THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

125 East Avenue
P.O. Box 5125
Norwalk, CT 06856

TO: MEMBERS, PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

FROM: DOUGLAS E. HEMPSTEAD, CHAIRMAN

DATE: JUNE 30, 2014

RE: **MEETING NOTICE**

A Special Meeting of the Planning Committee of the Common Council will be held on **Monday, July 7th, 2014 at 7:00 P.M.** in Room A330 at Norwalk City Hall. Please Note The Time And Location.

PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
JULY 7, 2014
7:00 PM

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

I. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – March 31, 2014 – Special Meeting
May 1, 2014 – Regular Meeting
June 5, 2014 – Regular Meeting

T

II. **BUSINESS**
   A. Request for Public Hearing Regarding PY39 CAPER at August 7, 2014 Planning Committee Meeting

III. **OLD BUSINESS**

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 5, 2014

ATTENDANCE:

Redevelopment Agency:	Felix R. Serrano, Chairman; Lori Torrano Lisa Cooper; Thomas Devine; LaTanya Langley
Planning Committee:	Douglas Hempstead, Chair; Richard Bonenfant John Kydes; Shannon O'Toole Giandurco Travis Simms; Sharon Stewart
STAFF:	Timothy Sheehan, Redevelopment Agency; Atty. Marc Grenier, DePanfilis & Vallerie, LLC; Tami Strauss, Community Development Planning Director
OTHERS:	Council Member Glenn Iannaccone, Council Member John Igneri Council Member David McCarthy, Council Member Jerry Petrini, Ken Olson, POKO Partners, LLC, Michael McGuire

CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Hempstead called the joint meeting of the Common Council Planning Committee and the Redevelopment Agency Board to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL.

Chairman Hempstead called the roll. A Planning Committee quorum was present.
Agency Chair Serrano called the roll. The Redevelopment Agency Board had a quorum present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

Mr. Michael McGuire came forward and read a statement into the record. [See Attached].

Mr. Olson came forward and said that he was present to ask for an extension. He said that he had been transparent with the City. The economic recession hit many projects hard. The financing structure was changed three or four times along the way. Originally, the plan was to sell condominiums. That is not possible now. He said that the new financing model with Citibank will work. He said that he had tax credits for the affordable units and financing is available for the parking garage. Now the project is ready to go. Preliminary clean up work is underway and the abatement needs State approval. Once the State signs off, the abatement work will start and then the demolition permit will be pulled. The first phase is 101 units of housing with 120 parking spaces. 36 of the units will be affordable.

Council Member Hempstead explained that this joint type of meeting had been done one other time and was to expedite the process. It also helps with everyone getting the same information at the same time.

Council Member Hempstead asked if there was anyone else from the public who wished to address the Agency or the Committee on the POKO development. No one else came forward.

Council Member Hempstead asked if there was anyone who wished to address the Planning Committee about the SONO Gardens issue.

Mr. Generoso came forward and thanked the Committee for their consideration regarding changing the modification of the percentage in the Existing Deed Restriction Requirement from 60% to 80%. He said that he has been trying to sell his unit for a number of years, but the people who are interested usually have just a bit too much income.

Mr. Elsenor, a resident of SONO Gardens said that the people who live there can't purchase the units because their incomes are too low. He said that many people have lived in SONO Gardens for most of their lives and now that they are getting older, they have to relocate elsewhere and can't sell their units.

Council Member Hempstead asked if there was anyone else who wished to address the Planning Committee about the SONO Gardens issue.

I. BUSINESS.

A. WALL STREET

1. Consideration of POKO-IWSR Developers, LLC Extension Request for Parcel 2a.

Mr. Sheehan then stated that all questions should be directed to staff and that the staff would answer. If the staff does not have the information, they will locate the information and get it to the Committee members and the Agency members.

Council Member Hempstead asked Mr. Sheehan if a letter from Citibank had been received. Mr. Olson gave out some copies of the letter to the Commissioners. He apologized for not having enough copies of the document for everyone. Mr. Sheehan said that he would send out electronic copies of those letters to the Agency members and Committee members.

Mr. Sheehan then narrated a PowerPoint presentation with the details of the development. Mr. Sheehan said that there was a zoning challenge that delayed the project for two years and also several lengthy permit processes that the developer had to go through.

Mr. Sheehan said that there was a 150 day window to show extension evidence before the City can declare a default. Mr. Sheehan then reviewed the terms of default as found on page 4 of the Committee information packet. Mr. Sheehan then referred to the Default, Mediation and Arbitration flow chart included in the PowerPoint presentation.

Agency Member Torrano pointed out that the Citibank letter was not even a preliminary agreement. Mr. Sheehan said that there is a requirement to have committed construction and financing within 150 days.

Council Member O'Toole Giandurco asked if the City has 2.5 million set aside for this project. Mr. Sheehan said that the Council had authorized a bond for 4.4 million for the project.

Council Member Bonenfant asked if the units were now all rental units. Mr. Sheehan explained that the requirement under the LDA requires a mix of units for sale and rental units. However, there were no firm numbers given in the LDA regarding how many units should be rental or owned. Mr. Sheehan said that the project now seemed to be primarily a rental project.

Council Member Bonenfant asked if the previous drawings were still accurate. Mr. Sheehan said that copies of the drawings were available in the back of the room.

Council Member McCarthy left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Council Member Bonenfant asked about the demolition process. Mr. Sheehan said that the site is slated for demolition.

Agency Member Langley asked what kind of barriers there might be for the project. Mr. Sheehan explained that if there was a failure within the first 150 days, it would be considered a default. He said that it was not a blanket extension.

Council Member Petrini asked if the Committee and the Agency were being asked to approve the entire ten-year project. Mr. Sheehan said that the Council and the Agency would have to discuss this issue.

Council Member Petrini had several questions about the options for the various phases, which Mr. Sheehan reviewed with everyone.

Council Member Petrini also wished to know what the City's options were if there was a default. Mr. Sheehan said that the mediators would have to determine a default.

Council Member Petrini asked what would happen if the Committee did not approve the extension. Mr. Sheehan said that ultimately, there would be mediation as to what would be agreeable to both sides. He went on to explain the details of the process. Atty. Grenier then summarized the various steps in the default process. He pointed out that during any time of the default process, either party could request mediation.

Council Member Petrini asked if there was an original process returning the Isaac Street parking lot to the City if the project did not go forward. Atty. Grenier then outlined the process and cautioned everyone that the lenders had a significant investment in the project. It would be a protracted process to return the lot to the City.

Mr. Sheehan noted that the project is not isolated to just the formerly City owned asset. The parking lots have no street frontage to either Wall Street or West Avenue. He said that the parking lots were more valuable as part of the whole project rather than as an independent parcel. However, establishing the right of re-entry would be time consuming. There is a great deal of private property now surrounding the parking lots.

Agency Member Torrano asked about the finances. She said that there had been revenue issues previously and wished to know what the timeline would be. Mr. Sheehan said that Mr. Olson has 150 days to complete all the requirements. He said that neither the City nor the Redevelopment Agency had received a communication from Citibank.

Council Member Kydes asked if POKO had provided any financial documents for first mortgage financing. Mr. Sheehan said that they already had a pre-development note, but the first mortgage financing could not be done until a later stage of the project.

A member of the public, Mr. Andy Kydes, then stated that he had been told that the meeting was to begin at 7:30 p.m. and that he wished to address the Agency Members and Committee members. Council Member Hempstead replied that the Public Participation portion of the meeting had been concluded. Mr. Kydes announced that he was a Norwalk resident and should be allowed to speak. Council Member Hempstead disagreed and repeated that the Public Participation portion had already been concluded. He suggested that Mr. Kydes submit any comments in writing. Mr. Kydes then began shouting at Mr. Hempstead about "OPM" – (**O**ther **P**eople's **M**oney). Council Member Hempstead told Mr. Kydes to leave the room. Mr. Kydes repeated his comments about OPM and shouted the project should not be allowed to go forward. Mr. Kydes then left the meeting.

Agency Member Devine asked how the 24 month time line had been calculated. Mr. Sheehan said that building timeline from the Agency's viewpoint and that it may be too long. Discussion followed about the details of the deadlines for Phase 1 completion.

Agency Chairman Serrano said that he would like to see how Phase 1 turns out before going for the remaining phases.

Council Member O'Toole Giandurco wished to know when the Council would need to vote on the extension. Mr. Sheehan said that a default would occur in September on the original timeline. Atty. Grenier pointed out that there should be some consideration about what the Committee and Agency want in terms of a timeline. Council Member Hempstead pointed out that mediation is mediation. He then reviewed the mediation process.

Council Member Hempstead had a question about the City's requirement for infrastructure in the area. Mr. Sheehan said that there was already a set number of months in which the project has to be completed. Mr. Hempstead asked for clarification from Tighe & Bond about the City's obligation in terms of infrastructure.

Council Member Hempstead said that if no work has been performed, the City has the right to ask for a default. He said that he was trying to understand the three year deadline.

Mr. Sheehan said that it was important for the Council and the Agency to realize that what the developer was asking for was within the LDA.

Council Member Bonenfant asked whether the original working drawings that contained the materials being used for the building were still accurate and if there was consideration for Phase 1 or 2 in terms of modifications. He said that the biggest issue would be parking. Any changes that require approvals would not buy more time.

Council Member Hempstead asked for clarification on what the City needed to do before it put shovels in the ground. Mr. Sheehan made a note of this.

Council Member Petrini asked about the Phase 1 extension versus from the entire project. He asked if the developer would have difficulty separating the funding for Phase 1 from the remainder of the project. Mr. Sheehan said that he would check this out.

Agency Member Langley said that she did not want to approve the extension for the entire project if that was possible.

Agency Member Torrano said that she would like to drill down on the details of the finances, particularly the State tax credits. If the tax credits of the financial arrangement fails, then this needs to be considered. Mr. Sheehan said that he would speak to CHAFA and another organization about this.

Council Member Hempstead asked if the units would be deed restricted. Mr. Sheehan said that 20% of the units in each of the phases would be affordable and deed restricted.

Council Member Hempstead then asked for more details about the financing. Mr. Sheehan said that he would email the Agency and Committee members more information.

Council Member McCarthy rejoined the meeting at 8:21 p.m.

Agency Chairman Serrano asked about the details of the public parking. Mr. Sheehan reviewed the details and said that he would post the Walker report on parking on the website.

Council Member Igneri left the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Council Member O'Toole Giandurco said that there had been a posting online stating that the demo should be moving forward within 30-45 days. Mr. Sheehan said that, in his opinion, he would have some concerns about that timeframe.

Council Member Hempstead said that a letter had come from Mr. Bill Nightingale that should be included in the record. [See attached]

Mr. Nicholas Kydes, a member of the public, asked if he could make a statement. He said that he had been told that the meeting was at 7:30 p.m. Council Member Hempstead said that the meeting had been posted as starting at 7:00 p.m. in numerous places and suggested that Mr. Kydes submit his comments in writing.

RECESS.

Council Member Hempstead announced a recess at 8:25 p.m. Council Members Petrini, and McCarthy left the meeting at this time. Council Member Hempstead reconvened the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

B. SONO Gardens.

1. **Modification of Existing Deed Restriction Requirement.**

Council Member Stewart recused herself from the meeting at 8:32 p.m.

Ms. Strauss, the Community Development Planning Director, then summarized a three page memo about the request to change the percentage for the AMI in the Committee information packet.

**** COUNCIL MEMBER HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO APPROVE ADVANCING TO THE COMMON COUNCIL A REQUEST TO AUTHORIZE AMENDING THE EXISTING DEED RESTRICTION REGARDING UNIT PRICING FOR SONO GARDENS TO READ AS FOLLOWS:**

"UNITS FOR SALE IN THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS SONO GARDENS LOCATED AT 25 MONROE STREET SHALL HAVE A PURCHASE PRICE NOT TO EXCEED THAT WHICH WOULD BE WITHIN REACH

OF THOSE RESIDENTS EARNING 60% OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT MEDIAN INCOME. THE FORMULA FOR PRICING WILL BE ESTABLISHED BY BEDROOM SIZE OF THE HOUSING UNIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPEALS PROCEDURE AS DEFINED IN SECTION 8-30G OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES."

Council Member Bonenfant asked if this would affect the stock of affordable housing that the City has. Mr. Sheehan said that it would not affect the affordable housing stock since they are deed restricted.

Council Member Bonenfant said that in order to increase the pool of qualified buyers but restrain "gentrification" creep. Mr. Sheehan said that they did not want the units going to market rate. Council Member Hempstead said that the worse thing that could happen would be vacancies because the units deteriorate. He said that this provides a wonderful mechanism for those who want or need to sell the unit and for those who would like to purchase the units.

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MODIFICATION OF EXISTING DEED RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AS STATED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

II. OLD BUSINESS.

There was no old business to consider at this time.

III. NEW BUSINESS.

There was no new business to consider at this time.

ADJOURNMENT.

**** COUNCIL MEMBER O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO MOVED TO ADJOURN.**
**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Sharon L. Soltes
Telesco Secretarial Services

What the City needs to know to make an informed decision on POKO

Good evening, my name is Michael McGuire and thank you for allowing me to speak on this issue.

By trade I am a commercial real estate valuation and consulting professional. Banks and lending institutions come to professional like me to see if projects like Wall Street Place are feasible as part of their due diligence.

I am also a stakeholder on Wall Street. In 2001 my wife Nancy and I purchased the 2nd through 4th floors of 64 Wall Street, the old kiddie town building. We did a complete renovation on the property with a focus on addressing the needs of the small office user. Upon completion of the project the building was recognized with a Pride in Norwalk award. Today 64 Wall Street is home to 20 business's which reflect the broad diversity of entrepreneurs Norwalk is known for.

Our decision to invest in Wall Street was based on the many positive attributes of the area that have been eroding over the past five years. I, and many of my neighbors are very concerned about the stagnant nature of the development projects in the Wall Street area.

The delays, as I see them, are as readily ascribable to the City as they are to POKO. It takes two to tango. That being the case I want to encourage the Council to consider two main points.

First Point – To quote Ronald Reagan "Trust but Verify" -

All bankers know developers are in love with their projects and accordingly banks conduct their own due diligence to ensure the integrity of their investment. As council members and stewards of the public trust I would hope you not rely solely on POKO's analysis but instead conduct your owner due diligence.

The City should conduct periodic feasibility studies on this development with a focus on the tax credits, grant resources, construction and permanent financing sources and their risks. As a City we have committed $4.4 million in infrastructure improvements in addition to essentially given the land to POKO. As a State we are chipping in another $5.0 million. Aren't we as taxpayers essentially a partners in this deal? If so let's find out what our partner is doing? POKO should be an open book on this.

However The lack of information flow and the opaque nature of the relationship between the City and POKO is troubling. Somewhere in this complex package of tax credits, grants and financing lay reasons for the ongoing delays with this project. To say you don't know what's going on after 7 years is very concerning and would suggest some changes to the process ~~and/or personnel~~ need to be made.

Second Point – Are you asking the right question?

At this point Norwalk and downtown can't afford a continued ego battle on the POKO issues. Accordingly, I don't think this should be a go/no-go referendum regarding should POKO be allowed to continue on with this project. Like it or not, this is the girl you brought to the dance. ~~You created this problem now it's up to you to solve it, not delay it.~~

Perhaps, the question at hand should be "Based on our due diligence what will it take to make this project a success"? With transparency the answer to that question is not hard to figure out. If elements of this project really need to change to be successful, allow the developer to make those changes in a cost and time effective way – fast track the program.

In conclusion, for this project to ultimately success will require transparency and accountability on both sides and a genuine desire to put Norwalk first.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Sheehan, Timothy

From: Douglas Hempstead [dhempstead@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2014 10:57 AM
To: Sheehan, Timothy
Subject: FW: Public input for POKO extension

Hi Tim will need this for the record for tonights meeting.
Doug

JUN 0 5 2014

Date: Wed, 4 Jun 2014 16:48:20 -0400
From: wnight@optonline.net
Subject: Fwd: Public input for POKO extension
To: commoncouncil3@norwalkct.org; HRilling@norwalkct.org

Dear Common Council and Mayor Rilling:

I wish I could attend the special Planning Committee meeting tomorrow night to speak about the proposed POKO LDA extension but unfortunately I have other commitments so I will hopefully get my comments onto the record with this email.

It is my hope you can impose a major reset of how development is done in Norwalk. It seems clear we've had a problem with contracted LDAs and "selected developers" in the past. Is has frustrated me deeply how these LDAs have left the city and taxpayers with bad deals that give us few options.

I hope the upcoming extension request of POKO can be used to "reset" Wall Street, ie at a minimum get the parking lot and its revenue back. I would also caution that a serious risk with POKO is a torn down building, a start of construction or some other midway point where he runs out of money and comes asking the city for funds to complete the job. Any agreements should allow for a ready termination of his involvement in such a case – if he makes it that far.

In the long run, a level playing field and equal opportunity for competition (no special treatments and special tax abatements etc,) should be the best motivator for quality development in Norwalk.

And just reading through the Agenda packet I would ask the question....why didn't the RDA question the validity of the Sept 2011 Demo application as anything more than a gimmick to stay compliant? It really makes the RDA an accomplice in the sham that this entire project has been. The last letter in the packet from the RDA to POKO confirming what they are requesting is a perfect example of the RDA's incompetence to deal with this. The RDA is not asking for any serious concessions in return for what would be a serious extension.

I also do not recall that the 2004 approvals envisioned the 40% affordable housing that Poko is now contemplating – not out of his altruistic heart but because it gives him a path to mooch more tax payer grants from various government agencies. While I respect that many of you would like to see as much affordable housing as possible, I would maintain that the state law of 10% is a well thought out rule. More than that and taxpayers will have to further subsidize this project for perpetuity. After all, the original idea was to develop certain areas of town to contribute more to the tax base and relieve taxpayers.

The bottom line is that POKO simply does not have the financial resources to do this project. No equity. And the figures showing the commitments he has (that I have read in press) do not add up anywhere close to what Phase 1 will cost. So if an LDA extension is approved I make a strong prediction we will be having this conversation again in the not too distant future.

It is also time to take a serious look at whether the RDA is up to the task of managing redevelopment in Norwalk. I personally think the RDA should be abolished, the $10mm slush fund returned to taxpayers, and some sort of accountable panel or commission established in its place.

I would happily offer my time on any commission or panel in this regard.

Sincerely,

Bill Nightingale, Jr.
17 South Beach Dr
Rowayton
cel 203 829 6472

CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
MAY 1, 2014

ATTENDANCE: Douglas Hempstead, Chair; Richard Bonenfant, Bruce Kimmel, John Kydes, Shannon O'Toole-Giandurco, Travis Simms (6:45 p.m.)

STAFF: Redevelopment Agency: Timothy Sheehan, Tami Strauss.
OTHERS: Representatives of CDBG Applications, as noted in Public Hearing.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hempstead called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and introduced the members as listed above who were in attendance, and stated that there was a quorum present.

Public Hearing:
2014 Neighborhood Assistance Act Tax Credit Program

Mr. Hempstead stated that as publicly noticed, the first part of the meeting was a public hearing for comments on Neighborhood Assistance Act Tax Credit Program (NAA-TCP) to determine if any of the applications should be recommended for program inclusion. He listed the rules of public comments, and asked those who wished to speak to state their name and affiliation for the record.

1. Peter Saverine, Star, Inc. Lighting the Way. Mr. Saverine stated that he was new to this program, and he thanked all involved for the efforts with the process.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there were others who wanted to comment on Neighborhood Assistance Act Tax Credit Program and hearing none said he would now accept comments on the second part of the Public Hearing.

PY40 (CDBG) Draft Annual Action Plan.

1. Gary Curto, Courage to Speak foundation. Mr. Curto stated that he appreciated the committee to reconsider the grant application for $14,000 to cover a part time program coordinator. He gave an overview of the mission of the organization and the annual events of Family Night at West Rocks Middle School and Ian's Race at Calf Pasture Beach. He spoke about the federal funding that has now run out that will not provide funding for after school programs of Courageous Parenting 101 which is free, bi-lingual program for parents endorsed by over forty faculty members at Norwalk Public Schools. He explained that the organization is now at a cross-roads that will not be able to sustain the programs that have gone on in Norwalk for over a decade.

Public Hearing – continued.

2. Carol Troy, Courage to Speak Foundation added that in addition to the programs mentioned they also partner with the Norwalk Housing Authority and reach nearly 1,000 students in the district providing programs at the learning centers and offering mentoring and group education on drug abuse. She spoke about the unique value that this program has by reaching parents and by offering after school programs to students at the middle school which is a critical age. She added that the program has been a mainstay at the schools, and now that federal funding has run out, she strongly urges the Committee to reconsider supporting this impactful educational program. She stated that will not provide funding for after school programs of Courageous Parenting 101, which is free, and she explained that the organization is at a cross-roads without the support of the CDBG grant.
3. Elizabeth Murdoch, Family & Children's Agency, spoke about the grant that helps women 18 and older and urged the Committee to support their grant application to support salary for a clinician to provide training and assistance to the children of women in recovery. She reviewed the mission of the organization and the programs that address mental health and substance abuse and spoke of the trauma related reasons for the issues and how they seek safety and protection programs along with psychological evaluation and education. She asked the Committee to reconsider funding and to support their long term efforts in Norwalk.
4. Diane Reese Tucker, Person to Person, asked for consideration of the $16,000 grant to continue an assistance program, and read her letter written to the Redevelopment Agency. She reviewed the focus and highlights of the program that reaches out to low wage workers to provide assistance with housing stability for the chronic homeless. She gave the history of the mission to provide food and how they worked hand in hand with the CCA, and since their merger how PTP has provided stability in the organization. She spoke about the efforts of case workers and providing utility subsidies to help pay bills and all of the work that goes on to end homelessness in Norwalk.

Mr. Simms entered the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

5. Cynthia Barnett, Saturday Academy, spoke about her passion to educate girls in the field of science and environmental programs. She spoke about how this program has made a difference and she asked for the funding to continue so that she can make her passion into a reality.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there were others who wished to speak, and hearing none, closed the Public Hearing at 6:48 p.m.

Business

2014 Neighborhood Assistance Act Tax Credit Program

Ms. Strauss referred to the memo and supporting documents detailing the program funding considerations. She explained the requested action was to determine which, if not all, 2014 NAA-TCP applications should be recommended for program inclusion, and to advance those to the Common Council.

Mr. Bonenfant asked if this was part of the annual program and Mr. Sheehan replied yes, that the intention is to certify that applications are cleared through the City.

Mr. Kimmel commended the agency and those that put the packet together that it was very comprehensive and detailed. Mr. Hempstead read the list of organizations and program titles and amounts as follows:

Organization	Program Title	Amount
Housing Authority of the City of Norwalk	Samuel Roodner Court Window Replacement	$150,000
Mid-Fairfield AIDS Project	Moore Place	$75,000
Norwalk Housing Foundation	College Scholarship Program	$150,000
South Norwalk Community Center	SoNoCC Early Childhood Center	$150,000
STAR, Inc., Lighting the Way...	Job Developer for Competitive Employment of People with Developmental Disabilities	$40,000
STAR, Inc., Lighting the Way...	Energy Saving Improvements	$46,000
The Carver Foundation	Summer Programs	$150,000
The Human Services Council	Energy Efficiency Project and One Park St. Bldg	$70,950
The Maritime Aquarium	Hybrid Diesel Electric System	$150,000

** **MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED 2014 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE ACT TAX CREDIT PROGRAM APPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM INCLUSION AND TO FORWARD ON TO THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.**

** **MOTION PASSED WITH FIVE VOTES IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED AND ONE ABSTENTION (SIMMS).**

<u>CDBG</u>

Ms. Strauss reviewed the summary spreadsheet with the updated amounts of funding for the program applications that outlines the ConPlan objective, strategy, organization, project title/description, recommended award and where there were contingencies. (Attached as supplemental document – page 8)

Mr. Sheehan clarified that the requested action was to consider pubic comment on the draft Annual Action Plan for CDBG Program Year 40 with the modifications as made last month listed as contingencies. Mr. Hempstead reviewed the spreadsheet summary and stated that since the MOU was received for the SoNo CC from the Superintendent of Schools, this satisfies the program conditions on the determination and that this would replace the Mid-Fairfield Aids Project and Women's Business Development Council on the draft.

Mr. Sheehan explained that the draft had been approved and that theoretically the total on the detailed summary document is actually over the allocation budget cap.

Mr. Kimmel stated that last month he may have spoken too soon regarding the municipality struggles with the cap guidelines.

He added that there are priority programs such as the Mayor's Summer Youth Program and the Neighborhood Coordinator and there needs to be a better way to manage the process. He stated that next year he would like to see those funds funded elsewhere in the city budget to free up funds for those programs worthy of grants for programs such as the Travis Simms Foundation. He added that pending the BET meeting on Monday, there could be a move to reallocate funding, and if that happens he would want to have them as a contingent program if the funding is determined.

Mr. Simms stated that he respects the Committee's decision but he finds it hard to accept that money continues to go to organizations year after year and not in the direction of providing more worthwhile programs for the youth in the City. He added that frankly he does not see justification for such large grant amounts for the South Norwalk Community Center.

Mr. Hempstead stated that NEON received a great percentage of funding for South Norwalk along with others such as Saturday Academy and other annual programs.

Ms. Stewart asked if we move that money from somewhere else and she referred to the larger grant allocation plan, and if there's still even a question as far as the South Norwalk Community Center, with all this money that they're asking for, can it be taking money from them?

Mr. Hempstead explained that the South Norwalk Community Center stands to receive $100,000 in block grants under the draft and that money is within a separate area of the plan and could not be transferred under allocation guidelines.

Mr. Simms said he was very disappointed with the committee for not funding this boxing program and said he is sick of programs from South Norwalk getting stonewalled. Mr. Simms said that to deny a program like this that's good for the kids and good for the community is just wrong. Overall, local social services agencies get what they ask for every year and this program should be funded.

Mr. Simms added that he has been working with the Police Athletic League and he provided a letter to Ms. Strauss who read it into the record as follows:

Re: Letter of Support — Simms Foundation Boxing Program

To whom it may concern:

The Norwalk Police Athletic League (PAL) is committed to assist the youth of Norwalk in ways that enhance character, intellectual and physical development. PAL seeks to support programs which correspond with those goals.

On behalf of the PAL Board, this letter represents willingness for discussion and exploration of the Simms Foundation Boxing Program with Mr. Simms. This dialogue will allow the PAL Board to determine if the program corresponds with our goals and is appropriate for our organization.

We look forward to a review of this program with Mr. Simms.

Sincerely,

Susan Zecca, President

Mr. Kimmel said those two city programs eventually must stand on their own rather than rely on block grants, and he described them as extremely important and extremely effective and priorities for recommended block grant funding. Mr. Kimmel reminded them that the Board of Estimate and Taxation is scheduled to adopt the city's 2014-15 operating budget Monday evening, and in theory, could find additional dollars and may change the situation totally.

Mr. Hempstead stated that we will have another bite at the apple at the full council meeting. Mr. Sheehan clarified that the Common Council will adopt the block grant allocation plan at the next meeting and there could be discussion on the floor.

Ms. Strauss stated that this may necessitate a special meeting to review the applications and meet guidelines of the public comment period.

Ms. Stewart stated that there needs to be a way to find the money and make it happen and that she feels they need to look again at the programs.

Mr. Hempstead stated that he wishes there were more money, and with a limited pot of funding, they have had to do their fiduciary responsibility and look at applications that can deliver the guidelines.

** **MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO ADVANCE TO THE COMMON COUNCIL THE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR THE CDBG PROGRAM YEAR 40 AT A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $1,028,033 WITH THE TOTAL CDBG ALLOCATION AMOUNT TO BE CONSISTENT WITH CAP AND REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE ALL RELATED DOCUMENTS CONSISTENT WITH THE APROVED ACTION PLAN.**

** **MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR, (KIMMEL, BONENFANT, O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO, HEMPSTEAD) NONE OPPOSED AND THREE ABSTENTIONS (SIMMS, KYDES, STEWART)**

<u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES –March 31, 2014</u>

Mr. Kimmel requested corrections to the votes on the motion on page 3 as follows:

** **THE MOTION FAILED WITH THREE VOTES IN FAVOR (KIMMEL, KYDES, SIMMS) THREE OPPOSED (HEMPSTEAD, O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO, BONENFANT) AND NO ABSTENTIONS.**

Mr. Simms stated that he had abstained from the vote on this motion and that he has always recused himself from voting on items involving the Travis Simms Foundation.

Mr. Bonenfant stated that it was his recollection that there was a previous motion made and this was an amendment that did result in a tie as indicated by Mr. Hempstead. Ms. O'Toole-Giandurco stated this was also her recollection.

Mr. Hempstead stated that it was important that the record accurately reflect the votes on the motions made regarding approval of the CDBG funding allocations.

** **MR. HEMPSTEAD MOVED TO TABLE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 31, 2014 MEETING PENDING REVISIONS AS NOTED.**

** **THE MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR, (KIMMEL, BONENFANT, O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO, HEMPSTEAD) ONE OPPOSED (SIMMS) AND TWO ABSTENTIONS (KYDES, STEWART)**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 3, 2014

** **MS. O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3, 2014 MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**

** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

A member of the public asked for a point of order and stated that there was no public comment portion as noted on the agenda for the regular meeting. Mr. Hempstead acknowledged that this was correct, and asked if there were members of the public that wished to speak.

Public Comments

1. Ms. Diane Cece, Olmstead Place, asked for clarification on the public comment period for the CDBG applications and that technically it goes through May 4. She asked how this additional comment period actually then gets handled.

Mr. Sheehan stated that it is forwarded on to the Council and comments at the council level are discerned based on the comment period. Ms. Cece stated that it does not seem as if they are taken into account.

Ms. Cece then spoke about Oak Hills Master Plan and asked about the process of going from Planning Commission to the Committee and how comments from the public can be taken into account. She stated that it is most disturbing that improvements have gone beyond a driving range and now a program asking for millions of taxpayer funding. She said this lacks transparency and has no built in time for a public hearing or for really any input from the public.

Mr. Simms asked if other members of the public could comment, and Mr. Hempstead noted that those comments would be added to the public hearing comments for the CDBG Program Year 40.

Public Comments -- continued

2. Phae Bowman, Common Council Member, spoke in support of the Travis Simms Foundation. She said a program for the youth is much needed in Norwalk and they have a partnership with PAL and this should be considered for the CDBG funding.
3. Sandra Stokes spoke in support of the Travis Simms Foundation. She said a program goes way beyond boxing, it keeps the youth off the streets, gives them something to focus on for acceptance other than gangs. She stated that she is very passionate for the youth and a program like this is much needed in Norwalk and now they have a partnership with PAL and this helps those kids who lack parent support. She added that there are learned competencies through the experience and lives are saved. She explained that youth need alternatives and she asked the Committee to reconsider the funding from the CDBG grants.
4. Fred Kitt, stated he was a product of a boxing program and it is much more than boxing. Kids need alternatives and years ago Mr. Harris had a program that kept kids off the streets and the older guys were mentors for the younger ones. He said it is not expensive to box, it is a gym workout, it keeps kids focused. He said he grew up at Meadow Gardens and boxed in the program run by John Harris, urged the panel to reconsider and fund the Travis Simms Foundation. He added that the program by Mr. Harris saved hundreds of lives, and he can honestly say he'd probably be dead, or in jail, if it were not for the boxing program.
5. Shawn Montegrano said he did not fit into sports but boxing provided him with a sport alternative and one that helped him to work out at the gym and it was a life changing experience for him. He added that the youth need alternatives and years ago Mr. Harris had a program that kept kids off the streets and the older guys were mentors for the younger ones. He said it is not expensive to box, it is a gym workout keeping kids focused.
6. Terrence Williams stated that he is a semi-professional boxer who has to travel to Stamford every day to train and there should be a facility in Norwalk. He said it keeps gangs away from the neighborhood and since they took away the YMCA the kids need a place more than ever.

Mr. Hempstead asked if there were others who wished to comment and hearing none, thanked those for their comments.

Other Business

Mr. Hempstead stated that he wanted to give the Committee a heads up on a pending request for an extension on the POKO agreement. Mr. Sheehan described the request as an amendment to the timeframe within, rather that change of, the LDA between the city, Redevelopment Agency and POKO Partners. Mr. Hempstead stated that at this stage of the game, there needs to be a lot more details and conditions for an extension. Mr. Sheehan mentioned there could be a special meeting with all parties involved to formally outline the request.

Mr. Hempstead stated that nothing officially has come from the Oak Hills Authority but he would suggest that there should be a joint public hearing. He added that there is a redundant effort and things can be streamlined so that items are vetted through the Planning Commission and the Planning Committee to make sure both groups are in sync.

ADJOURNMENT

** **MR. KYDES MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**
** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Knox; Telesco Secretarial Services

Attachment: CDBG Allocation Funding Considerations:

ConPlan Objective	ConPlan Strategy	Organization	Project Title/Description	Recommended Award
Stabilize or Reduce Housing Costs	Energy Efficient Renovations	~~Mid-Fairfield AIDS Project*~~	Energy efficient renovations to a supportive housing facility (1 facility serving 9 people)	~~$52,286~~
		Star, Inc., Lighting the Way...	Safety and Energy-Saving Improvements (1 facility serving 600 people)	$46,000
	Housing Rehabilitation	Keystone House	Bathroom remodel at Elmcrest Terrace Group Home (1 facility serving 12 people)	$11,000
		Norwalk Housing Authority	John Shostak Apartments accommodation improvements (serving 40 units)	$46,000
		Open Door Shelter*	Supportive Housing Flooring Needs (1 facility serving 26 people)	$23,000
Create Income Stability	Literacy / GED / Customized Job Training	Women's Business Development Council*	Microenterprise Assistance Program (serving 25 people)	~~$40,000~~
	Public Infrastructure Improvements	South Norwalk Community Center*	Renaissance Project (providing an Area Benefit)	$100,000
		Carver Foundation of Norwalk, Inc.	Facility Improvements - Replace Outdated HVAC System (providing an Area Benefit)	$92,500
	Summer Youth Employment	City of Norwalk	Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program (serving 165 people)	$21,746
Ameliorate the Impacts of this Economic Depression on Families	After-School Programming	Saturday Academy Inc	Computer Science Entrepreneurship Program (serving 50 people)	$15,820
		~~Travis Simms Foundation*~~	Youth Boxing Program (serving 200 people)	~~$43,493~~
	Basic Services	City of Norwalk	Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator (providing an Area Benefit)	$21,747
	Domestic Violence Prevention	Domestic Violence Crisis Center	Domestic Violence Prevention through Effective Community Policing (serving 75 people)	$30,000
		Norwalk Senior Center	Elder Abuse Prevention Initiative (serving 350 people)	$12,500
	Drug Prevention / Education	Family & Children's Agency	Project REWARD (serving 70 people)	$15,000
	Health / Mental Health Services	Child Guidance Center of Mid-Fairfield	Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (serving 50 people)	$30,000
Multiple Objectives	Multiple Strategies	Norwalk Redevelopment Agency obo City of Norwalk	City Neighborhoods Program (providing an Area Benefit)	$325,657
CDBG Program Administration	General Program Administration	Norwalk Redevelopment Agency obo City of Norwalk	General CDBG Program Administration	$260,033

*Organization's project recommended with contingencies.

/=Programs removed per Committee to bring within budget allocation cap guidelines.

Revised minutes

CITY OF NORWALK
[MITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
MARCH 31, 2014

[empstead, Chair; Richard Bonenfant, Bruce Kimmel,
[s, Shannon O'Toole-Giandurco, Travis Simms (6:50 p.m.)

[ment Agency: Timothy Sheehan, Tami Strauss.
[tives of CDBG Applications, as noted.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hempstead called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and stated that the members as listed above were in attendance, and that there was a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 19, 2014 - March 6, 2014

** **MS. O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2014 MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**
** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

** **MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2014 MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**
** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FUNDING

Ms. Strauss referred to the memo and supporting documents detailing the program funding considerations (see attached supplemental pages 4-6) She explained the application summary spreadsheets with the updated amounts of funding available for each category and the ratings in the matrix for the program applications and where there were deficiencies.

Mr. Sheehan explained that the spreadsheets represent the detailed summary document that provides color coded background information on the determination. It was noted that color coded designations are green cells represent application strengths and yellow cells represent potential application concerns.

Mr. Pat Ferrandino, Deputy Director of the SoNO Community Center explained that the center was awarded $100,000 in CDBG funding last year to fund new bathrooms and other improvements. He said this year's application in CDBG funds will pay for classrooms, and they are seeking outside funding to renovate the commercial kitchen. It would be used to teach nutritional programs in collaboration with The Friends of Ryan Park and make use of the community garden outside the back door.

Mr. Kimmel asked if municipalities have the ability to divert into the segmented pots and dispense with public services grants. Mr. Sheehan replied that all municipalities struggle with the 15% cap guidelines and incorporate public services. He added that the challenge is some have work to do, some have start up funding and there is a better way to manage the process.

**** MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO ADOPT THE DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES OF THE CDBG PROGRAM FUNDING FOR $621,157.**
**** MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

<u>Public Services</u>

There was discussion and review of programs in the recommendation. Mr. Kimmel asked if there was a way to steer applicants to tap into other funding sources available for the organization.

Mr. Sheehan replied that tin the past previously housing projects were included in the capital budget for affordable housing. He added that they have taken applications for affordable housing separately if funding was not available

Mr. Hempstead suggested that over the past few years there was an effort to steer groups that overlap to collaborate on program funding options.

Mr. Kimmel stated that had questions on the Travis Simms application and asked if it was necessary to have Mr. Simms move to the applicant section of the meeting room. Mr. Simms stated that he had recused himself from the vote at the last meeting, and he was intending to recuse himself tonight, but he would be happy to answer questions on his program.

Mr. Kimmel stated that not a lot of communities have a former world champion in boxing in their community, plus, there is a tradition in Norwalk of a strong boxing program that made a difference in many lives, such as the program run by the late John Harris. He explained that we have a unique individual in the city, and it's more complicated because he's a member of the Common Council. He added that we should bend over backwards and not demand that every detail of the application is done the way professional non-profits do them.

Mr. Kydes asked Mr. Simms about the original request and Mr. Simms explained his proposal started at $100,000, then dropped to $83,000. He said making do with less would be extremely hard but they would work hard to make it work, and they can still do a lot with $44,000. Mr. Simms added that he has been working with the Police Athletic League and NEON President Jackson, and while arrangements have not been finalized, it looks like the program can go into the Ben Franklin Center.

There was further discussion about the budget and expenses for the program and equipment. Mr. Simms stated that the goal is to have a well-rounded gym that has all the equipment and all.

Mr. Kimmel suggested that the Mayor's Summer Youth Program and the Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator could be funded elsewhere from the City's budget.

**** MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO ADOPT THE DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICES WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:
TRANSFER $21,746 FROM THE MAYOR'S SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM AND TRANSFER $21,747 FROM NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT COORDINATOR FOR A TOTAL OF $43,493 TO ADD TO THE TRAVIS SIMMS FOUNDATION.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED WITH THREE VOTES IN FAVOR (KIMMEL, KYDES, SIMMS) THREE OPPOSED (HEMPSTEAD, O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO, BONENFANT) AND NO ABSTENTIONS.**

Ms. O'Toole Giandurco stated to Mr. Simms that she didn't vote against his program, as there is so much potential, but at this point there are too many holes. Mr. Simms said he respected that, but there is currently not one program that targets these children in the city and has not been for many years, and with the summer coming before us we have the opportunity here to save these kids' lives.

There was further discussion on the way to secure alternate funding. Mr. Kimmel said the City's budget numbers continue to look good the operating budget is still well below the cap set by the council, and there should be money to fund the program.

There was discussion on the formulation of the cap for total funds available by category. Ms. Strauss reviewed the supporting documents to show how the funds are derived within HUD guidelines.

Mr. Hempstead said there was nothing to prohibit the Committee from advancing the draft at a higher amount than can be funded. He explained that the Committee has $1,028,033 in CDBG funding of that, $146,813 can be spent on public services.

Ms. Strauss reminded the Committee that the draft would be approved and forwarded along the process for the 30-day public comment period, to schedule will be a public hearing.

Mr. Kimmel said the council needed to give the Simms Foundation program a thumbs-up to help as it seeks other funding. He added that to exceed the cap as a continuation of the process should be done with the stipulation that it will be clear that the committee will stick with the cap eventually.

Ms. Strauss outlined that guidelines for the application are outlined to require a confirmed location for the program, a Memorandum of Understanding with the facility, a budget of how the grant would be utilized and fundraising plan for the balance of the cost.

**** MR. KIMMEL MOVED TO APPROVE THE DRAFT CDBG ALLOCATION AMENDED TO EXCEED THE CAP RECOMMENDATION PENDING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. APPROVAL INCLUDES AN ADDITIONAL $43,493 TO FUND THE TRAVIS SIMMS FOUNDATION APPLICATION WITH CONDITIONS AS NOTED ABOVE. APPROVAL IS CONTINGENT UPON INPUT FROM THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT, UPON WHICH TIME THE TOTAL CDBG ALLOCATION AMOUNT WILL THEN BE ADJUSTED TO BE CONSISTENT WITH CAP.**
**** THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX VOTES IN FAVOR (BONENFANT, KIMMEL, KYDES, HEMPSTEAD, O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO, SIMMS) NONE OPPOSED AND NO ABSTENTIONS.**

Mr. Kimmel asked about the action required by the Committee following the 30-day period and Mr. Sheehan clarified the public comment period regarding the allocation and use of funds.

Mr. Sheehan noted that all comments received will be incorporated into the action plan and the planning Committee will then have an opportunity to schedule a Special Meeting. Comments can be reviewed by the Committee prior to approving the drafted AAP for submission to the common council for final approval and the executed AAP must be submitted to HUD no later than May 15, 2014.

ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

Ms. Strauss referred to the memo included in the agenda packet and reported that HUD released its actual funding allocations for Program Year 40. Norwalk's allocation of $889,453 represents a 1.5% cut over the previous year (PY39) as compared to the 10% cut that was projected.

The following chart breaks down the $1,028,033 that is available by category (and allowable by HUD) in PY40 (including anticipated program income and reprogrammed funds).

Funding Category	Actual Amount	CDBG Requests
Public Services	$146,813	$530,989
Planning and Administration	$260,033	$294,745
Micro-Enterprise Assistance and Public Facilities	$621,157	$736,786
TOTAL	**$1,028,033**	**$1,562,520**

** **MR. KYDES MOVED TO APPROVE AND PUBLICLY POST THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE PY40 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR THE 30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD TO BEGIN APRIL 4, 2014 AND END MAY 4, 2014.**

** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PUBLIC HEARING REQUEST

There was discussion on holding the public hearing at the beginning of the next regular meeting, and it was as agreed by consensus of the Committee to schedule it as follows.

** **MS. O'TOOLE-GIANDURCO MOVED TO APPROVE THE SCHEDULING OF A PUBLIC HEARING AT THE REGULAR PLANNING MEETING OF MAY 1, 2014 AT 7:00 P.M.**

** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ADJOURNMENT

** **MR. KYDES MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Knox;
Telesco Secretarial Services

Attachments:
CDBG Allocation Funding Considerations
CDBG PY40 Program Outline/Application Summary

At the request of the Planning Committee the staff is providing its suggested list of CDBG applications for Committee consideration in advancing the draft Annual Action Plan. A number of factors were taken into account in making these suggestions including CDBG eligibility, the qualifications of the applicant, cost efficiency, and the extent of the direct community benefit of the project or program.

Public Facilities– total available $621,157

- **Keystone House:** $11,000 for bathroom renovation at Elmcrest Group Home that houses 12 people.
- **Norwalk Housing Authority:** $46,000 for accessible renovations at John Shostak Apartments benefitting 40 people. The Housing Authority received $1.2 million from HUD (above what NHA estimated) for capital improvements that will be deployed towards replacing windows at Roodner Court; the NHA has indicated that these capital funds will be not be able to cover the accessible renovations at John Shostak.
- **Star Inc.**: $46,000 for safety, energy efficient renovations at community center that serves 600 people annually.
- **Carver Foundation of Norwalk:** $92,500 for HVAC system upgrade so that committed afterschool programs may commence. This project serves the low- and moderate-income census tracts of Norwalk totaling over 11,000 people.
- **Norwalk Redevelopment Agency on behalf of the City of Norwalk:** $325,657 to deliver projects that have low- and moderate-income targeted benefit. Previous projects include Oyster Shell Park, Washington Village Choice Neighborhoods application, administering housing rehabilitation loan program and hurricane assistance funds, brownfields remediation, and planning and design work for public infrastructure and facilities. City Neighborhoods primarily serves the low- and moderate-income census tracts of Norwalk totaling over 11,000 people.

Contingent Allocation

- **South Norwalk Community Center:** $100,000 for facilities renovations. Funds will be restricted contingent upon the final commitment of a pending programming partner; and successful completion of SoNoCC's current CDBG grant.

Public Services– total available $146,813

- **Domestic Violence Crisis Center:** $30,000 for Community Policing program to benefit 75 victims of domestic violence.
- **City of Norwalk Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator:** $21,747 for improvement, beautification projects that benefit over 11,000 people in the city's low- and moderate-income census tracts (cut from $25,000 request).
- **City of Norwalk Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program:** $21,746 for job training for 165 low- and moderate-income youth (cut from $25,000 request).
- **Child Guidance Center:** $30,000 for psychiatric nurse to work with 50 adolescents.
- **Family & Children's Agency:** $15,000 for Project REWARD – an outpatient substance abuse treatment for 70 women.
- **Norwalk Senior Center:** $12,500 for Elder Abuse prevention initiative to reach 350 people.
- **Saturday Academy:** $15,820 for afterschool program for 50 girls focused on STEM.

Planning and Administration Amount Available: $260,033

- **Norwalk Redevelopment Agency:** $260,033 for grant administration, reporting, planning and compliance.

PUBLIC SERVICES - TOTAL AVAILABLE $146,813						
Tab #	Organization	Project Title	Request	Proposed Beneficiaries	Request per Beneficiary	Beneficiary Type
2	Child Guidance Center of Mid-Fairfield	Advanced Practice Registered Nurse	$30,000	50	$600	People
3	City of Norwalk CT	Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program	$25,000	165	$152	People
4	City of Norwalk CT	Neighborhood Improvement Coordinator	$25,000	AREA BENEFIT		
5	Courage to Speak Foundation	Drug Prevention Education for After School Programs	$14,770	115	$128	People
6	Domestic Violence Crisis Center	Domestic Violence Prevention through Effective Community Policing	$30,000	75	$400	People
7	Family & Children's Agency	Project REWARD	$15,000	70	$214	People
8	Housing Development Fund	Affordable Housing Counseling Program	$20,000	60	$333	Households
9	Human Services Council	South Norwalk Affordable Housing/Homelessness Prevention Services	$78,500	36	$2,181	People
10	Liberation Programs	Substance Abuse Education, Prevention and Wellness	$6,000	100	$60	People
11	NEON, Inc.	Empower Through Education and Employment	$43,694	40	$1,092	People
12	Norwalk Housing Authority	Resident Transport Van	$35,705	340	$105	People
13	Norwalk Senior Center	Elder Abuse Prevention Initiative	$12,500	350	$36	People
14	Person to Person	Emergency Financial Assistance	$16,000	40	$400	Households
15	Saturday Academy Inc	Computer Science Entrepreneurship Program	$15,820	50	$316	People
16	South Norwalk Community Center	AfterSchool Programs	$50,000	125	$400	People
17	Star, Inc., Lighting the Way...	Competitive Employment Job Developer	$20,000	75	$267	People
18	Travis Simms Foundation	Youth Boxing Program	$65,000	200	$325	People
19	United Way of Coastal Fairfield County	Services Navigator, Coordinated Care Team	$28,000	100	$280	People
		Totals	$530,989	1,991		Average

Cost Per Beneficiary Analysis - Low: ≤$203 (≤80% of Category Average); Average: $204-$305 (81%-120% of Category Average); High: ≥$306 (≥121% of Category Average)

Request/Project Total Analysis - Low Range: Request is 0%-49% of indicated project total; Mid Range: Request is 50%-80% of indicated project total; High Range: Request is 81%-100% of indicated project total

Green boxes represent application strengths

Yellow boxes represent potential application concerns.

* Based upon information provided during presentation to the Planning Committee

** ConPlan strategy is met by current PY39 project(s).

Tab #	Organization	Project Title	Request	Proposed Beneficiaries	Request per Beneficiary	Beneficiary Type	Cost Per Beneficiary Analysis
20	Women's Business Development Council	Microenterprise Assistance Program	$40,000	25	$1,600	People	High

Public Facilities

Tab #	Organization	Project Title	Request	Proposed Beneficiaries	Request per Beneficiary	Beneficiary Type	Cost Per Beneficiary Analysis
21	Carver Foundation of Norwalk, Inc.	Replace outdated HVAC System	$92,500	AREA BENEFIT			
22	Keystone House	Bathroom remodel at Elmcrest Terrace Group Home.	$11,000	12	$917	Households	High
23	Mid-Fairfield AIDS Project	Purchase and install energy efficient heating and air conditioning system	$52,286	9	$5,810	People	High
24	Norwalk Housing Authority	John Shostak Apartments accommodation improvements	$46,000	40	$1,150	Households	High
26	Open Door Shelter	Supportive Housing Flooring Needs	$23,000	26	$885	People	High
27	South Norwalk Community Center	Renaissance Project	$100,000	AREA BENEFIT			
28	Star, Inc., Lighting the Way...	Safety and Energy-Saving Improvements	$46,000	600	$77	People	
29	Norwalk Redevelopment Agency	City Neighborhoods Program (Review provided by a third party)	$328,000	AREA BENEFIT			
		Totals	$736,786	712		Average	$307

PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION - TOTAL AVAILABLE $260,033

Tab #	Organization	Project Title	Request	Proposed Beneficiaries	Request per Beneficiary	Beneficiary Type
25	Open Door Shelter	Sono-Life Center Pre-Development Costs***	$50,000	80	$625	People
30	Norwalk Redevelopment Agency	General CDBG Program Administration	$244,745	AREA BENEFIT		
		Total	$294,745			

Cost Per Beneficiary Analysis - Low: ≤$246 (≤80% of Category Average); Average: $247-$368 (81%-120% of Category Average); High: ≥$369 (≥121% of Category Average)

Request/Project Total Analysis - Low Range: Request is 0%-49% of indicated project total; Mid Range: Request is 50%-80% of indicated project total; High Range: Request is 81%-100% of indicated project total

Green boxes represent application strengths.

Yellow boxes represent potential application concerns.

* Based upon information provided during presentation to the Planning Committee

** ConPlan strategy is met by current PY39 project(s).

***Originally applied for under "Public Facilities." Subsequent review finds it an eligible activity under "Planning."

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

125 East Avenue
P.O. Box 5125
Norwalk, CT 06856

TO: MEMBERS, PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE NORWALK COMMON COUNCIL

FROM: TAMI STRAUSS, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

DATE: JUNE 18, 2014

RE: REQUEST FOR PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING PY39 CAPER AT AUGUST 7, 2014 PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

The Norwalk Redevelopment Agency, as administrator of the City of Norwalk's CDBG allocation, is in the process of preparing the year-end CAPER report for the last program year (PY39) that ended on June 30, 2014.

Pursuant to the Agency's Citizen's Participation Plan, the creation of the CAPER requires a public hearing followed by a 15-day comment period, and subsequent approval by the Planning Committee and Common Council. The agency requests that a public hearing be scheduled for the August 7, 2014 meeting of the Planning Committee at 7pm.

The comment period will commence on August 8th and close on August 23rd.

The Norwalk Redevelopment Agency will submit the draft CAPER, incorporating public comments, to the Planning Committee for approval at the meeting scheduled for September 4, 2014. A final document will be submitted to the Common Council for approval on August 9th or 23rd and submitted to HUD by the September 30th deadline.

REQUESTED ACTION: Planning Committee approves scheduling a public hearing regarding the PY39 CAPER on August 7, 2014 at 7:00pm.