

CITY OF DERBY
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING
APRIL 11, 2006

DERBY CITY HALL – ALDERMANIC CHAMBERS – 6:30 P.M.

Mayor Anthony Staffieri called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. All rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Present: Anthony Staffieri
 Greg Russo
 Glenn Stevens
 Richard T. Dunne (arrived at 6:49 p.m.)

Absent: John Orazietti

Also Present: Joseph Coppola, Corporation Counsel (arrived at 6:47 p.m.)

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/CORRECTIONS/ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A MOTION was made by Mr. Stevens with a second by Mr. Russo to move the Public Portion to item #5 on the agenda and adopt the agenda as amended. **Motion carried.**

PUBLIC PORTION

Brian Calvert, 37 Lewis Street, Derby, CT – I would just like to read to you something from the minutes of the Board of Aldermen meeting. It was a question and answer and representation by John Ceruzzi and I'll read it here. He's talking about a redevelopment parcel it says here "I refer to the Redevelopment parcel bounded by Main Street Rte. 8, the Housatonic River, the Mayor referred to it as the DOT site we also refer to it as the relocation site." That's the Ceruzzi Organization refers to it as that. It is a longer piece of property here along the Naugatuck River (he was pointing to a map) east of Route 8. To get to our ultimate goal, which is to create a new development on the Redevelopment Parcel, we need the Relocation Parcel to take some of these folks and relocate them so Derby doesn't lose some of their viable businesses. Not only lose them, but also keep them relatively close to downtown and in the area where these employees are accustomed to being." So he was recognizing the DOT as a relocation place. And we from then on, based upon his words and other words (inaudible) actually the only gentleman that was there was John Orazietti on this board Greg Russo was there at that meeting. So at that point this came into being and we were told that's where we would go. And we adjusted our lifestyle and our future plans based upon that. And we were given no reason not to that that was where we were going to go. In 2005 Mr. Skolnick who is here was asked by Mr. Guardiano is the DOT property taken off the table. And he was very upset about it. He said I think it's a good solution why is it not now? Mr. Skolnick said wait I said we haven't completed our due

diligence but that the early indications are that the DOT parcel would be a very difficult relocation parcel because of the expense that it would require to develop it into a suitable property location. Mr. Guardiano then asked him what are some of the obstacles that you feel that make the DOT piece not viable at this point. Mr. Skolnick replied okay, again I haven't received all the information back but the – and I'm not going to say, I'm not going to say that the contamination is a serious problem on the parcel but there are contaminants. He went on to say when you add up the cost in our estimation of bringing in infrastructure, bringing in a roadway, remediating and abating the dollars are very out of whack, dramatically out of whack. And again Mr. Guardiano asked him "has it been taken off the table?" Mr. Skolnick - "no, but frankly again it's our opinion that without some magic wand we should be focusing our energies on other suitable location parcels and other properties that may be more viable than the DOT parcel." The point that I'm trying to make gentlemen is the very organization that we're dealing with, Ceruzzi Derby Development LLC, designated that as a relocation area. They did that; we didn't do that. And they led us to believe that was a viable thing. I assume Mr. Ceruzzi, being a smart businessman, looked into it before he made that commitment. And I consider it a commitment at a public meeting to say that. And so if he maybe spoke out of turn and now it's going to cost more than he originally thought it would cost, I would said well sometimes you got to eat it. We didn't ask you to make that statement, you made it. You thought it was a good idea at the time. You mislead a lot of people in this City into sitting back and not taking advantage of the then good real estate market where there are other options. You lead us to believe that was going to happen. Time went by, years went by and now there are no other options. Mr. Skolnick does say we should seek other options. I hope he is going to speak to Mr. Ceruzzi because maybe he's got some other options. He was the one who came up with the DOT good idea so maybe Mr. Ceruzzi's got some other options. The point I'm trying to make gentlemen is I think this should be reopened. The fact that this organization made a financial blunder, if that's what you want to call it, hey we all do that. I made a financial blunder to buy downtown as it turns out. But you know I think this board should say to the organization gentlemen we made this agreement. You made these statements. You led us to believe that this was it. Do this now, relocate these people, or there's no deal. We're talking about \$300 million – these figures are thrown out for a project like this. So what's a \$1.5 million or \$2 million – whatever it costs to take care of this problem? They're trying to nickel and dime people at this end of a project this size. I think it's about time for this board to step up and say enough is enough now. You have to do what you said you were going to do. If it costs you a few more dollars than you thought so be it – that's life. And gentlemen I would like to ask if that's something that you're prepared to do? To back up what was asked of this organization before and their answers before. Are you prepared to say to them that these were the promises you made and these are the promises we expect you to fulfill. Can I ask you that?

Mr. Stevens – Mr. Chairman for the record I would like to have the dates for those minutes.

Mr. Calvert – I can give you that. The original one, the Ceruzzi one, was March 13, 2003 – when this whole thing pretty much started rolling. And the Mr. Skolnick one was September 28, 2005.

Mr. Stevens – For the record Mr. Chairman I think both those minutes reflect two different Preferred Developer Agreements.

Mayor Staffieri – For the record like Mr. Stevens suggested it is two different agreements.

Mr. Calvert – The Agreements are the same. There are minor changes as far as the scope of the project goes but the basic agreements are exactly the same. I have them right here.

Mayor Staffieri – We have been speaking to Mr. Skolnick and nothing is off the table. We are exploring all avenues to try to do the right thing and also to see if it's viable or not viable – the cost effectiveness of everything and if it's doable. It is being checked.

Mr. Calvert – So what do I get from that answer?

Mayor Staffieri – That is a possible, viable alternate site – it is possible, it is being researched.

Mr. Calvert – Okay – but the Mr. Ceruzzi statement is completely lost, it's gone. Whatever promises that gentleman made on behalf of this Redevelopment organization those are not viable comments now?

Mayor Staffieri – I wasn't here, Mr. Ceruzzi's not here.

Mr. Calvert – He's still the developer (inaudible.)

Mayor Staffieri – But we are going to check to see if it's doable.

Mr. Calvert – I would hope so. And as I say – I mean the gentleman is here, we've spoken at length. We've all made financial blunders. What we're saying to him is we don't want you to go broke. We're not asking you to put \$25 million into relocating four people. What we're saying is don't tell us its going to cost you a few extra dollars because somebody in your organization made a mistake. We're saying step up, be the big guy and say listen we'll take care of this because for the good of the (inaudible.) We're giving this guy, and when I say we that's me too, we're giving him 16 acres here of prime property downtown. The least he can do is say yes we will fulfill what the original Mr. Ceruzzi said even though he's an old guy and he didn't know what he's talking about – whatever – I think they should stand behind what the statement was and that's basically what I have to say tonight.

Mayor Staffieri – Thank you Mr. Calvert. Anyone else from the public?

Jeff Auerbach, Derby Garden Center, 4 Caroline Street, Derby, CT – I would just like to follow up what Brian said. And I don't want to rehash the whole thing but just understand that years ago the prior mayor said that Lifetouch was involved and they were going to do that phase of it. That property with the (inaudible) and DOT the State was giving the property to the City so that everyone could make the move. We were really led to believe that that property was going to be available. My other comment is this – there is a piece of property there. One of our concerns or one thing that we discussed or think about – the business people down there – at one point that's going

to be developed. It's a piece of land – you're not just going to leave it there for fifty years undeveloped. And our concern is that we're going to be pushed out forever and all of a sudden we're going to find out in five years that somebody's built a beautiful industrial complex down there and we were just pushed out because we were too early. That doesn't seem right. I think the City when they come back and give us answers as to what is going to happen they really have to be answering for many years going forward. Again, we don't want to find out that we were pushed out and then five years later you have a beautiful industrial park there and we weren't included. There's no reason that we can't be in there as the first people to go into that property. It's my understanding it's a large piece. So at some point, I don't expect it now, but at some point we should get a specific answer as to what is going to be done down there. I can't believe that they're just going to leave it vacant for years to come. It has a value – with buildings on it and taxpayers on it it's going to be valuable to the City. So please at some point give us a specific answer on that. It's just an offshoot of what I think Brian is saying.

Mayor Staffieri – Thank you Mr. Auerbach. Anyone else from the public?

Carl Yacobacci, 10 Lombardi Drive, Derby, CT – I won't reiterate everything they said. I just want it on record I agree with both of these gentlemen and what they said. And I put my quotation marks around both remarks.

Mayor Staffieri – Thank you. Anyone else from the public?

Hearing no one else wishing to comment...

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

A MOTION was made by Mayor Staffieri with a second by Mr. Dunne to nominate Glenn Stevens as Chairman of the Derby Redevelopment Agency. **Motion carried.**

Mr. Stevens took over running the meeting.

MINUTES

A MOTION was made by Mr. Dunne with a second by Mr. Russo to approve the minutes of the March 7 Special Meeting and March 14 Regular Meeting. **Motion carried.**

REVIEW PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY HARRALL-MICHALOWSKI ASSOCIATES, INC.

Mr. Stevens informed the members that Mr. Michalowski is present this evening to answer any questions the agency members might have. Do you have a presentation or...

Mr. Michalowski – I think we just go right to questions. I think we laid out the program of what we can do for the agency. I think in essence we substitute for what had been a staff function. When in the days when redevelopment agencies had sufficient funding to employ a staff – this is an activity I'm been involved with for many, many years. I've probably been involved in the relocation of several hundred businesses throughout Connecticut over they years. The process is defined in Chapter 130 of the Statutes. There are certain levels of compensation that are prescribed there, which don't give

anyone any discretion. I point out to members of the agency that that statute was put on the books in 1975 – that's how ancient it is. It is being looked at in Hartford right now as part of the various eminent domain bills and if some of those pass they will raise some of the caps. Most of that affects residential relocation so it doesn't apply to anyone here. So that could have an impact going forward as we do proceed depending whether new legislation would be effective upon adoption. It's basically down to four bills – two on judiciary and two on planning & development. And many provisions within there would be effective upon adoption. So it's to be seen which of any of the four arise. So we need to keep our eyes on that process as it happens.

Mr. Dunne – Can you tell us from your knowledge regarding the new legislation effective upon adoption but retroactive to redevelopment plans that have already been adopted. I haven't gotten a clear answer.

Mr. Michalowski – That's a good question. That I have to get legally – your attorney needs to give you a legal answer on that. If there are dollar amounts that are raised I would interpret literally and say that the new dollar amounts apply from that date going forward. Procedurally procedures aren't really being modified from the legislation that I have read. But that's an excellent question that needs a definitive answer. I'm sure there has to be guidance from the Attorney General's office on that. It changes every year so I can't believe there is no definitive ruling but the question has to be asked.

Mr. Dunne – Mr. Chairman I would just ask do we have a draft contract or letter of engagement?

Mr. Stevens – No.

Atty. Coppola – There's a couple of things that I need to discuss with you before I can do that.

Mr. Stevens – We have item ten.

Mr. Dunne – Right. We can discuss the terms of a contract in negotiations. I just had a couple of things that – actually I don't have any but I promised Mr. Oraziotti who asked me if I would ask a couple of questions that he raised concern about at the last meeting. The not to exceed fee would include your out of pocket expenses?

Mr. Michalowski – Yes.

Mr. Dunne – Okay. So we wouldn't have a fee for time and then additional...

Mr. Michalowski – Unless there was some extraordinary – I should qualify it – if there were some extraordinary costs – not the nickel, dime, expressed mailings and nonsense like that – but let's say we have to bring in some fixture appraiser to establish a value because of the uniqueness of a piece of equipment – I imagine we would ask the agency to contract directly with a vendor who could do that. That should be about the only instance where those additional costs would come in.

Mr. Dunne – And then the second question was under #4 of your proposal – the schedule for completion. I'll quote from – “seven months should be allocated for the relocation process.” How comfortable do you feel knowing what you know about the parcels and the businesses and the tenants? Is that something you feel very comfortable with or...

Mr. Michalowski – Well it's – I was unsure where the Agency – some of these parcels you don't own yet.

Mr. Dunne – Correct.

Mr. Michalowski – Okay so this is all going to be triggered off the point of where you come to an agreement to acquire the property. Obviously you can't relocate someone unless it's in public or an agreement to purchase and proceed from that point.

Mr. Dunne – So you wouldn't be including your firm's time in conducting discussions with the property owners or the tenants regarding the acquisition of relocation.

Mr. Michalowski – Well acquisition is not a function that you're engaging me to be involved with. That's I presume someone else's responsibility. I would work with the property owners and businesses to explain the relocation component. It's a (inaudible) component with a separate set of statutes, which provides certain benefits. And they need to understand what that is because that's obviously critical that they continue to maintain their business and it's a separate amount of dollars. And then there's obviously the value of the property itself. Those two could be put together in negotiations – that's often done. So you have the value discussion and the relocation discussion produces an amount of money hopefully sufficient that these businesses go forward and relocate to a new site and continue on. I think that we can be useful in understanding (inaudible) categories of costs and we would help acquisition negotiations. The bottom line number.

Mr. Dunne – So under this proposal your firm is not anticipating conducting appraisals on real property.

Atty. Coppola – No. That's not a part of the bid either.

Mr. Dunne – That's why I'm looking back through it.

Mr. Russo – It doesn't ask for that.

Mr. Dunne – I'm just confused why we asked for a Certified Appraiser's License if we weren't contemplating having appraisals done.

Mr. Michalowski – I was confused about that.

Mr. Rogers – I was under the impression that was going to be part of this also.

Atty. Coppola – No (inaudible) real estate. We asked for a Real Estate license.

Mr. Russo – Mr. Chairman – the question that I have is have you had an opportunity to take a look at the Relocation Plan for the City of Derby?

Mr. Michalowski – Yes. Essentially you're dealing with a prescribed statute that defines – there's not a great deal of latitude in the relocation program. It's spelled out what is eligible and broadly what is not eligible. So that set of parameters has to be applied to a given business situation, items categorized into their various components, costed out and it will generate a number. That's pretty much the process. There's always – (inaudible) many nuisances and shades of grey in that process. It's directed towards personal property as opposed to acquisition, which is the real property. Making the dividing line as to what goes into what camp is probably the first important part of doing that and then getting the costs to move those items and put them back in operation or at a relocation. That's the focus of the relocation piece.

Mr. Rogers – Based upon the Relocation Plan I guess what my concern is as you stated very early in your conversation was that you were going to act as the staff or you've acted as staff for this agency. Now the agency's responsibility is obviously to negotiate with property owners and determine a relocation plan – viable alternatives. To summarize you're going to be performing – you're not going to be performing appraisals – but you will be assembling and putting together viable alternatives (inaudible) relocation plans – I guess really if I were to take a step back and have you start almost all over we have a copy of your background and qualifications, which is very extensive, but for the record I guess can you summarize what you plan on doing for the board and also for the public.

Mr. Dunne – Without getting too specific.

Mr. Rogers – Right.

Mr. Dunne – And just understanding that the City has a responsibility to acquire real property under its agreement with the developer. And I don't want to interrupt before he starts; I just want to make something clear. The relocation process, in this case its part and parcel of the negotiation that we as the City will have with property owners, so your firm will actually be involved with the City during the acquisition process in order to ascertain viable alternatives and available sites. So knowing that...

Mr. Michalowski – Usually I'm sitting with a team of – it's the City's attorney who usually negotiates acquisition, myself, property owners looking at alternatives. That's what I'm used to doing and...

Mr. Dunne – But that portion of it is in your proposal.

Mr. Michalowski – In terms yes – absolutely. Because you can't do this without considerable discussion with the property owner and the client. In terms of sequence of things certain kind of administrative items need to be put into place – setting up files or what have you, taking a look at your acquisition appraisals that you must already have, identification of personal properties – just to get familiar with each of the businesses. And then an early meeting with each of the businesses to get acquainted. Get a look at what the personal property is of the businesses. What the preferences are for location of each of the businesses. Areas of service so we can identify trade area. We

use that then to basically search available properties to see whether the desire is existing. From what I'm hearing there's a desire to build new buildings. If you're looking a vacant site so if that's the case that would be part of the equation. Where are properly zoned parcels within their service area to allow that to happen and (inaudible) obviously existing buildings that could meet the requirements. We bring those forward overtime and proceed to see down the road trying to find something that will work. We're not real estate brokers. We work with commercial brokers to identify those pieces and then the negotiations goes between the owner and the seller (inaudible.) And the work out the budget detail on eligible expenses for a physical move and re-establishment at the new location. That generates a relocation claim with supporting documentation that reimburses the property owner for those levels of expenses. In my experience it is very important that the pre-planning before a move is the most important. So that everyone understands before money is spent just what can be paid for and what can't. So it is always better to decide that before hand. This is an opportunity for a business also to take a look at its future. Does it make sense to continue operating in the exact same fashion that they are at this moment in time? Or because of changes in their market – customers and the like – use the (inaudible) you have to do anyway should that business reshape itself in some fashion. Because long-term that is what is going to make it viable going on into the future. So those adjustments are part of the consideration process in terms of business. So that's something we try to encourage. Move takes place and that is a lot of paperwork to give you the documentation that you need (inaudible.)

Mr. Dunne – I'm sure you've work in situations where the business that occupied the space is the same as the owner of the building. I'm sure you're very careful to draw that appropriate line between two separate and distinct processes.

Leo Moscato, 34 Lewis Street, Derby, CT – Excuse me Mr. Chairman could I...

Mr. Stevens – The public portion is closed.

Mr. Moscato – Since this gentleman spoke and that we didn't have any time to say what we were going to say is there any possible way that I can make a statement? You can say no if you want, you can say yes.

Mr. Stevens – The public portion is closed.

Mr. Moscato – I just think this would be a waste of time to even hire this man. It should have happened six years.

Mr. Stevens – The public portion is closed.

Mr. Moscato – (Inaudible.)

Mr. Stevens – Any other comments? Questions?

Mr. Dunne – No I'm prepared to go and discuss this in executive session.

Atty. Coppola – Mr. Dunne you understand that Mr. Michalowski is one part of the three-part puzzle, which I don't think you – do you understand?

Mr. Dunne – Absolutely.

Atty. Coppola – The valuation of the property is separate and the package being offered is yet another parcel. Mr. Michalowski is only one piece.

Mr. Dunne – My concern was that for property owners who operate their business in the same facility for them it's a single discussion.

Atty. Coppola – That's something different.

Mr. Dunne – No I understand but in order to conduct this officially I wanted to make certain that his firm was going to be working hand-in-hand with the City during the acquisition period so that we could be the full deal on the table.

Atty. Coppola – He will be working hand-in-hand with you; you're with this board.

BILLBOARD OPTIONS

Mr. Stevens presented a design of the proposed sign that is to be placed at the corner of the Derby/Shelton Bridge. He said they received information from various sources within the City and they have put together the proposal for the agency in order for the agency to forward it to the Planning & Zoning Commission for approval. Mr. Skolnick said he would also like the agency members to review the language and the names to appear on the sign. Also included on the proposal are the dimensions of the sign, the materials and colors of the sign, and a map of where the site would be located.

Mr. Dunne once again stated that the process of this having to go before Planning & Zoning is ridiculous. He does not agree with the interpretation of it – he thinks this board has the full power to approve a project sign without going to P&Z. It's not a permanent sign. He just wanted that noted for the record.

Mr. Stevens said he thinks it has something to do with the size of the sign. He said we would submit this to Planning & Zoning. Atty. Coppola informed the agency members that the application has been filed to Planning & Zoning and this information would be the necessary supporting documentation.

Mr. Skolnick said the package in front of you this evening includes all of the comments that they have received up to date. Any other changes would have to be made prior to them manufacturing the sign. He said they are hopeful that someone from the agency, City or Mayor's office would sign off that this is the appropriate text to be included on the sign.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Dunne with a second by Mayor Staffieri to direct Corporation Counsel to file the appropriate documentation and to approve the sign.
Motion carried.

UPDATE ON SOUTH SIDE OF MAIN STREET REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. Skolnick – By way of updating the agency as to the activities being performed by the developer we continue to make strides with regard to the Engineering GAP Study. We are researching the various ways to both dynamically compact and create a solid foundation for the development. We are on target for sometime towards the middle of

the summer to be able to come back to the agency and show a more completed engineering analysis and a where necessary a revised plan where the conceptual project doesn't marry well to the existing conditions. And we feel very good about the process and the professional team that we've hired. We have an exciting update – a week ago Friday we did close on the Scarpa Electric building, which is 30 Caroline Street and are now owners within the redevelopment district. However we will not need any relocation assistance from the relocation expert. And as you all have been notified in the past we are in contract although hard and binding for the Teitlemen property behind the Scarpa Electric building. We are hopeful to continue to meet with both the other private owners within the district while the relocation expert is meeting with them and are hopeful that they are desirous of a private transaction that we can bring about a private sale like we have in the other instances. By way of commenting to the public session I would just like to note for the record that yes as the Mayor mentioned Ceruzzi Derby Redevelopment, which we are the managing member of and the development partner for, has had a long history with the Redevelopment Agency and at times the DOT, as it was referred to as the Relocation Parcel, had been discussed. But there was a time and I believe in the '03 reference discussion was the occasion where that resource was being considered to relocate some of the more major – meaning larger tenants – within the parcel and I believe the Agency had studied the Housatonic Lumber tenant and the Lifetouch tenant and at that point there was considerably more economics in the package and I would urge the private property owners within the district to look and focus on the reality of the magnitude or the dollars that are available for the relocation and that starts at the value of their properties. And so perhaps at one time when Lifetouch and Housatonic Lumber were interested or there was dialogue or discussion that called for the potential use of the DOT piece as a relocation asset at that time since the value of those properties collectively were a multiple of the value of the private property owners within the newly configured district there may have been economics that made sense then that do not make sense today. And so I urge both this agency and the affected property owners to consider that the economics of the relocation and the value of their property is the engine that drives the ability to relocate them. And it's the engine that drives their economics or their participation in the economics of this transaction. I don't want to loosely throw around \$300 million here or there but I will say that already it is important to note that there is market value that has been established by the transactions known as the Hubbell Shoe building, the transaction known as the Scarpa Electric building, the transaction that will be known as the Teitlemen building and all these transactions are establishing market-value within the relocation or redevelopment district. And while the developer continues to be interested in assisting the process, both the Redevelopment Agency and the owners within the relocation district we believe a good step is taken tonight by hiring a relocation expert that can adequately inventory the needs of the owners and create an appropriate plan for their relocation of the business. That said we're open to a dialogue with any of the private property owners and are available to do just that.

Mr. Dunne – Mr. Chairman I would just, since we've gotten into it, I just want to go back to the DOT site. As all you know I was Director of Development for the City at the time we acquired it. The site was acquired for one reason – the State gave it to the City for \$1.00 for one reason – there was potential to do a \$15 million development for Lifetouch only. No one else – just Lifetouch only – that had potential to retain 300 jobs and then draw and consolidate another 160 jobs from a plant they've acquired in Rhode Island.

That's the reason Derby got the site. That's the reason why the State gave it to us. Lifetouch has made other business decisions separate (inaudible) anything that's gone on in the redevelopment zone. But we did then announce the redevelopment project. We did then speak with the developer and we were talking primarily about a Phase I zone that included Lifetouch and Housatonic Lumber. And to the extent that it was available that was the intent at the time. And I can speak to that first hand. I do want to compliment the developer. There's a very different situation going on between the reality of the work that's going on on the ground, the hard engineering work that's happening, the money that is being expended. I can tell you in the four months that I have been involved with them there has not been one thing that they've promised that they haven't delivered and on time. How people may feel about how they're being treated – I know how I would feel – I would probably be much less well behaved than the folks here if it was my business be affected. But that is separate and different from the quality of the work that's going on, the effort that is being put forward and the commitment that's being shown by this developer to the City.

Mr. Skolnick – By way of completing the update we continue to be involved in assisting the City with the issue relative to the demolition, specifically relative to 256 Main Street, and the issues regarding the common wall. We expect that our engineering will be forwarding for a meeting to be held with both the demolition contractor and the City as well as the adjacent property owner – that being the owner of 250 Main Street. We have gotten a bid from the demolition contractor to perform the shoring up of the brick building that once was the exterior wall of 256 Main Street and will become the exterior of 250 Main Street and the engineering requires that the building wall be tied back into the steel beams of the adjacent property. We are waiting for a proposal for the roof flashing necessary to close it in from the top of the structure as well from a construction manager to oversee the work. But we estimate the work will include roughly \$40,000-\$50,000. As we understand it the adjacent property owner has a deed agreement with the City to cover half that expense and we urge the Agency to assist the City in attempting to get cooperation from the adjacent property owner to participate in the expense of shoring up their exterior wall. And that is important as it relates to the appearance that nothing is happening on the site because demolition isn't moving forward. Because this issue is stalling the appearance of work happening on the site.

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting will be held on May 9, 2006 at 6:30 p.m.

DISCUSS BID PROPOSAL FOR RELOCATION AGENT (EXECUTIVE SESSION)

A MOTION was made by Mr. Dunne with a second by Mayor Staffieri to go into executive session at 7:30 p.m. subject to adjournment inviting Corporation Counsel and Philip Michalowski for the purpose of discussion of the bid proposal for the relocation agent. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Finn
Recording Secretary

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