

**Minutes**  
**Redevelopment Agency**  
**Wednesday, April 4, 2007**  
**5:00 pm - Town Hall**  
**Town Manager's Conference Room**

1. **Call to Order** - Chairman Lee Kuckro called the meeting to order at 5:01 pm.
2. **Roll Call/Attendance** - All were present at 5:01 except where noted. Members in attendance: Lee Kuckro - Chair, Dan Camilliere - Vice Chair, Joe Soja, Paul Thompson [arrived 5:31] and Mike Zaleski [arrived 5:15]. Also in attendance: Town Planner/Economic Development Manager, Peter Gillespie; and Councilor Martin Walsh [arrived 5:10].

Members absent: none.

3. **Public Comments** - No one from the public was present.
4. **Approval of Minutes** - [March 21, 2007](#) - Mr. Kuckro asked if there were corrections needed for the draft minutes, and none were requested. Mr. Camilliere motioned to approve the minutes, Mr. Soja seconded the motion and the vote showed all members in favor.
5. **Discussion of Agency Presentation to the Town Council, April 10, 2007** - Mr. Kuckro noted that it was not necessary to go into executive session yet, since most of the presentation content could be discussed without mentioning the names of the specific projects. Mr. Kuckro then started the discussion of the content planned for the presentation by asking Mr. Gillespie if he will be the presenter. Mr. Gillespie said he would do so, and will get to the Agency members a draft of the presentation before the April 10th meeting. Mr. Camilliere recommended that the Agency chair open the presentation, turn it over to Mr. Gillespie, and moderate questions from the Council members.

Mr. Soja started a discussion of the specific presentation slide content by suggesting that the presentation slides include the Agency member names, the towns the Agency has toured to view other redevelopment projects, and that the Agency has consulted with the Bond Council. Then the 13 projects considered by the Agency would all be listed, followed by a list of the Top 5 projects to be recommended. The projects not ranked in the Top 5 would not be named or discussed in detail. The overall project evaluation criteria should be listed and described, as well as how the Agency arrived at using those criteria. Next, there would be a detailed review of the pros and cons for each of the evaluation criteria for the Top 5 projects. An aerial photograph would be shown for each of the Top 5.

Mr. Gillespie said the presentation would include a matrix for the Top 5 projects to summarize and compare the project attributes. Example attributes include: presence of development obstacles such as floodplain or business relocation; the expected economic benefit to the town; and various costs such as acquisition, environmental clean-up and demolition. Mr. Kuckro suggested adding tax abatement and civic approval to the project attributes list, and asked if the matrix should include numeric value for the costs. Mr. Gillespie said he envisioned that the matrix would indicate whether an attribute applied to the project and how, but he did not plan to include numeric values.

Mr. Kuckro agreed by saying that the purpose of the presentation was to get feedback from the Council on the viability of the projects and whether the Agency should seek funds to explore them in more detail. That is, for example, hire an appraiser to better assess the property value. Mr. Gillespie added that the Agency did not have to get an answer from the Council immediately on April 10th - there was time for the Council to have further discussion, ask for more information, etc. and still allow the Agency time to prepare referendum language by August.

Mr. Kuckro said he did not have a good sense for whether the public would feel comfortable voting on a

referendum question if it did not specifically identify the projects. Mr. Gillespie said the Agency could meet with the Bond Counsel in May to get advice on the content of the referendum question. He also said it would likely be important for the public to know that the process after the referendum is open and has a clear path. That is, if the referendum is approved, there will be a public hearing and adoption of an economic development plan all prior to any money being spent pursuant to the referendum. Mr. Gillespie noted that the content of the redevelopment plan is governed by state statute. He also said that final approval for use of the funds would be contingent upon receipt of approval through all normal applicable town boards, commissions and processes such as Planning and Zoning, Housing, Zoning Board of Appeals, Town Council, etc.

Mr. Gillespie said that he thought it would be best to prepare cost and other information prior to the referendum, so it would be ready for a public hearing as soon as possible after the vote. Mr. Gillespie also said some of the economic development plan could be prepared before the referendum so it, too, would be ready to go after the referendum. Mr. Kuckro said the presentation on April 10th should include a projected timeline for drafting the redevelopment plan. Mr. Gillespie said this could be developed as soon as possible, but could go no faster than the timelines specified in state statutes.

Mr. Kuckro asked about the funding part of preparation for the referendum. Mr. Gillespie said that Town Manager Therrien planned to put preliminary funding on the agenda for the Town Council. Preliminary funding could be used for research and preparation like hiring an appraiser. Mr. Soja asked for examples of research and preparation costs for redevelopment projects in other towns, like New London or Windsor. Mr. Gillespie said that such costs vary greatly depending on the project, but sometimes are very small. Mr. Kuckro added that up-front preparation could be anything from the Town doing simple advertising or facilitation between buyer and seller, to more complex preparations such as land acquisition, demolition and other site groundwork. Councilor Walsh offered to get some information on such preparation from the City of Stamford when he is there soon.

6. **Executive Session To Discuss Real Estate Matters** - Mr. Zaleski motioned to go into executive session at 5:34 p.m. to discuss real estate matters. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the vote showed all members in favor. During the executive session, the Agency members discussed real estate negotiations, and no votes were taken. Mr. Zaleski motioned to come out of the executive session at 5:48 p.m. and return to the regular agenda, Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and the vote showed all members in favor.
7. **Return to Regular Agenda** - Mr. Kuckro stated that the Bond Council may be present at the next Agency meeting, depending on the outcome of the April 10th presentation to the Town Council. Mr. Kuckro also asked if there was any progress to report on individual projects. Mr. Gillespie answered that there was none to report.
8. **Next Meeting Date** - May 2, 2007 at 5:00 pm. (April 18, 2007 meeting cancelled).
9. **Correspondence** - none.
10. **Call to Adjourn** - Mr. Camilliere motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:50 pm, Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the vote showed all members in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin T. Sullivan  
Agency Recording Secretary