

Mr. Schneider said he had missed the previous meeting and was surprised that the Agency appeared to be moving towards purchasing the Broad Street Parkade site. He said the Agency has not had time to negotiate with the current owners or to work out a deal within the private sector. He also said he believes that in the current economy it does not make sense to pose such a question to the Manchester taxpayers. He advocated waiting until November 2010 to pose a referendum question.

Mr. Darby said the Board of Directors was in favor of the Redevelopment Agency moving forward with the plan and had asked what the Agency needed to move forward. He said if the referendum question passed, it would not mean that the Agency has to buy the Parkade property, but would give it the option of doing so. Mr. Ansaldi said he thought such a bond would put the Town at a disadvantage in negotiating with the current owner of the property because the owner would know that the Town wants to purchase it and how much money the Town has to do so.

Mr. Devaney said the best way to insure the Parkade site is developed according to the plan, would be to control the site. He said during and after recent meetings with Broad Street property owners and town boards and commissions, those in attendance told him they are fed up with the appearance of the vacant Parkade. He said he believes such a question would have the support of the majority of residents and the Agency should move now in order to take advantage of that. He reiterated that although the Agency would have the power to do so, it would not have to spend all of the approved funds.

Mr. Tomko said that controlling a site does not necessarily mean owning it and that the Town could make an offer to the current owner and hold to a certain price. He also advised having money on hand for other aspects of plan execution.

Mr. Sweet indicated he thought it might be better to allow more time for negotiation and a possible private development scenario. He said an interim step would be to bond money for the acquisition of the Nichols property in order to "green" Broad Street.

Mr. Darby said he agreed with Mr. Cope's description of the possible acquisition and demolition of the Parkade as a "grand gesture" that would show residents of Manchester that the Agency was serious about redeveloping Broad Street while removing the blighted buildings. Mr. Wlochowski said by wording the question in a flexible way, allowing for various uses of the money, the Agency was providing itself with necessary options. He felt it was wise to utilize the current momentum behind the plan and believed that such a question could pass.

Mr. Schneider asked why a previous referendum on the Town's acquisition of the Broad Street property failed. Mr. Darby said that question was not backed up with a plan of what to do with the Broad Street property, and those who petitioned for the question were asking that the Town maintain ownership for recreational or other uses. Mr. Tomko said this referendum question would be backed by an actual tangible plan. He said it was also noteworthy that the plan requires the Town's due-diligence on any property prior to acquisition. Mr. Darby said at all meetings in which the redevelopment plan update was presented, those in attendance appeared to favor adoption of the plan. He said this is the best time to move forward.

Mr. Cope said the average citizen in Manchester has seen the Parkade vacant for 17 years. He said residents are tired of the eyesore and want to see something done on the property. He said

the upcoming election provides an opportunity for both parties to take some credit for the redevelopment of the Parkade. He said something has to be done on the Parkade property and this is the Agency's opportunity to get something accomplished. He thought the Broad Street street improvements should be a separate question.

Mr. Schneider said he believed a referendum question would be decided by pocketbook issues. He said the nation currently has a 10% unemployment rate and he doubted the Manchester taxpayers would be willing to fund such a project in this economy. He reiterated that he would rather wait until 2010 to pose such a question. Mr. Ansaldi said he thought the question would be a tough sell for Manchester taxpayers and thought that if it does pass, the Agency would be taking some of the private element out of the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Tomko said the type of development proposed in the redevelopment plan would provide a large increase in tax revenue.

Mr. Sweet suggested that Broad Street improvements should be put on the back burner at this time and that the engineering of the street might change with the redevelopment of the Parkade and other properties. He suggested that including a civic investment portion in the referendum question could encourage taxpayers to support the question.

Mr. Cope said he thought the Town and Agency should be in negotiations with the property owner so that the Town would know exactly what would be necessary to catalyze development on the Parkade. Mr. MacVane asked if a failed referendum question would weaken the Agency's position. He felt the Town would not be taken seriously if it did not have any money behind the negotiations.

The Agency decided by consensus to return to the issue of the referendum question at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Anderson told the Agency that if it decided to move forward with the referendum question it would be working on the adoption of the redevelopment plan at the same time. He said the state statutes require that the plan must be advertised on the Town's website for 35 days in advance of a public hearing. He said assuming there are no major issues with the current draft of the plan, the Agency could decide to schedule a meeting at the end of next week to adopt the final proposed plan. That would allow the Agency to schedule a public hearing for the first week in September.

Mr. Anderson said Agency members should have received a copy of the draft redevelopment plan via email. He said the plan was written according to the requirements in the State statute. The required sections include a description of the redevelopment area, current and proposed land uses, current and proposed streets and utilities, the relocation of any current residents, and current and proposed zoning. The plan also includes sections on financial incentives and a newly added section on implementation. The implementation section includes a description of the Phase I development, and paragraphs on incentives for private development, public/private partnerships, and site control. Agency comments and suggestions included:

- Mr. Sweet suggested the implementation section be more overt about which options were preferred, namely he thought it should be clear that the Agency preferred private development and that owning the site was not a preferred strategy.

- Mr. Devanney suggested including a community/senior center in the list of possible civic uses.
- Mr. Tomko suggested moving the last line about due diligence up to the beginning of the implementation section.

Mr. Anderson said some subsurface work had been done in preparation of the previous development application for the Parkade site. He would pass this document along to engineering staff for their insight as to how thorough and helpful this information might be to the Agency.

Mr. Sweet said the Agency should complete a press release to be distributed to media outlets once the plan is publicized. Mr. Tomko indicated he and his colleague, Mr. Zinsser, had met with Circle Associates, the current owner of the vacant parcel behind the Nichols properties. The Zinsser Agency is currently marketing that property and told Circle Associates that the property would be part of the redevelopment plan.

The Agency decided by consensus to schedule a meeting for ***Thursday, July 23, 2009 at 7:30 a.m.*** to act on the proposed plan and discuss the July 20th meeting with staff and members of the Board of Directors. Mr. Darby said it was important that the Agency give the Directors some signal of what it was advocating for at this meeting on Monday.

Mr. Darby moved that the Redevelopment agency request that the Board of Directors place a referendum question on its August agenda for a general obligation bond of between \$7 million and \$8 million for the purposes of implementing the Broad Street redevelopment plan. Mr. Cope seconded the motion.

During discussion, Mr. Schneider asked if there would be a public hearing on the inclusion of the referendum question. Mr. Darby said there would be an opportunity for residents to comment at a public hearing. Mr. Tomko said there would also be an opportunity for residents to speak at the public hearing on the adoption of the plan itself.

Mr. Sweet moved the question.

Members O'Connor, Darby, Devanney, Cope, Wlochowski, Tomko and MacVane voted in favor. Members Schneider, Ansaldi and Sweet were opposed. The motion carried 7 votes to 3.

Mr. Sweet moved to recommend that a referendum question for the Broad Street streetscape improvements not be included as a referendum question this fall.

During discussion, Mr. Tomko said he was in favor of not including that question at this time. Mr. Cope said he thought the reconstruction project would be competing with the execution of the plan.

The motion carried unanimously.

The next meeting of the Manchester Redevelopment Agency will take place on ***Thursday, July 23, 2009 at 7:30 a.m. in the Lincoln Center Hearing Room.***