue, Chairman Mulvehill closed the hearing on the Proposed Webster Street Parking Lot Fee Changes at 7:15 p.m.

Proposed Fee Changes for Parking Violations

Chairman Mulvehill opened the public hearing on the Proposed Fee Changes for Parking Violations at 7:15 p.m. He asked if there were any members of the public present who wished to speak on the issue.

Mr. Erlinger commented that he was happy to see that the Penalties were more consistent with other areas.

Chairman Mulvehill asked if there was any other member of the public who wished to speak on the issue of the Proposed Fee Changes for Parking Violations. Seeing that there were no additional members of the public who wished to speak on this issue, Chairman Mulvehill closed the hearing on the Proposed Fee Changes for Parking Violations at 7:16 p.m.

RECESS

Chairman Mulvehill declared a recess at 7:16 p.m. The Authority reconvened their meeting at 7:27 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Mulvehill called the regular meeting of the Parking Authority to order at 7:27 p.m. He stated that Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Johnson were present from the Parking Authority and requested that the Authority members agree to hear the presentation from the Parking Authority first. This was agreeable to all.

5. Approve the Isaac Street Municipal Parking Lot Development Project
Presentation by the Redevelopment Agency

Mr. Johnson opened the presentation by saying that the Redevelopment Agency had returned to the Parking Authority to secure an option agreement between the City of Norwalk and the Redevelopment Agency for the Isaac Street Parking Lot. Similar to the plan presented and approved last month, this would be an early step for revitalizing Wall Street, which has been approved in concept by other multiple municipal bodies. Mr. Johnson went on to state that all the background, rationale and guarantees stated in the July and September presentations apply to this agreement, also. All the public parking at the site will remain. At the September meeting, the Authority requested two assurances that were integrated into the final High Street agreement, which have been also incorporated into this agreement from the outset. Specifically, this focused on the fact that the parking for the proposed residential units are adequate, as determined by Zoning, and that the agreement not be executed until the development is substantially changed by more than 20% without the consent of the Common Council. The Planning Committee of the Common Council imposed additional requirement subsequent to the Parking Authority's requests. These include a five year time limit and a requirement that specifies the contemplated development components. Mr. Johnson stated that the Redevelopment Agency was grateful for the approval on the High Street project and said that it was hoped that the Parking Authority would see fit to act in a similar manner for Isaac. He then went on to say that it was the intent of both Mr. Sheehan and himself to keep the discussion focused on the specifics of what is within the scope of the Parking Authority's approval. Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Johnson did not intend to address the issues the potential future project, the potential future parking demands, the potential future developer intent or anything else like that. Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Johnson would be focusing on the option agreement itself, the terms of the agreement and why the agency was seeking the Parking Authority's approval. Mr. Johnson concluded that the Agency was requesting that the Parking Authority vote on the issue at the meeting in order to allow the Redevelopment Agency to take the next steps it requires.

Chairman Mulvehill then asked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Sheehan that if they were not going to address the downtown overall parking demand in the future, who would be addressing that issue. Mr. Sheehan stated that this would come under the Planning Commission's authority and also is covered by the Master Plan development. Mr. Sheehan went on to say the Planning Commission has adopted this particular plan, pending approval of the Master Plan for Conservation and Development. Mr. Sheehan said that this was developed by the Norwalk Redevelopment Agency in conjunction with the Planning Commission. The Redevelopment Agency makes presentations to the Planning Commission to ensure that the plans are in line and meet municipal objectives associated with comprehensive master planning for the City of Norwalk. The Planning Commission has approved this plan. Mr. Johnson added that the Planning Commission has also approved the present option agreement that was currently before the Parking Authority.

Chairman Mulvehill stated that he wished to be assured that the Planning Commission has in fact studied this issue. He expressed his concern that the Planning Commission might assume that the Parking Authority is overseeing the parking. Mr. Sheehan replied that the Parking Authority had no Master Planning Authority with regard to the parking needs of the City, by statute or by code. Chairman Mulvehill disagreed, saying that it was by practice. Mr. Sheehan repeated that the Parking Authority had no Master Planning Authority with regard to the parking needs of the City, by statute or by code. Chairman Mulvehill replied that when 800 people arrived to park in a 400 vehicle lot, the Parking Authority has to deal with it. Mr. Sheehan replied that this was a Planning issue. Mr. Sheehan reiterated that by statute and by code, that was not an authority that the Parking Authority has, in terms of the parking demand for the community. That specifically falls to the Planning Department and more specifically to the Planning Commission. Chairman Mulvehill replied that it did not sound like the Redevelopment Agency needs the approval of the Parking Authority. Mr. Sheehan replied that Chairman Mulvehill asked who had looked at the plan and whose responsibility it was to oversee projects like this. He then stated that he had merely answered the question and that the Redevelopment Agency would like the Parking Authority's approval.

Chairman Mulvehill asked if a study of the future parking demands has been done. Mr. Sheehan replied that this question should be asked of Mike Greene or to Walter Briggs, the Chairman of the Planning Commission. Chairman Mulvehill stated that he was not trying to take over a planning function, but just wanted to make sure that in a few years from now, someone isn't wondering why parking wasn't taken in to account. Mr. Sheehan said that the Redevelopment Agency had presented the Parking Authority with information indicating that the existing public parking spaces that are currently there will remain. He went on to say that it would be possible to encompass double the size of the development that is proposed and could accommodate all of that in the existing public parking that is currently there. Chairman Mulvehill stated that his concern was not the current parking, but that the request, that is being made, requires that the City give up the future capacity to expand the parking. In simple terms, this means that if the project is completely successful and there are thriving businesses in the downtown area, which generates the demand for parking, the City will not longer have the ability to say that they can build a parking garage at that site because the land will have been transferred to someone else. Once this land is transferred, the City will no long have the capacity for future parking expansion. Mr. Sheehan replied that this was calculated into the Master Plan, which was done and presented to the Authority. He stated that when the Redevelopment Agency embarked on this project, it was understood that the entire premise for the Wall Street Development Plan was to basically leverage the City's parking resources into development opportunities. Chairman Mulvehill stated that he did not remember anything like that being presented to the Authority. Mr. Sheehan stated that it needed to be very clear that this was the City's urban development policy for over four years. There have been numerous public meetings on this issue and it was presented to the Authority last month. Mr. Sheehan said that during the last four years, the Parking Authority might not have retained the information. Mr. Sheehan then stated that he had come to the Parking Authority and done a presentation on leveraging the City's parking resources. He also said that he would be happy to research the dates of the presentations for Chairman Mulvehill. Chairman Mulvehill replied that to his knowledge, the presentations were more of a heads up in terms of long term planning rather than a proposed plan of action. Chairman Mulvehill then state that the next thing he was aware of was that his Authority was being asked to approve plans in very short time periods. He reiterated that his concern was centered on getting assurance that someone has actually looked at the plan in terms of future parking and that Mr. Sheehan had given him the names of those people to contact.

Mr. Johnson then suggested that the parking needs have been planned for and that this was part of the Master Plan for Conservation and Development, which is a ten year horizon document, which was adopted by the City in 2003. That plan specifically targeted leveraging up the public land resources, i.e. the parking lots in the area, but also presented plan around what the amount of public parking should be for the development and what the amount of private parking should be for that development.

Mr. Bentkover stated that the ten year plan was not done or adopted by the Parking Authority. Mr. Sheehan reiterated that the Parking Authority does not have that authority. Mr. Bentkover replied that the Parking Authority was not asking for that authority. He then pointed out that the Redevelopment Agency was coming to the Parking Authority and asking for approval on a project that he had mentioned at the September meeting. Mr. Johnson had replied that the Isaac Street Parking Lot was not a completed project yet. Mr. Sheehan disagreed.

Mr. Bentkover went on to say that if Mr. Sheehan was saying that the Parking Authority was informed about this plan, Mr. Sheehan was incorrect. Mr. Sheehan said that this was incorrect. Mr. Bentkover disagreed. Mr. Bentkover said that if Mr. Sheehan felt that all of Chairman Mulvehill's concerns have been met then perhaps having someone come from the Planning Commission to the Parking Authority to speak on this issue. Mr. Sheehan reiterated that the Parking Authority does not have that authority. Mr. Bentkover replied that in that case, then the Planning Commission did not need the Parking Authority's approval and that he did not like being put up against a wall like this. Mr. Sheehan replied that he had asked if the Authority members had any questions about this a few days ago and if there had been questions or requests for people to be present, Mr. Sheehan would have requested those people to be present.

Chairman Mulvehill pointed out that he works in New York, running a business. Being invited a few days ago to let the Redevelopment Agency know if he had questions about the proposed plan does not work for him. Mr. Sheehan replied that he had let the staff know that he had questions. Chairman Mulvehill replied that he had spoken with Kathryn while in a cab in New York this morning. He stated that he had told Ms. Hebert that he did not understand why the Redevelopment did not understand his concerns about giving up future parking capacity and that this issue had not been addressed for the second time.

Chairman Mulvehill stated that Mr. Sheehan's answer was that someone else has studied this issue. Chairman Mulvehill went on to say that Mr. Sheehan was working on this project as part of his job and that there was a body of appointed people who work on these projects only once a month. Chairman Mulvehill said that it would be not be realistic to expect those who are on commission to respond to material in a few days. As a result, the Authority members end up with working meetings where the information is presented to them and they must ask their questions then. During the past week, Chairman Mulvehill stated that he did not have time to write an email about his concerns or even develop a long list of questions about his concerns. However, his concerns center on the giving up of the land for future potential parking capacity. He pointed out that people were complaining about how the City had given up the land by the Maritime Aquarium for a parking garage and the Maritime Aquarium had voiced concerns regarding whether the Parking Authority was taking into account their future expansion and parking needs. There is criticism of this and it is going to the Parking Authority, which in fact, did not even exist when the plans for the parking garage were done. Mr. Sheehan asked what the demand on that garage would be for the next ten years. Chairman Mulvehill replied that according to the president of the Aquarium, the Maritime Aquarium thinks they may run out of capacity in the next two years. The Aquarium is planning to increase their attendance by 30% over the next several years at peak times. Mr. Sheehan said that he seriously questions that plan.

Chairman Mulvehill said that the Authority could act on the plan or determine what is the most concise way for someone to come down and present their study's findings to the Parking Authority. When land is given up, it is given up forever. Mr. Sheehan stated that the Parking Authority has weight in the decision, as does the City of Norwalk, which is the owner of the asset. Chairman Mulvehill stated that Crown Theater was asserting that the City had given up 260 parking spaces to the Theaters. The Corporation Counsel is currently researching this matter. In a related vein, Chairman Mulvehill said that someone should look at the situation at Main and Wall, with respect to the High Street option agreement. There should be provisions or some other technique, in any land transfer that the land reverts to the City if the developer does not fulfill their promises of running the lot in a manner that is keeping within the standards of the City. Mr. Sheehan asked if he was referring to the public spaces or the land itself. Chairman Mulvehill stated that it would be possible for a condominium association to decide not to plow or maintain the public portion of a parking garage. Mr. Sheehan pointed out that these would be mixed used developments that would depend on the public parking that is there. He then asked what the benefit would be for the developers to ignore the public since the mixed-use component would include commercial, which would depend on the public spaces as well. Chairman Mulvehill reiterated that if an association does not keep up the facility for whatever reason and the land has been transferred to them, the City would have no recourse. Isaac Street is important to the overall parking scheme downtown.

Mr. Sheehan said that he had no problems discussing that when the option was actually executed and the project is moving forward. Chairman Mulvehill suggested perhaps a 99 year lease with the right to renew it might be an option as long as the developer has performed all the obligations that they have taken on. There are many safeguards in the Maritime Garage in terms of who owns it, and what happens if it is not kept up.

Mr. Sheehan commented that the Redevelopment Agency had been part of the market study that was performed for the Maritime Garage before he worked at the Redevelopment Agency. According to the market study, the garage should be operating at peak capacity now. Unfortunately, the garage is not filled. Mr. Sheehan said that he did not disagree with Chairman Mulvehill regarding the planning of such a facility and the care needed. He also reiterated that during his meeting with the president of the Maritime Aquarium, the president expressed concerns that the Parking Authority had rented spaces to Virgin Atlantic without consulting with the Aquarium.

Chairman Mulvehill concluded with the statement that parking has to work and that he would much rather err on the side of too much parking rather than not enough. He also commented that people were complaining that people were avoiding Webster Street because of the fees, but it remains consistently full. Mr. Sheehan stated that at the end of the day, having constraints on parking is a good thing because it means that people are there. Mr. Sheehan stated that he was with Chairman Mulvehill in making sure that there was at least adequate capacity for parking. Chairman Mulvehill commented that with issues such as the Haviland Street deck, the construction of the deck precludes adding another level.

Mr. Sheehan then returned to the issue of having someone take a look at the parking. He then suggested that possibly a memo of understanding indicating that the plan had been reviewed the plan which would be cosigned by Mike Greene and Walter Briggs for the file. The memo of understanding would indicate that it is their belief that the parking is adequate enough, based on what is being proposed for both projects. Chairman Mulvehill said that it would suffice for him, but the other members of the Authority would have to speak for themselves. He also mentioned that there had been two requests for expansion, which would have involved the Isaac Street Lot, one being Action Housing, and a second one from My Three Sons. There are many buildings in the Wall Street area that are under utilized and if these buildings were utilized, there would be a strong increase in traffic and parking.

Mr. Sheehan asked if there would be a vote contingent on having the memorandum of understanding for the file. Chairman Mulvehill stated that it would be fine with him. The other members stated that giving up the rights was a major concern. Mr. Sheehan reiterated that the Chairman of the Planning Commission has agreed to this plan. He also said that he would be happy to have the memorandum of understanding signed by Mr. Briggs and Mr. Greene for the Authority's file. Mr. Sheehan said for clarification, that in terms of the planning issues, that the Redevelopment and Planning and Zoning have been working together with the general trends in urban planning. The Redevelopment Agency cannot work on a plan that is not within the constrict of the Zoning Regulations. Without the cooperation of Planning and Zoning, any proposed project will be futile. Chairman Mulvehill pointed out that most of the businesses in the center of Norwalk rely on the municipal parking. Therefore, if under the zoning rules, no one has to provide for additional parking spaces, there will be problems. The critical planning component to this is that if a merchant or developer wants to expand, it will be self-limiting if there is no parking. It would be good for the City to say that they have potential parking for expansion. Mr. Sheehan commented that the Webster Street Lot was a result of urban renewal. He then went on to say that in his mind, the Lot was bad urban renewal because it was just a surface lot and has remained just a surface lot for twenty-five plus years. That is not good urban planning. It should provide public parking but it should provide more than public parking for the critical land mass that it occupies. Chairman Mulvehill agreed saying that it should provide more public parking than it does currently.

Chairman Mulvehill thanked Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Johnson for their time.

APPROVALS/AUTHORIZATIONS

1. Approve the Minutes from the Parking Authority meeting held on Wednesday, September 27, 2006.

Mr. Bentkover stated for the record that he would like to thank the secretarial service for what he thought were the best minutes that the Authority had received since the Authority began. He felt that they were excellent.

Chairman Mulvehill stated that he had some lengthy additions for clarification.

Please note the following changes:

Page 2, 5th paragraph, line 2: please change "A lengthy discussion followed regarding the number of parking spaces required by Zoning, and whether the proposed language in the option agreement would cover maintenance issues and clearly state the retention of the 91 public parking spaces." To

"A lengthy discussion followed regarding the number of parking spaces required by Zoning, and future parking demands including any "fee in lieu" public parking the City might be asked to provide. It was also discussed whether the proposed language in the option agreement would cover maintenance issues and clearly state the retention of the 91 public parking spaces. Chairman Mulvehill stated his principle concern was knowing that the lot as proposed would be adequate to supply the private and public parking demand for that area if the project is successful. Chairman Mulvehill was given assurances that the Redevelopment Agency had analyzed the new construction and projected uses that depend on public parking and concluded that the parking would be adequate to meet demand of successful redevelopment."

Mr. Bentkover asked that the following change be made:

Page 2, paragraph 2 – please change the following from

"He also briefly mentioned the proposed Isaac Street parking structure, which is still in the planning stages." To

He also briefly mentioned the proposed Isaac Street parking structure, which is still in the planning stages. Nothing had been finalized and that the Redevelopment Agency would be coming back to the Parking Authority at some future date."

Page 3, paragraph 2, please change - It was noted that the Vice Chairman would be acting on behalf of the Parking Authority rather than just the Chairman. To "It was noted that the Vice Chairman could act on behalf of the Parking Authority rather than just the Chairman."

Page 2, paragraph 2, please change "the assignment of $500,00 earmarked for the repair" to "the assignment of $1,500,000 earmarked for the repair"

Page 3, Change Motion Wording:

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED OPTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NORWALK AND THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE SALE OF THE MAIN/HIGH MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT PENDING THE FOLLOWING CHANGES SUGGESTED BY THE PARKING AUTHORITY AND APPROVED BY CORPORATION COUNSEL:

1. PROJECT IS NOT APPROVED IN FORM SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED TO THE PARKING AUTHORITY THEN OPTION WILL NOT BE EXERCISED.
2. ADEQUATE PRIVATE PARKING DOWN THE ROAD FOR POTENTIAL SPIN OFF DEVELOPMENT.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Please change the following heading on page 4:

7. AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ISSUE ORDERS ON CONTRACT TO NEW ENGLAND PAVING CO., FOR PROJECT NO. 4R 2005-3, PROPOSED BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR, IN CONNECTION WITH THE PAVEMENT PROJECT ON THE EASTBOUND SIDE OF THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION, FOR A SUM AND PAYMENT NOT TO EXCEED #22,750. ACCOUNT NO. 21409B 5727

to:

7. AUTHORIZE THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ISSUE ORDERS ON CONTRACT TO NEW ENGLAND PAVING CO., FOR PROJECT NO. 4R 2005-3, PROPOSED BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR, IN CONNECTION WITH THE PAVEMENT PROJECT ON THE EASTBOUND SIDE OF THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION, FOR A SUM AND PAYMENT NOT TO EXCEED $22,750. ACCOUNT NO. 21409B 5727

Page 5 - Please change the following motion from:

** CHAIRMAN MULVEHILL MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ISSUE ORDERS ON CONTRACT TO NEW ENGLAND PAVING CO., FOR PROJECT NO. 4R 2005-3, PROPOSED BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR, IN CONNECTION WITH THE PAVEMENT PROJECT ON THE EASTBOUND SIDE OF THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION, FOR A SUM AND PAYMENT NOT TO EXCEED #22,750. ACCOUNT NO. 21409B 5727
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

To:

** CHAIRMAN MULVEHILL MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ISSUE ORDERS ON CONTRACT TO

NEW ENGLAND PAVING CO., FOR PROJECT NO. 4R 2005-3, PROPOSED BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR, IN CONNECTION WITH THE PAVEMENT PROJECT ON THE EASTBOUND SIDE OF THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION, FOR A SUM AND PAYMENT NOT TO EXCEED $22,750. ACCOUNT NO. 21409B 5727
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Page 7, paragraph 5, line 5: Please change the following from: “the LDA did not state how long actually would allow free parking for movie patrons.” To “the LDA did not state how long the agreement actually would allow free parking for movie patrons.”

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approved at the Parking Authority Meeting dated September 27, 2006. Technical Correction: Authorize the Chairman of the Parking Authority, Urban Mulvehill, or the Vice Chairman of the Parking Authority, Stephen Bentkover, to execute a five year lease term with New England Fashion + Design Cooperative for the Old Police Substation Building located at the South Norwalk Railroad Station, based on the attached list of terms.

Ms. Hebert explained that even though the Parking Authority had approved this item last month, the Corporation Counsel wished to have it done as a separate vote with a technical correction.

** CHAIRMAN MULVEHILL MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUTHORIZATION THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN MULVEHILL, OR THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, STEPHEN BENTKOVER, TO EXECUTE A FIVE YEAR LEASE TERM WITH NEW ENGLAND FASHION + DESIGN COOPERATIVE FOR THE OLD POLICE SUBSTATION BUILDING LOCATED AT THE SOUTH NORWALK RAILROAD STATION, BASED ON THE ATTACHED LIST OF TERMS.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Authorize the Chairman of the Parking Authority, Urban Mulvehill, or the Vice Chairman of the Parking Authority, Stephen Bentkover, to execute a Lease Agreement with the Alga Marina Restaurant, for the space inside the Maritime Garage adjacent to the Parking Lobby area, for a five-year term based on the attached list of terms.

Chairman Mulvehill mentioned again that the president of the Maritime Aquarium was concerned about the parking situation and the fact that the Maritime Aquarium had not been consulted when the deal with Virgin Atlantic was made. Mr. Alvord and Ms. Hebert both assured him that the space that was being leased was vacant retail space and would not impact the parking in any way.

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, URBAN MULVEHILL, OR THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY, STEPHEN BENTKOVER, TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH THE ALGA MARINA RESTAURANT, FOR THE SPACE INSIDE THE MARITIME GARAGE ADJACENT TO THE PARKING LOBBY AREA, FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM BASED ON THE ATTACHED LIST OF TERMS.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approve the proposed fee schedule changes.

Chairman Mulvehill commented that there had been much public input on this issue, particularly about the grace period and the effect it would have on business. Ms. Lightfield once again requested that the Authority please consider extending the grace period to 7 p.m. Mr. Alvord commented that he had encouraged the manager of Crown Theater to attend tonight's meeting.

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGE IN FEES AT THE WEBSTER STREET PARKING LOT FROM:

THE EVENING RATE OF $3.00 FLAT FEE FROM 6 TO 9 P.M. TO $2.00 FLAT FEE FROM 6 TO 10 P.M.

THE EVENING RATE OF $5.00 FLAT FEE AFTER 9 P.M. TO $5.00 AFTER 10 P.M.

AND THE GRACE PERIOD OF 45 MINUTES BE REDUCED TO 15 MINUTES DURING THE DAY AND ELIMINATED AFTER 6 P.M.

WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE WOULD BE THREE (3) 15 MINUTE PARKING SPACES CREATED ON NORTH MAIN STREET FOR LOADING AND TAKE OUT.

**THE MOTION FAILED WITH TWO IN FAVOR (BENTKOVER AND FREDERICI) AND TWO AGAINST (MULVEHILL AND COVELLO).

Proposed Fee Schedule Changes:

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGE IN PARKING VIOLATIONS FEES SCHEDULE FROM:

A $10 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR BEING PARKED IN A CROSSWALK; TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR BEING PARKED IN A CROSSWALK.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR OVERTIME PARKING TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR OVERTIME PARKING.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR PARKING AT THE CURB TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR PARKING AT THE CURB.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR PARKING IN A NO PARKING ZONE TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR PARKING IN A NO PARKING ZONE.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR OCCUPYING MORE THAN ONE SPACE TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR OCCUPYING MORE THAN ONE SPACE.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR PARKING ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE STREET TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR PARKING ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE STREET.

A $15 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $30, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $50 FOR UNATTENDED VEHICLES TO A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $40, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $60 FOR UNATTENDED VEHICLES.

A $20 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR PARKING ON THE SIDEWALK TO A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $60, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $90 FOR PARKING ON THE SIDEWALK.

A $25 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR CROSSWALK OBSTRUCTING TO A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $60, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $90 FOR CROSSWALK OBSTRUCTING.

A $25 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR DRIVEWAY OBSTRUCTING TO A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $60, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $90 FOR DRIVEWAY OBSTRUCTING.

A $25 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR PARKING WITHIN 25 FEET OF A STOP SIGN TO A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $60, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $90 FOR PARKING WITHIN 25 FEET OF A STOP SIGN.

A $25 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR OBSTRUCTING A BUS STOP TO A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $60, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $90 FOR OBSTRUCTING A BUS STOP.

A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR PARKING WITHIN 10 FEET OF A FIRE HYDRANT TO A $35 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $70, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $105 FOR PARKING WITHIN 10 FEET OF A FIRE HYDRANT.

A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR PARKING IN A FIRE LANE TO A $35 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $70, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $105 FOR PARKING IN A FIRE LANE.

A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR PARKING IN A TOW ZONE TO A $35 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $70, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $105 FOR PARKING IN A TOW ZONE.

A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR OBSTRUCTING TRAFFIC TO A $35 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $70, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $105 FOR OBSTRUCTING TRAFFIC.

A $30 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR DOUBLE PARKING TO A $35 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $70, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $105 FOR DOUBLE PARKING.

A $45 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $75, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $100 FOR PARKING WITHOUT A VALID PERMIT TO A $50 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $100, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $125 FOR PARKING WITHOUT A VALID PERMIT.

A $75 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $100, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $100 FOR A COMMERICAL VEHICLE TO A $80 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $110, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $125 FOR A COMMERICAL VEHICLE.

A $25 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $50, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $75 FOR OBSTRUCTION SNOW REMOVAL TO A $100 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $125, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $150 FOR OBSTRUCTION SNOW REMOVAL.

A $90 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $100, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $100 FOR HANDICAPPED PARKING TO A $150 FINE, WITH A 15 DAY PENALTY OF $175, AND A 30 DAY PENTALY OF $200 FOR HANDICAPPED PARKING.

A BOOT FEE OF $75.00 TO A BOOT FEE OF $85.00.

A TOWED VEHICLE FROM $60.00 TO A TOWED VEHICLE FEE OF $70.00.

AND A REDUCTION IN THE BOOT/TOW ELIGIBILITY FROM FIVE OR MORE TICKETS TO THREE OR MORE TICKETS.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Mulvehill commented that there would be a mock disaster drill on the 28th at the South Norwalk Station and asked Mr. Alvord what would needed to be done. Mr. Alvord replied that he had been aware of all the planning stages and that the Police and Fire Department were taking care of all the arrangements.

DISCUSSION

6. Monthly Financial Report

Ms. Hebert reviewed her report for the Authority members. There was a brief discussion on creating a Capital Funds Budget with a cap for future improvements. Ms. Hebert also said that she was in the process of putting together the proposed 07-08 Operating and Capital Budgets.

7. Monthly Operation Report

Mr. DelMonaco presented his monthly report to the Authority members. There were some questions about the number of equipment failures at the Webster Street Lot. Mr. DelMonaco replied that it was important to remember two facts; that the Webster Street lot is the most utilized lot in the City and that the equipment is located outside. Factoring in the volume of traffic and the weather conditions, the equipment is functioning well.

Ms. Hebert reminded the Authority members that they still needed to vote on Agenda Item #5.

5. Approve the Isaac Street Municipal Parking Lot Development Project
Presentation by the Redevelopment Agency (CONT'D)

Chairman Mulvehill stated that he was pleased with the meeting because Mr. Sheehan had answered the question he had about the City planning for future parking. Mr. Alvord commented that Mr. Jones from the Redevelopment Agency and Mr. Briggs from the Planning Commission were very supportive. Chairman Mulvehill commented that he was not pleased that this plan would result in a loss of revenue for the Parking Authority. He also stated that the Parking Authority was created to implement policies for the City. Ms. Lightfield requested to speak and was recognized by Chairman Mulvehill. She suggested that the Parking Authority consider asking the Planning Commission to see the traffic study that was done for the project.

** MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO TABLE THE APPROVAL OF THE ISAAC STREET MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT UNTIL THE PARKING AUTHORITY HAD TIME TO EXAMINE THE EVIDENCE OF AN ANALYSIS OF THE PARKING DEMAND AND CAPACITY FOR THE PROJECT.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Capital Projects

a. Webster Parking Lot Phase II Reconfiguration Project

Ms. Hebert reported that the project was almost fully completed with only the painting in of the reserve parking space numbers and the planting of four more trees to be done.

b. Yankee Doodle Garage Improvement Project

Work has started on the Garage. The work will focus on the roof and stairwells. The painting will be done separately.

c. SoNo Lighting Under the Bridge Project

The SONO Lighting Project is ready to go and will take two weeks to complete because of the relocation of several of the historic light poles.

9. Other Business

a. South Norwalk Railroad Station – Eastbound Flood Lighting/SNEW

Mr. Alvord commented that SNEW has installed two 400-watt flood lights on each of the light poles in the eastbound Parking area.

b. Crown Theater Agreement

It was felt that the Authority needed to hear from Crown Theaters as to what the theaters planned to do about the parking situation before any further action could be taken.

c. Leases
· St. Thomas Church School – ENRR Station

Ms. Hebert reported that Corporation Counsel had sent out the lease agreement earlier in the week.

· Virgin Atlantic Airways – Maritime Garage

Ms. Hebert reported that Corporation Counsel had sent out the lease agreement to Virgin Atlantic.

d. Proposed Operating Budget – Fiscal Year 2007-08

Ms. Hebert reported that she will send the information on this for the November meeting.

e. Proposed Capital Improvement Projects – Fiscal Year 2007-08

Ms. Hebert reported that she will send the information on this for the November meeting.

f. Other

There were no additional items to be discussed at this time.

OTHER

10. Action on any item discussed herein.

There was no additional discussion at this time.

11. Next Parking Authority meeting:

Wednesday, November 15, 2006 at 7:30 p.m., Public Works Conference Room

ADJOURNMENT

**MR. BENTKOVER MOVED TO ADJOURN
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Soltes
Telesco Secretarial Services