

**CITY OF DERBY**  
**REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING**  
**AUGUST 10, 2005**

**FORMER DERBY CITY HALL – ALDERMANIC CHAMBERS – 6:30 P.M.**  
**(35 Fifth Street)**

Mayor Marc J. Garofalo called the meeting/ to order at 6:35 p.m. All rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

**Roll Call**

Present: The Honorable Mayor Marc J. Garofalo  
John Oraziatti (arrived at 6:36 p.m.)  
Vincent J. Guardiano  
Glenn Stevens  
Greg Russo

Also Present: Alderwoman Sheri Pflugh  
Michael J. Joyce, P.E., Milone & MacBroom, Inc.  
Warren Holcomb, Esq.

**ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, CORRECTIONS TO AGENDA**

**A MOTION** was made by Mr. Stevens with a second by Mr. Stevens to adopt the agenda as presented. **Motion carried.**

**PUBLIC PORTION**

Mayor Garofalo noted that Item #6 on the agenda is specific to the Redevelopment Plan pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, which we will take up at Item #6. If there are any other comments pursuant to Section 101 of the Charter, please come forward, state your name and address now for the record.

Dan Waleski, 21 Elm Street, Derby, CT – I just have a general comment in that I find that people in town generally are not all that familiar about the proposal for redeveloping downtown Derby. They don't seem to have too much of the details. They're really at somewhat of a loss as to whether they like it or don't like it or this or that. I'm just trying to say here and I feel that the administration here ought to do something about informing the general public as to what exactly you're going to do and how you're going to do it and what it's all about. All I keep hearing is that this project will generate \$5 million worth of taxes and that justifies the whole project. I want to go on record in saying I not at all sure that that is the case. Thank you.

Jeff Auerbach – Are you saying we can ask questions later in the redevelopment portion (inaudible.)

Mayor Garofalo – The public hearing – Item #6 is pursuant to the General Statutes on the Redevelopment Plan. There's a draft Redevelopment Plan that was previously distributed and discussed by this agency. It was referred to the Planning & Zoning Agency who also issued an opinion on it. And also the Housing Authority did also approve the Redevelopment Plan as well. That is the Redevelopment Plan in short is simply a – pursuant to the Redevelopment Statutes it's the document that's essentially the blueprint for the process of revitalization and redevelopment. If we did not have, in other words, if we did not even have a developer on board it would be the Plan of Redevelopment for the City – like the City desired for this particular redevelopment zone.

Mr. Auerbach – I'm sorry I just wanted to know if we should ask questions now or wait until Item #6?

Mayor Garofalo – Well I think if you have general questions about redevelopment you should speak now. If you want to speak specifically to the project – you know the plan itself then you should do that in item #6.

Jeff Auerbach, Derby Garden Center, 4 Caroline Street, Derby, CT – I just have one question. At one of the prior meetings we were told sixty days after the signing – I believe it's in the agreement – that the buildings would be really, we would see them coming down and I don't see any activity. Can you give us a specific response as to why it hasn't happened and what is going to happen as far as the demolition goes?

Anita Coscia, 10 Talmadge Street, Derby, CT – I see the confusion. We do have a Preferred Developer, the City has its own plans – maybe we can get a statement from the City and from Mr. Ceruzzi – his plan and why things are being held up. And maybe through the board if we can request Mr. Ceruzzi to make a statement about what's going on and what's happening and what's the holdup actually.

Markanthony Izzo, Olivia Street, Derby, CT – I guess that in addition to the confusion it's confusing because is there going to be any more public hearings and what's really the purpose of this public hearing tonight? To get ideas on downtown? Because there is already a plan in place. Or is this a waste of time? That's the question I have there. And because we also had this design charrette that happened in February where people were supposed to give ideas then. And at first that was supposed to be a sixty-day process and it turned into a one-night process. And it gets very, very confusing what's going on. Is there (inaudible.) Like why are we here? Why do you have to have a public portion, I mean a public hearing for this? You keep on stating this General Statute, Connecticut General Statute. What exactly is that? Can you read the Statute so we know exactly what it is and why we're here? Because people take time out of their lives to come here because we're wondering if we should still be making suggestions to the plan. Is the plan in place? Is it set in stone? You know what I mean? Or is this just a formality? The job is taken and we're just doing a formality just to cover bases. I just don't understand it. If someone could answer that. We would really like to know what the General Statute that we keep on hearing (inaudible.)

Atty. Holcomb – The General Statute that I believe is being referred to is C.G.S. Section 8-127, which in relevant part requires that before a Redevelopment Plan is approved it requires a Public Hearing and that is the purpose of the meeting tonight – to have a Public Hearing to comply with Section 8-127 of the General Statutes.

Mr. Izzo – Okay. It's not to have a discussion, because I know you don't like this at these meetings, but I thought this plan was already approved?

Atty. Holcomb – No it has not already been approved.

Mr. Izzo – Thank you.

Mike Joyce, P.E., Milone & MacBroom, Inc. (City Engineer & City Planner) – Just to clarify the word “plan” with respect to (inaudible) this Redevelopment Plan the plan is not a development plan for construction or a Site Plan approval. The plan is a document, as the Mayor identified, that outlines the City's intent for this area regardless of, with all due respect, whether Ceruzzi and partners come into Derby or not. Before Derby can do anything with this area under the redevelopment concept they have to adopt this plan per State Statute. That gives them certain abilities under that Statute. So while you had designs for that meeting to discuss visions with respect to what this area would look like that vision was also discussed during the opinion from the Planning & Zoning Commission. That document was submitted to this Agency by State Statute and then submitted to both the Housing Authority and to the Planning & Zoning Commission. They both gave written opinions back saying they agree with the opinion of the plan and there's a couple of recommendations here. At that point once those are back in they bring that plan, that document over to the public for their comments. Again it's not about what color the buildings are or how many units are displaced (inaudible.) It's the perimeter of the area – it's the types of uses that are going to be allowed in the area. Some of the underlying land uses that are allowed in the area one of which includes you already have a downtown CDD Zone that was identified back in 2000. (Inaudible) talk about what the City wanted in this location and that basically allowed the format for where we are today. So it's not as specific (inaudible) going to go where. That's not the plan (inaudible). In order for the developer to be able to submit that type of plan they would have to adopt this Redevelopment Plan. Hopefully that clarifies it a little bit.

Mr. Izzo – Mr. Mayor if I may follow up...

Mayor Garofalo – Please.

Mr. Izzo – Whatever is happening in that zone that's not going to be approved today. (Inaudible) it's going to be a development zone is that what we're saying here?

Mayor Garofalo – It's the Plan of Redevelopment. Respectfully Mr. Izzo this is not new. Right from the get go we've always known and there's been several drafts, this is the latest draft, of this Plan of Redevelopment. We had it in draft format because obviously the Plan has changed and evolved. The initial offering on this was – the City's desire

before we even solicited a Preferred Redeveloper was for a mixed project – a mixed use project – both for residential, retail and commercial. As you know there was also then a Preferred Development Agreement that was signed a year ago that called for just 270 units of residential or thereabouts. After further discussion the developers came back with a larger plan, which I think mirrored the City's original intent to have it be a mixed-use development. So the Plan of Redevelopment, just to restate it as Mr. Joyce had said, this is a document that needs to be adopted pursuant to the Statutes to say essentially what is it that the City wants? I mean if Ceruzzi was not involved in this at all, some towns do this right at the beginning. They say we want this and that's it. We have kept this process as an open process to have the design meetings, these meetings every month to update the public and this is an issue that needs to be brought to closure. The Statute actually says that you have to have at least one public hearing to comply with the Statute. The draft of the Redevelopment Plan has been on file for several months. The Concept Plan, which mirrors the Plan of Redevelopment, has been discussed. It was received in February with overwhelming support of the community. It was discussed at the March meeting and April meeting in particular. And at this point we're at the next phase of this. Planning & Zoning offered a bunch of comments. The Housing Authority because it is predominately a project that has housing in it, it had to be approved also by the Housing Authority as well. And we're here – in a sense this is really the blueprint to say is this what the City wants in the conceptual, just in the basic form. As Ceruzzi and Company are doing what they're doing, is this what the City wants? Do you want the mixed-use development? The housing, the parking, the retail and the commercial element of it. That is really the – I don't think it's a waste of anybody's time. I think it's a very important project and that really is what and why we're here.

Mr. Stevens – I think it just really sets the guidelines. But instead of setting the guidelines before Ceruzzi came in it kind of evolved and what it's going to do is set the guideline. Planning & Zoning looked at it and we made some comments, the Housing Board made comments and now the guidelines are going to get set (inaudible) and then Ceruzzi will have to follow the guidelines.

Mr. Izzo – Just a final comment. With all due respect Mr. Mayor and I've actually stated this in a previous meeting as you just stated here that some cities do it differently – do all these first before they go out and get a developer. So again I would like to restate that's the way we should have done it number one. And since it's, as you say, that the City overwhelmingly approved the plan that's all well and good but I still want to remain consistent by saying that we should actually have a control density downtown here and not just put those two big buildings – especially with what's happening over there in Shelton. I would just want to remain consistent.

Mayor Garofalo – That would be the appropriate comment for item #6.

Mr. Izzo – Thank you very much.

Mayor Garofalo – I mean just so that the record. Anybody else from the public? Your name and address for the record.

Tony Staffieri, 17 O'Sullivan Road, Derby, CT – Something just came up now that I've been meaning to ask in other committee meetings – is you mentioned housing – that housing had to approve it. Now does that mean that there's going to be low-income housing? That housing had to approve it.

Mayor Garofalo – Do you want low-income housing down there?

Mr. Staffieri – No.

Mayor Garofalo – The Housing Authority pursuant to Section – that Section of the Statute it says if a project is predominately, which the proposal is then what is requested in the draft Redevelopment Plan talks about between 600 and 700 units of housing, pursuant to the Statute it has to be approved by the Housing Authority, which has nothing to do with low-income housing. It has nothing to do with that at all. That's what the Statute says and we have to comply with the Statute.

Mr. Staffieri – This started out that it being a retail and commercial district – now it's turned into 700 units. It's turning into more of a residential unit. Where the City has been trying to reduce the density it looks like the City is looking to build up a huge density problem where the Police Department is going to have to – you're going to have to increase the Police Department just with the amount of people that they're going to put there.

Mayor Garofalo – Actually if you refer to the Economic Impact Study that the City did commission the impact on services was relatively minor. I don't have it with me here tonight, but I would refer you to that matter because the relative impact was minor. And I think the commission members would bear that and anybody that was here for those discussions that were held in public.

Mr. Staffieri – Well I don't really want to get into it now – I know that the Police Department has a problem that they can't control now because of a shortage of manpower and we're creating a huge area that with the amount of housing that we're putting in there who's going to take care of it? I just wanted to bring it up.

Mayor Garofalo – Thank you. Anybody else from the public?

Carl Yacobacci, 176 Main Street, Derby, CT – In this plan that you have that you're voting on tonight...

Mayor Garofalo – No the Commission is not going to vote on it tonight. Nobody is going to vote on it tonight. Just a public hearing to get your input. It's not on the agenda to vote – just a public hearing.

Mr. Yacobacci – One question – does this also discuss the relocation of the existing businesses downtown? Where we're going to be relocated?

Mayor Garofalo – No. Not specifically to say that you're or anybody's company is going to go from the position where they are now to some other position.

Mr. Yacobacci – Well how can you say this is a general outline of what's going to happen to downtown, what's going to happen...

Mayor Garofalo – In the zone itself, in the zone itself.

Mr. Yacobacci – Where in the zone is there anything to address the needs of the people who are going to get dislocated from the zone?

Mayor Garofalo – Yes there is a plan to relocate, to relocate. It doesn't say specifically where...

Mr. Yacobacci – So the town hasn't put anything in there for possible locations or anything like that.

Mayor Garofalo – That would not be part of this Redevelopment Plan. It wouldn't be part of a Plan of Redevelopment. It's a very specific document a Plan of Redevelopment. Anybody else from the public?

***Hearing no one else wishing to address the committee, without objection the public portion was closed.***

#### **APPROVE MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2005 MEETING**

**A MOTION** was made by Mr. Russo with a second by Mr. Stevens to approve the Minutes of the July 12, 2005 meeting as presented. **Motion carried.**

#### **UPDATE ON SOUTH SIDE OF MAIN STREET REVITALIZATION PROJECT (REGULAR & EXECUTIVE SESSION)**

Robert Skolnick, Development Partner of Ceruzzi Derby Development, LLC – By way of an update on various tasks that we're undergoing I had reported at the last meeting that we had ordered Title work to be performed on the pieces of property that the City owns and that work I'm told all of the preliminary search and draft are complete. Within the next week we should be receiving the final report. I'm sure we'll be in touch with the City's counsel if there are any objections to what we find. So within the next week we should have a way better handle on what if any issues there are with regard to Title. With regard to an update as to the access permission that we've been attempting to be granted by the current owners within the redevelopment district we have been working with Gary (inaudible) to make introduction and deliver the permission slips to all of the property owners. I believe that all of them have either received contact by Gary or have received a meeting with Gary and received the permission form. We've had a couple of them signed and returned – we have a few that are pending review by counsel and we have in addition met with a group of current property owners last night – those that are potentially interested in a relocation or a change of property. And many of them had the opinion that they weren't going

to sign the permission to access their properties until we got further along in the process. And so we're still optimistic that we will get the permission. We're working through several issues relative to that. As it pertains to those people that are current business and property owners that may be interested in relocating, we recently received through the City's engineer a set of plans, survey and documents and we've commissioned an architect to help us study the viability of utilizing the D.O.T. piece as a potential relocation parcel. First we wanted, and we're in the process of studying, the environmental soundness of that parcel and the development potential, which we believe there is, and upon completion of that we also received – quarried and received from many of the current property owners – again those that are potentially interested in relocation a programmatic requirement which we will be drafting onto that parcel so that we can sit down with them in particular and discuss the viability of relocating the four or five potential tenants onto that D.O.T. piece. So that's going to be something that we report on monthly as we get better acquainted with both the owners as well as the property. As it relates to the demolition, which at the last meeting I had reported that the process had begun, our counsel has advised us not to discuss the facts and details of the demolition during the public setting. The reason for that is that the sensitive nature of the on going litigation between the City and the demo contractor and it would compromise those negotiations to talk publicly about it. However, we are prepared to report on the progress of our dialogue and our plans and our activity as it relates to the demolition and the remediation both in executive session as well as the next public session. I'm sure by that time it would be quite apparent what's going on with the remediation and with the demolition because we hope at that time we hope to be out there in the field and physically be (inaudible) what's happening. If there any questions I can answer?

Mr. Oraziotti – Mr. Skolnick at our last July 12<sup>th</sup> meeting we spoke about utility disconnects and at that time you said two of the three buildings have already been disconnected and the third building behind Hubbell's that it wasn't done yet and you would know by the Thursday after our 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, which I assume was the 14<sup>th</sup>, has the utilities been disconnected?

Mr. Skolnick – Again, details relative to...

Mr. Oraziotti – That's the demolition...

Mr. Skolnick – I'm happy to answer that in...

Mr. Oraziotti – Okay. I'm sorry I didn't realize it was part of...

Mayor Garofalo – Okay any further questions from the agency? Okay we'll pass on the issue of executive session and move onto #6 – the public hearing.

**CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING ON REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SOUTH SIDE OF MAIN STREET REVITALIZATION PROJECT**

Dan Waleski, 21 Elm Street, Derby, CT – Question, could you tell us just exactly what the boundaries are as it stands today?

Mayor Garofalo – Perhaps Mr. Joyce can give an overview of the plan.

Mr. Joyce – As defined in the Redevelopment Plan the limits of the Redevelopment area, which is considered Phase I A that's the way the language of the Redevelopment Plan has been adopted orientation on the map is straight (inaudible) and straight out. Housatonic River to your left, Route 8 going north to south to your right. Here is Bridge Street to the west (inaudible) Main Street, 34, back across (inaudible) East Derby. This is Factory Street; this is Caroline Street as the private cross street that comes in behind the (inaudible) buildings. The perimeter of the redevelopment area is First Street to the west; Housatonic River to the south and west; the Housatonic Railroad right-of-way line to the south; the eastern street line for Caroline Street; cutting across the municipal parking lot parcel (inaudible); coming up the western side of Factory Street and the northerly side of Hallock Court (inaudible) on the corner of Caroline and Main Street. That is the area that was adopted. That is the area that is also included in the Preferred Development Agreement that was agreed upon between the City and the developer. So that is the boundary of the Redevelopment Zone.

Mayor Garofalo – And the plan itself, as you know from previous meetings, is the construction of a 1,500 vehicle parking structure on the lower grade of that property. Approximately between 600 and 700 residential units approximately two-thirds of which would be rental and one-third to be owner – I forget, 60-40. I'm sorry it's actually two-thirds to be owner occupied and one-third to be rental. 100,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of retail space including a multi-plex urban-style cinema. The incorporation of the River Walk, an amphitheater and other green space in the middle and also the extension of an improvement of Caroline Street to the south and westerly direction to the Housatonic River.

Mr. Joyce – While those improvements for – as suggested by the Planning & Zoning Board – those specific requirements are not in the actual Redevelopment Plan. There's a recommendation from Planning & Zoning that they liked the idea of connecting Caroline Street with Elizabeth Street and (inaudible) so Planning & Zoning in their review has said we like that idea please incorporate that into the Redevelopment Plan. They like to maintain the access to the river as the Mayor had said. Those specific details about how the river is accessed are not spelled out in this plan. Back up to a comment which was asked before regarding relocation – Exhibit 5 of the Redevelopment Plan discusses relocation. It goes through non-residential relocation; services offered to the people who are relocated, etc... On that Redevelopment Plan there is a section on relocation assistance at some point – it completely spells it out and is in conformance with the State Statutes on relocation. Just to answer that question as well. Again with this particular zone there are a couple of changes to the CDD Zone that was adopted in 2000. The CDD Zone that was adopted in 2000, which is the Center Design Development District is the underlying zone through a good portion of the downtown area – not just this area here. In that area there were some certain things that the Commission of Planning & Zoning certainly wanted to clarify. The original language it said "Redevelopment Zone" – any area that identifies Redevelopment Zone. Well the City might not want this type of density in every CDD zone or any other Redevelopment Zone in town. So what Planning & Zoning suggested let's identify this as Phase I A. Let's

do this as a specific area – the density associated with (inaudible) to a specific area – that way if another redevelopment area is identified in town the specifics that we're talking about here are not particular to that. We're talking about this area only. So it's not an expansive – it's not (inaudible) the other side of town that says this is a redevelopment area now of all of a sudden we can do the same thing. (Inaudible) this is the concept we're following the idea from the design charrette – let's follow that. This is where we want it. We don't want it anywhere else this is where we want it downtown. With that there was a change – the big change here was the density of apartments. Currently right now according to the Zoning Regulations you allow twelve units per acre for residential density. To incorporate the idea of the charrette that density had to increase to thirty to accommodate that. That's basically the main crux of the changes. CDD zone does not have any side or rear setback requirements – those are building lines. Because half of your buildings or 90% of your buildings in the downtown area would be non-conforming. You're allowed to build to your building line. One of the things that's required is you need to maintain your own parking for residential construction on your own property. That's why these parking decks and parking garage were discussed in that area. They are not looking to go to parking garages or other off-site areas outside the zone to accommodate their parking needs. So that's why the discussion in the design charrette had to have stacked parking in that area. So nothing has changed with respect to CDD. The CDD still allows the uses it does. It excludes the uses of (inaudible) as well. No fast food restaurants in that area – primarily service based industries (inaudible). The other part of the Redevelopment Plan and while the specifics maybe not specific enough for the public are a formality that the State needs the City have to go through. They have to identify if there's infrastructure in the area (inaudible) gas, electric, so forth. Other areas being accessibility to mass transit. The Plan is not very complicated – it's intended not to be very complicated because this plan goes back to your Planning & Zoning Regulations, which requires the developer to submit detailed information of their plan at that time. This just says what we want in this area.

Mayor Garofalo – And by its nature it's not very specific.

Mr. Joyce – Exactly.

Carl Yacobacci, 176 Main Street, Derby, CT – I would just like to know when an updated version of this would be available for the public to take a look at. To see what changes were made.

Mayor Garofalo – What the Redevelopment?

Mr. Yacobacci – Because you have the other one that's on line.

Mayor Garofalo – That's it.

Mr. Yacobacci – And there's no changes that have been made to that since that's been on line?

Mayor Garofalo – Nope.

Mr. Yacobacci – Okay we're can we submit changes because there are some things on there from property that I have that are listed in other people's names or things that are vacant buildings that are actually occupied.

Mayor Garofalo – You mean a correction of property ownership?

Mr. Yacobacci – Yeah, a correction. I don't know if that matters a lot because if this document is going (inaudible) as exactly as possible.

Mayor Garofalo – Yeah you could submit that to my office.

Mr. Yacobacci – Okay.

Al Misiewicz, 171 Derby Avenue, Derby, CT – Last week I read in the paper that \$5.5 million was being used to widen Route 34 through Derby. Has this been taken into this plan? Has this been taken into consideration for this plan that they plan on widening the road? And if it is I wonder what the holdups on this seems to be the asbestos removal on these buildings. If these buildings are now going to fall into the widening of the 34 area why isn't the State taking care of this?

Mayor Garofalo – Well the money was just approved by Congress and it is anticipated that it would be signed by the President tomorrow. And it is not going to be available – it goes into effect October 1<sup>st</sup>, which is the federal fiscal year. There are a few other steps that need to take place. The City, as part of the Valley Council of Government and the Valley Planning Region, is paired with the Greater Bridgeport Planning Agency and both groups, the ten towns are part of what they call the Greater Bridgeport Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization, which is responsible for administering federal funds – transportation funds. It needs to be included on the "TIP", which is the Transportation Improvement Plan; it's usually a five to seven planning tool that administers the federal funds that are passed from the federal government to the state. And we actually as part of this project – the \$5.4 million is something that we have been working on for probably six or seven years and really through the efforts of Congresswoman DeLauro, working closely with her office and Senator Lieberman's office we were able to obtain approval on that money through their efforts and working locally, closely with them to in fact make that available to the City obviously to widen 34, which is part of this project and that would have to be approved by the State and so forth – there's a whole bunch of steps. And to whatever extent we couldn't say right now to what extent it would affect this project.

Mr. Misiewicz – Well it will definitely affect about forty feet maybe of your area and it's also a lot of demolition costs. So will we be reimbursed by the State for tearing down these buildings (inaudible) if they're just going to pave it over?

Mayor Garofalo – The cost of the demolition is being borne by, pursuant to our Preferred Development Agreement, is being borne by the developer, not by the City.

Mr. Misiewicz – That's correct but if I were a developer and I find out that the State is going to widen that road I wouldn't want to pay for cleaning the area for the State to (inaudible.)

Mayor Garofalo – Well there's value associated with the land if the buildings are on it or if they're torn down. It's all intertwined – where, how, and when is really not germane to the Redevelopment Plan but certainly part of the project itself and obviously the widening or the potential widening of 34 on Main Street is subject to debate and discussion as to where – first of all if it were to be widened, how it would be widened and where it would be widened.

Mr. Russo – Mr. Mayor if anything that would impact the boundary lines – that's really it.

Mayor Garofalo – Yeah the north boundary line.

Mr. Russo – But for purposes of the Plan of Redevelopment that's the only thing that will really impact. (Inaudible) is silent as to where the monies are coming from and how it's going to be paid for.

Mr. Misiewicz – What I'm saying is I would hope that this plan would be going for seven years, which you said the State is going to require...

Mayor Garofalo – No it's a seven year plan – it's a seven year planning. There's a ranking of money that is done locally and the region or super-region level – but this is a specific earmark to Derby. This is just a specific earmark to Derby but it does, in a technical way, have to be approved by the MPO.

Mr. Misiewicz – Yes, but I mean they must have a vague idea where they want to widen 34.

Mayor Garofalo – It's not they, we initiated it. We initiated the money for the traffic issue separate from the Redevelopment process – we did that. We were actually one of the more successful cities because we worked closely with the congresswoman's office and the senator's office we were able to obtain a greater benefit. Because in some publications you'll see the document – there's \$2.4 in one and then the other I think \$2.7 or \$2.8 in the other package – House and Senate.

Mr. Misiewicz – It's just that if we initiated this thing we should have a very good idea where we would like 34 widened. It should be taken into account this plan.

Mr. Yacobacci – Just to clarify maybe somebody from Ceruzzi's office could talk about this because at one of the previous meetings Mr. Ceruzzi himself said that by widening 34 it would have a big impact on the project. That he didn't want it widened and I know the discussion was made that there was just some money to look at some study. Now that this has changed and we are going to widen 34 just as he said you said the project can go forward at least if they start put buildings up and the State comes in what happens then? Are the buildings going to start coming back down again?

Mayor Garofalo – The State is not going to come in and do anything the City doesn't want to do. The previous money was planning money – it was \$1.5 million for 34 and that's really about the flow mostly into Derby coming from New Haven into Derby. This is construction money that would be available for the widening of 34.

Mr. Yacobacci – You just said that the State won't do anything the City doesn't want it to do so in essence you could tell the State that this is going forward – you still want to have on street parking for Route 34 so the State won't do anything the City doesn't want it to do would you then give a commitment or whatever to say that yes no we're not widening Route 34 and for all the businesses that are going to be on Main Street there will be parking. Or is this a possibility that you would just say that no we are going to take away all the parking and have the sidewalk on the Main Street?

Mayor Garofalo – The idea – through the whole design process and everything else the whole idea would be to make it more pedestrian friendly, more customer friendly parking wise and to an extent that we could comply with the widening to accommodate that, that would be within...

Mr. Yacobacci – (Inaudible.)

Mayor Garofalo – Let's not put the cart before the horse. This was just approved – it hasn't even been signed into law. The idea was to have availability to make the necessary improvements to Route 34 knowing there would be a redevelopment project and hopefully – we couldn't predict that it would be...

Mr. Yacobacci – Sometimes hopefully and maybe – it's kind of hard for us to really think that way by saying well hopefully we don't need to do this – maybe it won't happen, but we're looking at redeveloping the whole front of our town. We don't want to see that – like you said you want to make sure it gets done right the first time should we have any answers on what is going to be expanded, not expanded – especially for the contractor. He said you're going to spend millions of dollars tearing down buildings only to know that the State would have paid for that because they're going to widen 34, shore it up and now you have a nice area to go through. (Inaudible) get concerned about is that you have this nice plan for downtown with all these sidewalks and parking and then is it going to go away in the middle of the project?

Mayor Garofalo – Anybody else from the public.

Mr. Waleski – First question I have concerning the project and I'm going to just point out some concerns that I and other citizens have – first of all it has to do with the overall area that's being included here. I have questions in regard to water supply for this particular project. I have questions concerning traffic. I have questions concerning future school system. I have questions concerning the sewage system that is going to be required and needed. Questions mentioned earlier as to police. There's questions here in regard to fire protection in our Fire Department; we're a volunteer Fire Department, which I'm sure you're well aware. I have concerns about trash collection.

I have concerns about public safety in general. People coming and going and all the rest. There's a great concern about the real heavy density that is going to be involved with this project. And you could go on and on in regard to things of that sort. I'm not all together sure everyone has taken into consideration the fact that we're the smallest city in the state. We're only 5.3 square miles; 12,000 population. This is a grandiose plan – it's very large for the – that is items that will be included in the proposed plan are large and encompassing. There will be condominiums involved, which means less control for the City and all the control vested in the (inaudible.) The Greenway that we're spending money to put in, which we hope will benefit the entire City as a whole is going to be of immense benefit to this project and I'm just wondering how it will affect the usage by other citizens from the other parts of the City. We're including City-owned land in this project – kind of a give away here. Anyway these are just some of the concerns that I have that I don't feel have been adequately answered and I hope that these can be solved to satisfaction. But I do feel this is an awfully large project for the area and for the small town of Derby and I have some reservations about the project. I feel it would be nice if we had some alternative plans that we could compare to – we haven't. The City's presented just this one plan and I'm not all together sure it's the perfect fit for Derby in this lower section of Derby with the extraordinary potential of the two rivers coming together, which could be of immense value if this part of town is done properly and correctly. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Garofalo – Anybody else from the public.

Anita Coscia, 10 Talmadge Street, Derby, CT – This is a big project like everyone is saying. We welcome Ceruzzi – we have confidence in our boards and everybody's minds working together and making it work to everyone's advantage. I have confidence in that.

Mayor Garofalo – Anybody else from the public.

Markanthony Izzo, Olivia Street, Derby, CT – Just to add something to Mr. Waleski – there are a least a couple of other things that were – for comparison sake – in 1995 the Olde Birmingham Business Association did sponsor a charrette where three architects came in and made some designs for the public to view. I have actually submitted a video to the City for them to view and it's available through the Mayor's office if anyone wants to see it. Also, I don't recall the year but at one point the Groves Report was done – it was a firm from San Antonio Texas that came in and actually made some signs also. So there are alternate signs out there just for the record.

Mayor Garofalo – Anybody else? Anyone else like to speak? Anybody else from the public? Do any of the board members like to speak with respect to the public hearing? Okay then motion would be in order to close the public hearing.

**A MOTION** was made by Mr. Guardiano with a second by Mr. Stevens to close the Public Hearing on the Redevelopment Plan for the South Side of Main Street Revitalization Project. **Motion carried.**

**REMINDER OF NEXT REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2005**

Mayor Garofalo reminded everyone that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, September 7, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. **THERE WAS CONFUSION AS TO THE DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING-IT WAS NOTED THAT IT SHOULD PROBABLY BE THE 14<sup>TH</sup> – IT WILL BE POSTED AT CITY HALL**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR THE SOUTH SIDE OF MAIN STREET UPDATE WITH RESPECT TO THE PENDING LITIGATION**

**A MOTION** was made by Mr. Oraziotti with a second by Mr. Stevens to go into Executive Session for the South Side of Main Street update with respect to the pending litigation, subject to adjournment, inviting representations of Ceruzzi Derby Redevelopment, Corporation Counsel, Alderwoman Pflugh and Mr. Joyce. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Finn  
Recording Secretary

**A TAPE RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS ON FILE IN THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE.**