CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
APRIL 1, 2010

ATTENDANCE: Douglas Hempstead, Chair; Andrew Conroy, Laurel Lindstrom, Clyde Mount, Kelly Straniti, John Tobin

STAFF: Norwalk Redevelopment Agency: Timothy Sheehan, John Burritt, Michael Moore, Susan Sweitzer, Sally Johnson, CDBG Administrator

OTHERS: Phillip Mayfield, OKM Associates

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hempstead called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and announced that the first part of the meeting was the second public hearing session for CDBG Program Grants with the purpose of providing applicants an opportunity to provide further information on their PY36 applications for further consideration by the Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Moore, of the Redevelopment Agency reviewed the procedure for conducting the public hearing, and asked those who planned to speak to state their name, credentials or affiliation to the application, the amount requested, and how funds will be used, and the outcome of people served. He asked the presenters to limit comments only as relevant to the application as listed, comments were to be limited to three minutes in length, and when the time was close to the limit speakers would be given a thirty second warning to summarize their closing comments.

Prior to the application presentations, Mr. Hempstead asked Mr. Moore to give an overview of the CDBG program process grant approval process, and added that it is a difficult process due to the fact that the City has limited CDBG funds. Mr. Moore stated that one of the objectives this year was to consolidate and group programs together so that the grants would be spread by category with little overlap. He added that in 2010 the City is faced with a continuing upheaval in the housing market combined with a dramatic decline in the economy which is especially severe for low income households. He added that here are strategies that may be used by the City to stabilize housing costs and create income stability, and support organizations are trying to assist low income residents with the impact of the economic depression on families. He stated that in addition, these programs enable people to find jobs, retain jobs and transition from one career to another, become appropriately trained for jobs, and bring stability to families.

The following comments are not verbatim and represent a summary of statements made.

1. Rev. Albert R. Dancy, Application ID No. 169, stated that he was representing Serving All Vessels Equally-SAVE, which was not awarded as submitted. He stated that he was here to appeal to the Committee for reconsideration the Caregivers Choice Mentoring Children/Prisoners and added that this program is partnered through the Office of Juvenile Justice Prevention for youth in danger of entering gangs, the dollars are used to mentor youth, and 97% of the students are from single parent homes. Rev. Dancy stated that this program helps kids that have had trouble in life and helps reel them in for help to stay off the streets, adding that it costs far more to incarcerate than the cost of an after school program that helps prevent the youth from facing trouble with the law. There were no further questions asked or comments made by the Commission members.

Rev. Dancy also stated that the application entitled Freedom of Choice Learn and Serve was also not included in the grant approvals, and he appealed to the Committee to consider at least one of the two program applications. Mr. Hempstead stated that it is clearly a hard job of awarding the grants, and that this year the challenge was to consolidate efforts by the various groups especially the many after school programs addressing academic needs of the youth. There were no further questions asked or comments made by the Commission members

2. Kathleen Hunter stated that she was representing Fairfield 08 and the Norwalk Supportive Housing Initiative, which was not awarded as submitted. She stated that she was here to appeal to the Committee for reconsideration, adding that the grant was based on homelessness as identified in 2009 based on Norwalk Fairfield County statistics. She added that the goal of this grant was specifically to identify, develop and support services required to retain existing staff to provide outreach services necessary to secure rental subsidies for permanent housing, addressing the challenges of the recession with involvement by the community stakeholders. Ms. Hunter added that veterans are included, and this grant is used to leverage funding, in concert with the Department of Social services and Interfaith Housing Associations. There were no questions asked or comments made by the Commission members

3. Lauren Rosato stated that she was representing the Norwalk Education Foundation-NEF, and thanked the Committee for the opportunity to provide further information on the all-important programs that are provided for the Norwalk Public Schools. She stated that the Education Excellence in Extended Learning encompasses programs such as “Power Hour” and stated the program objectives as outlined in the PY36 Summary. She provided an overview of the NEF and highlighted programs such as TechSmart Teachers (TST) that delivers professional development in technology for Norwalk teachers and staff, guided by the district’s Technology Department. Teachers share knowledge and skills with their peers on how to integrate technology into classrooms. TST helps hundreds of teachers and thousands of students become citizens of the technology driven 21st Century. She added that other programs included documentary film-making, literacy learning, and after school programs such as “After the Bell” where classes are offered free of charge throughout the year.

Ms. Rosato added that Technology Liaisons coordinate and participate in the advancement, fluid maintenance, and integration of technology in the district through their roles in each building. The liaison is the point person for communication between the technology department, teachers, and administrators. At least one liaison serves in each of the district's 19 schools, and Technology Liaisons saved over $15,000 for the district by resolving 66% of the technology issues reported to them in their buildings (20 hrs, per school on avg.) from January – June 2009. She added that the Outcomes are that there are 23 Liasons served in all 19 schools from December 2008 - June 2009 that have addressed 100 issues that flowed through Technology Liaisons from January - June 2009, 66% resolved by Tech Liaisons. She added that they are beginning the process of immersing students into SmartBoard learning and advancing these children into 21st Century technological learning." There were no questions asked or comments made by the Commission members.

4. Tammy Strauss, stated she was representing the Norwalk Housing Development fund which was not fully awarded as submitted, only one have of the proposal, and she stated that she was here to appeal to the Committee for reconsideration the Affordable Housing Counseling Program, and stated that this is to avoid foreclosures, currently counseling 35 families at the goal of 60 families. Ms. Strauss added that while their budget comes from banks, and the Fairfield County Community Foundation, most of their fee income comes from loans to help them operate at a break-even. She added that they target low-middle income families with outreach event at Norwalk Community College and Norwalk Hospital. She anticipates the needs to double with the current economy. There were no further questions asked or comments made by the Committee members.

5. Neil Brodsky stated that he was representing the Norwalk Housing Authority and the program objectives are to get children to believe in themselves, adding that this was a job skills training program for literacy coordinators and that federal and state funds were drying up. He added that they target low-middle income families and that the Authority has relied on the CBDG grants in the past for this project, and he sincerely hopes the Committee will reconsider and find the funds to add them to the approval list. There were no further questions asked or comments made by the Committee members.

6. Lynn Burgess, stated she was representing George Washington Carver Center, and stated her appreciation for the approval of the program providing tutoring and after school homework help. She added that Carver has received CDBG funding over the past five years for this activity, along with providing funds for students to visit historic black colleges for students in the college application process. There were no questions asked or comments made by the Committee members.

7. John Aldrich, (John Cagnina and Grechan Powell) stated he was representing Rowayton Senior Housing and was here to show their appreciation of the grant awarded for the Sprinkler System Installation.

He stated that the installation of sprinklers, will make the housing complex safe and he is very grateful for the Committee's approval of this senior housing to address the needs of the growing senior population in Norwalk. There were no further questions asked or comments made by the Committee members.

9. Marian Cicolello stated she was representing Women's Business Development, and was here to appeal for the Committee to reconsider the application and stated the program objectives that this is a nine week Fast-Track Business Development Program in conjunction with U.S. Small Business Administration and Fairfield County Business Administration through the State of Connecticut. She stated that funding form the state had been cut by 30-40% and this program helps people create jobs and financial stability, helps businesses stay open and provide supplemental income to those who have lost primary jobs for the families. Mr. Tobin asked if this is designed to benefit women only, and she responded that 20% of the benefactors are male.

8. Chris Jachino stated that he was representing the Family & Children's Agency Community Connections Drop-In Center and After School Literacy Programs, which were not awarded as submitted. He stated that he was here to appeal to the Committee for reconsideration, and stated the objectives in accordance with the application.

Mr. Hempstead closed the public hearing portion of the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. Hempstead asked Mr. Moore to define how the list was developed and to review the approval process in further detail.

Mr. Moore stated that the list was developed by the Joint Committee and he asked Mr. Albanese to give an overview of the grant approval process. Mr. Albanese stated that the goal was to better serve the community and that the City has limited CDBG funds, and resources and he added that in 2010 the City is faced with a continuing upheaval in the housing market combined with a dramatic decline in the economy which is especially severe for low income households. He added that here are strategies that may be used by the City to stabilize housing costs and create income stability, and support organizations are trying to assist low income residents with the impact of the economic depression on families. He stated that in addition, there was an initiative to include programs that enable people to find jobs, retain jobs and transition from one career to another, become appropriately trained for jobs, and bring stability to families. He added that programs that program that address the loss of household income that increase the need for other services such as domestic violence or homelessness.

Mr. Conroy asked Mr. Moore to go through the math on page one of his handout defining the 15% constraints on health services to get to the recommended $138,000. Ms. Lindstrom asked how the list was developed and if the Committee could add or subtract at this point, adding that there seemed to be no creation of new opportunities only repeated programs. Ms. Straniti stated that while she understands the efforts to consolidate the after school programs, she would like to see programs that address the group that is hurting the most during this tough economy, and that is the self betterment for adults who are lost or unemployed and those that could be potentially homeless.

Mr. Albanese stated that their intention was to create an efficient way to address how priorities were established and felt that some programs could just not deliver, and some were overprescribed in a specific category, such as after school programs.

Mr. Phillip Mayfield, OKM Associates responded that due to congressional intent, the grant approval process is a “bricks and water” approach with guidelines of homeless prevention with large amounts of dollars from the state and a level of communities receiving direct grants from the federal government   Ms. Straniti asked if these groups are made aware of other funds that are available, and Mr. Moore responded yes that organizations are made aware and that there is overlap with service categories.

Mr. Tobin asked why six organizations are recommended to split $75,000 and was it narrowed down and offered at a higher level for each; and if monies could be added to the Carver Center, for example. Mr. Hempstead asked if they could capture unused funds and reallocate them, and Mr. Moore responded that as long as they adhered to the 15% guideline, there was some room for reallocations.

Mr. Hempstead introduced Sally Johnson CDBG administrator and stated that she works with Michael Moore. Mr. Hempstead asked Ms. Johnson to say a few words. Ms. Johnson began talking about the CDBG program. Mr. Moore said Sally Johnson assists him with the administration procedures. Mr. Hempstead asked Ms. Johnson to continue to describe her duties. She stated that she is monitoring the programs to ensure that the sub recipients actually doing what are described in their application. She added hearing how effective the programs are and to see the impact that some of these programs have on the youth and underprivileged citizens of the City is very rewarding.

Mr. Sheehan stated that this is the second public hearing as required, and that after thirty days, they can make changes within the 15% constraints on health services and other job related required percentages and he clarified that any subsequent changed beyond the 25% adjustment, if not, then they can commence with the thirty day period.

Mr. Hempstead stated that his general comments in response to the grant applications, is that he was satisfied to see a collaborative effort with consolidation of programs among the agencies. He stated that he would like to open this up for full Committee discussion and feedback on items; for example, there were several applications for after-school programs that are just a diluted effort within the limited CDBG funds that are available.

Mr. Sheehan clarified that no action was required tonight as the applicants that have not been approved have thirty days to respond for re-consideration according to the guidelines set forth in the Consolidated 5 Year Plan and stated that it is designed to encourage jurisdictions to shape the goals and strategies for expending the CDBG monies that the City is eligible to receive. He added that in 2010 the City is faced with a continuing upheaval in the housing market combined with a dramatic decline in the economy which is especially severe for low income households.

Mr. Hempstead concluded that this was not an action item for tonight, but that the members take time to review the supporting documents in details and that this would be put on the next meeting agenda as an action item for approval on to advance the item to the Common Council for approval by May 11, 2010.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Tobin stated that on page 7 in the last paragraph he did not make the first statement, but did make the last, and Mr. Hempstead said to just switch the name with his.

** **MS. LINDSTROM MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 4, 2010 MEETING, WITH CHANGES NOTED.**
** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

BUSINESS

Mr. Hempstead requested a suspension of the rules to change the order of items in the agenda to make the following item as the first on the agenda.

B. Norwalk Enterprise Zone

Mr. Jack Burritt, Associate Director of the Norwalk Redevelopment Agency presented a summary of the presentation made to the Committee at the February meeting. He introduced Ms. Susan Sweitzer, with the Redevelopment Agency and she presented a map highlighting the Southern Section around Woodward Avenue. She reviewed of the economic impact of expanding the City's Enterprise Zone to include the 95/7 Development and the South Norwalk industrial area, compared to the Mr. Burritt's analysis of last month. She presented an analysis of the assumptions of tax revenues She added that included was a letter from Mr. Hamilton that makes various assumptions from 2003-2009 of forty-seven assessment adjustments and stated that it translated to abatements over nine years of $163,525 if applied to property improvements.

Mr. Burritt presented an analysis of Building Permit Fees from Construction of District 95/7 and stated that assumptions were based on estimated construction costs and permit fees of $15/1,000 of construction value. He outlined the building phases for retail and office use from the District 95/7 Project for the seven building phases of retail and residential use at a cost per square feet, representing a total of $232,800,000 for a total permit fees of $3,543,216.

He referred to his chart in the packet that was presented at last month's meeting, of the approved development program at build-out and summarized that the projected taxes at full build out based on the assumptions listed is a total of $4,325,850 for the total 1,144,000 square footage at the various tax rates for Office, Retail, Hotel and Residential use.

NORWALK re: DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

TO: MEMBERS, PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

FROM: TIMOTHY T. SHEEHAN, STAFF

RE: ENTERPRISE ZONE – APPLICATION FOR EXPANSION IMPLICATIONS FOR CONVEYANCE TAX REVENUES

DATE: MARCH 17, 2010

At the Planning Committee's meeting of March 4, 2010, expansion of the existing Norwalk Enterprise Zone was considered by the Committee. During the course of discussion, the question was raised as to the implications that such an expansion might have upon conveyance tax revenues to the City from the sale of real property located within the Enterprise Zone. The short answer to that question is that the existence of an Enterprise Zone has no impact upon local conveyance tax paid upon sale or transfer of property situated within the limits of the Enterprise Zone. While the State portion of the conveyance tax is, in fact abated on such sales, the local conveyance tax is unaffected and is due and payable, just as if the property were situated in any other area of the city. By way of example, on the 2007 sale of the rental portion of the Maritime Yards Project from Maritime Place Parcel # 3 (Spinnaker) to Jefferson at Maritime L.P, the city collected $250,250 in conveyance taxes on the sale of this property which is located in the existing Enterprise Zone.

The background on this issue is that the Connecticut Conveyance Tax is comprised of two parts, the State share and the Local Share. The Local share of the conveyance tax was increased by the State legislature in 2003 from .11% to .25% for all Connecticut municipalities. However, for those communities designated as "Targeted Investment Communities", the conveyance tax was permitted to rise by an additional .25%, to a total of .5%. This latter category includes communities with Enterprise Zones, such as Norwalk, which currently receives .5% conveyance tax on property sales, regardless of whether they are located within an Enterprise Zone or elsewhere in the community. In the 2003 legislation that increased the local share of the conveyance tax, the increase was scheduled to "sunset" on June 30, 2008, however this was extended by the legislature and today remains at .5%.

The State share of the conveyance tax is a bit more complicated, as for residential property it is .5% on the first $800,000 and 1% on the portion of the sale that exceeds $800,000. For unimproved land it is .5%, while for non-residential property (other than unimproved land) it is 1%. Under CGS Sec. 12-498 Exempt Transactions, if a property is located in an Enterprise Zone, the State portion of the conveyance tax is waived. The attached form, OP-236 Real Estate Conveyance Tax Return was provided by the Norwalk Town Clerk to illustrate how the exemption is recorded by the Town Clerk for State records for properties in an Enterprise Zone.

In summary, the Enterprise Zone has no adverse impact on local conveyance tax revenues. To the contrary, the fact that the City of Norwalk is a Targeted Investment Community actually serves to increase the conveyance tax revenues from .25% to .5%.of the sale price.

The Norwalk Redevelopment Agency is seeking the Common Council's consideration of expanding the boundaries of the current Norwalk Enterprise Zone. The Enterprise Zone provides limited tax relief for certain types of businesses under certain conditions. This tax relief is shared between the local municipality and the State. The Enterprise Zone has been employed by Norwalk since its adoption in 1982 under State enabling legislation and it has benefited numerous businesses and developments. Currently, a portion of the Reed Putnam Urban Renewal Project is located within the City's Enterprise Zone; however, the District 95/7 Project (Reed Putnam Parcels 1, 2 & 4) is outside the Enterprise Zone limits.

The expansion of the existing zone boundary to embrace that portion of the project now outside the zone is an implementation recommendation suggested in a report commissioned by the Redevelopment Agency and produced by JCI. The report indicates that Norwalk lags behind Stamford in effectively competing for Class A office and new office development activity. In addition it is noted in the report that the Harbor Point development in Stamford is included in that city's Enterprise Zone currently providing Stamford a competitive advantage that does not exist in Norwalk for the 95/7 site. The area in question meets the state eligibility requirements for an Enterprise Zone. The attached spreadsheet provided by the Agency analyses the cost of such an expansion to the city over the next 10 years, based on development of the currently approved District 95/7 project.

The Agency has brought forward additional analysis done by Mr. Hamilton regarding the proposed expansion of the Enterprise Zone boundaries impacting South Norwalk's industrial area. Mr. Hamilton memo also provides comment on the analysis provided to the Committee by Mr. Burritt regarding the inclusion of 95/7 project in the zone.

Mr. Hempstead asked if this could be sunset in the absence of development at the estimated predictions, and Mr. Burritt stated that the agency has worked with the City's Finance Department and he referred to the outline included in the packet from Mr. Hamilton.

Ms. Straniti thanked Mr. Burritt for his thorough analysis and for providing the information requested. Mr. Hempstead concluded that this was an action item for tonight, and that revised language was highlighted on the handout, reflected as follows:

Approval for the Mayor to request from the Commissioner of the CT Dept. of Economic and Community Development consent to expand the boundaries of the Norwalk Enterprise Zone consistent with the attached Exhibit A – Proposed enterprise Zone Map and said approval is granted subject to the requirement that, at the 10 year anniversary date of the expansion, the City shall initiate a review of the Enterprise Zone expansion to determine its continued necessity and eligibility.

****	MR. MOUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REVISED LANGUAGE FOR THE ENTERPRISE ZONE FOR CITY REVIEW AND FORWARD TO THE COMMON COUNCIL AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROVAL FOR THE MAYOR TO REQUEST FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF THE CT DEPT. OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONSENT TO EXPAND THE BOUNDARIES OF THE NORWALK ENTERPRISE ZONE CONSISTENT WITH THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT A – PROPOSED ENTERPRISE ZONE MAP AND SAID APPROVAL IS GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENT THAT, AT THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY DATE OF THE EXPANSION, THE CITY SHALL INITIATE A REVIEW OF THE ENTERPRISE ZONE EXPANSION TO DETERMINE ITS CONTINUED NECESSITY AND ELIGIBILITY.**

****	THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Sheehan stated that regarding the eligibility of projects which meet the statutory requirements but are already under construction within the area are Chapter 585 indicates that existing businesses and or structures are not eligible unless significant improvements have been made. He referred to the paragraph attached to his handout that stated that the statute does not exclude from eligibility projects that are under construction or in the process of being leased from applying for the benefits. If such structures are fully built out and leased up at the time the State approves the expansion of the zone boundaries then these projects would be considered existing. It would be the Agency's recommendation that the proposed expansion of the zone operate accordingly, and that no adjustment be made to the expanded boundaries to exclude such development projects.

****	MR. MOUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE AND FORWARD TO THE COMMON COUNCIL AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO AUTHORIZE AND EXECUTE ANY DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY RELATED TO SUCH CONSENT FROM THE COMMISSIONER REFLECTING REVISED LANGUAGE AS FOLLOWS:**

CHAPTER 585 INDICATES THAT EXISTING BUSINESSES AND OR STRUCTURES ARE NOT ELIGIBLE UNLESS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE, THAT THE STATUTE DOES NOT EXCLUDE FROM ELIGIBILITY PROJECTS THAT ARE UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR IN THE PROCESS OF BEING LEASED FROM APPLYING FOR THE BENEFITS. IF SUCH STRUCTURES ARE FULLY BUILT OUT AND LEASED UP AT THE TIME THE STATE APPROVES THE EXPANSION OF THE ZONE BOUNDARIES THEN THESE PROJECTS WOULD BE CONSIDERED EXISTING AND THAT NO ADJUSTMENT BE MADE TO THE EXPANDED BOUNDARIES TO EXCLUDE SUCH DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

****	THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Capital Budget 2011

Mr. Hempstead stated that there are two additional projects that should be reflected, which are the Traffic Study, and the changes to the removal of Tokeneke Bridge, which was no longer $300,000 but was reduced by $240,000. Mr. Tobin stated that the Mayor had proposed to move it forward by one year and that there is zero requested year and dollars appropriated this year. Mr. Hempstead stated that the project is requested in an Out Year of 2011 and that the Mayor approved removal of the old bridge for less and moving the money into the building of pedestrian footbridge.

Mr. Conroy stated that based on City Charter, the Capital Budget cannot include any new projects and coincides with the approval of the Committee and can be down with a motion for recommended transfers, and should not go back to Corporation Counsel.

Mr. Sheehan submitted the following letter from Mayor Moccia reflecting his recommendation on the 2010-2011 Capital Budget:

In accordance with the City Code, I have completed my review and herewith transmit my recommendations for the FY 2010-11 Capital Budget.

I am recommending a total capital budget of $16,675,500. This is $567,000 less than the amount recommended by the Planning Commission. Of the total recommended amount, $2,534,914 will be financed from grants and other non-general fund sources, leaving a balance to be financed and repaid from the general fund of $14,140,586. To place this recommendation in perspective, the amount of governmental activities' debt the City is scheduled to retire in FY 2010-11 is $15.7 million, so the City's overall level of debt will decline slightly as a result of the recommended FY 2010-11 capital budget.

I have accepted the Planning Commission's recommendations to add $40,000 for 5" fire hose replacement; $50,000 for a sidewalk plan; and $15,000 for repairs to the City's Hungarian Monument.

After the Planning Commission acted on the FY 2011 Capital Budget, we learned that the cost of demolishing the Old Police Facility and removing the Tokeneke Bridge are expected to be less than originally estimated. I have recommended, therefore, reducing the appropriation for the Old Police Facility by $450,000 to $1.3 million, and reducing the appropriation for the Tokeneke Bridge from $340,000 to $100,000. In turn, I have recommended restoring $123,000 to fund the following projects: $24,000 for Public Works Center repairs; $40,000 to construct a footbridge over the Five Mile River; $9,000 additional for Fleet Replacement, to purchase a leaf vacuum/shredder; and $50,000 additional for Sidewalks and Curbing. In addition, I have recommended moving a $50,000 appropriation for Downtown Parking Analysis from the Planning and Zoning Department to the Parking Authority, since the Parking Authority oversees all parking functions in the City.

Mr. Hempstead requested the addition of Planning & Zoning Item B-11 Five Mile River Footbridge $40,000 and noted that this was to be added per Mayor Moccia's letter or approval, and since this was not originally part of the budget as recommended by the Planning Committee, a motion was required.

** **MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE ADDITION TO PLANNING & ZONING OF ITEM B-11 FIVE MILE RIVER FOOTBRIDGE $40,000.00.**

** **THE MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE ABSTENTION (MS. LINDSTROM.)**

Mr. Hempstead recommended funds be transferred as follows:
From the Fire Department $100,000 to Recreation and Parks Cranbury Park Master Plan, $80,000 for Windows & Maintenance $5,000 for Tree Planting and $15,000 to Fodor Farm.

** **MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE TRANSFER FROM** : **FIRE DEPARTMENT $100,000 TO RECREATION AND PARKS CRANBURY PARK MASTER PLAN: $80,000 FOR WINDOWS & MAINTENANCE, $5,000 FOR TREE PLANTING AND $15,000 TO FODOR FARM.**

** **THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Hempstead recommended funds be transferred in reply to the Information & Technology request to improve the technology and presentation equipment for the Council Chambers. He recommended a transfer from the Health Department, and Ms. Straniti stated that she did not feel comfortable putting all of that money to the room modifications. She suggested that money be moved into Open Space where possible, and Mr. Hempstead suggested a transfer, as follows:

From: Health Department $100,000 to
To: Department of Public Works
$75,000 Water Course Maintenance and
Recreation, Parks $25,000 Open Space Development

** **MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO TRANSFER FROM THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT $100,000 TO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS $75,000 WATER COURSE MAINTENANCE AND RECREATION, PARKS $25,000 OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT.**

** **THE MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE ABSTENTION (MR. CONROY)**

Mr. Hempstead recommended the following transfer:
From: Parking Authority: Move $50,000 from Parking Analysis to Planning & Zoning.

** MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE TRANSFER FROM : PARKING AUTHORITY PARKING ANALYSIS $50,000 TO PLANNING & ZONING.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Hempstead recommended the following transfer:
From: Board of Education: $40,000 To: Library $35,000 Ceiling Repairs and $5,000 Children's Library Bathroom.

** MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO APPROVE AND TO FORWARD ON TO THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL THE 2011 CAPITAL BUDGET CHANGE TRANSFER FROM : FROM BOARD OF EDUCATION $40,000 TO: LIBRARY $35,000 CEILING REPAIRS AND $5,000 CHILDREN'S LIBRARY BATHROOM

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

** MR. HEMPSTEAD MOTIONED TO APPROVE AND TO FORWARD ON TO THE COMMON COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2011 AS AMENDED WITH CHANGES AS LISTED ABOVE.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Acquisition of the Globe Theater by the Redevelopment Agency

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Hempstead called for a motion to enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing an update of the acquisition of the Globe Theater by the Redevelopment Agency

** MR. CONROY MOTIONED TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING AN UPDATE OF THE ACQUISITION OF GLOBE THEATER BY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting went into Executive Session at 8:55 p.m. and was reconvened into public session at 9:35 p.m. There were no votes or actions taken.

ADJOURNMENT

** MS. STRANITI MOVED TO ADJOURN.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Marilyn Knox, Telesco Secretarial Services

Note: CDBG Grant Application Approval Lists – to be provided by M. Moore, Redevelopment Agency