Town of East Haddam
Redevelopment Agency
October 27, 2022
Adopted November 10, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Kolek called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. at the Municipal Office Complex and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ATTENDANCE
Redevelopment Agency Members: Melanie Kolek, Andrew Lord, James Curtin, Randy Dill, William DiCristofaro, Jacqueline Nowell, John Cotter, Thomas Sevigny, and Caitlin Taylor.

Absent Member(s): Gary Laskowski

Other(s): First Selectwoman Irene Haines, Linda Zemienieski, Gary Bogan, Todd Gelston, Charlotte Gelston, Marilyn Gleeson, Rob Smith, Amalia Shaltiel, and Ruth Ziobron (remotely).

2. Approval of Minutes – Meeting of October 13, 2022
Motion to approve the October 13, 2022, minutes with the following changes:
Item 6, General Discussion, last sentence change to "Mr. Dill said, if it's off the table with Mr. Bogan, that he guessed it would not be a part of the project".
Cotter/Taylor **Passed Unanimously**

3. Audience of Citizens
Chair Kolek shared an email correspondence from Jonathan Silvers. She informed the Agency there would be an email option for audience of citizen comment. Emails to the RA during the meeting will be read during the General Discussion section of the agenda.

Ms. Gleeson and Mr. Smith highlighted items in their letters (attached to October 14, 2022, meeting minutes). Ms. Gleeson stated swing bridges were not being built and there could be a possibility that the bridge would be replaced sometime in the future (30 years) but not exactly in the same place and to keep this in mind when planning. She stated there was great interest in the project, noting over sixty people were attending this meeting on the YouTube link.

Mr. Smith discussed:
-Address Mr. Bogan not wanting his property included in the Revitalization Map.
-Contact the Board of Directors or Trustees of Goodspeed to review the project with them.
-Concern using a Brownfield Remediation Grant because it may look unfavorable for future grant applications.
-Consult with the DOT for future long term bridge plans.
-Include Revitalization Committee's work on the Redevelopment Agency website.

Mr. Dill noted that the DOT had attended Revitalization Committee meetings where they had discussed the bridge needing repairs but that he was not under the impression that the bridge was going away in its present form. He stated the bridge was unique, historical, and

fitted with East Haddam and that he did not see it going away even after 30 years. Mr. Curtin remembered the DOT meeting stating that they were adamant there would never be a new bridge built in East Haddam. Chair Kolek will review the Revitalization Committee minutes for these discussions.

Responsive to a question by Mr. Bogan, the Agency will consult with the Board of Selectman regarding him not wanting his property as a part of the Redevelopment Map. Chair Kolek stated the Environmental Consultant would be able to inform the Agency if remediation of the property would add value to the town project. Chair Kolek stated executive sessions would be at the end of the agenda and that the Statute for the executive sessions will be noted. She stated the Agency would only go into Executive Session if it met the legal criteria under the Freedom of Information Act.

Ms. Shaltiel suggested Agency Members take the Brownfield Equity training course.

Mr. Riley from Centerbridge will be presenting a scaled down plan at the next meeting on November 10th at 7 p.m. Chair Kolek stated Mr. Riley, and the Agency was listening to everyone's opinion and concerns. She stated that just as it was important for the Agency to hear citizen concerns, it was also important for the Agency to hear what Mr. Riley had to say. Chair Kolek stated she did not want to give the impression that the Agency was giving Mr. Riley a fast-track preference. She stated the Agency would be thoughtful and diligent by listening to what our townspeople want. The Agency will develop additional goals and next steps while waiting for the TIF and Environmental Consultant work to be complete.

Mr. Lord stated he wanted to dispel the idea that there was a preconceived conclusion. He stated the Agency knows how important the project is to everyone in town. Mr. Lord stated he was committed to getting the best project for the site which is the best use of the property. He stated the Agency was not just assuming an outcome. Mr. Lord stated he believed the environmental issues were of utmost importance and there had been studies conducted with data collected and estimates of the cleanup. Studies had made decisions in the past about the town not doing the remediation, but to let the developer take care of it. Mr. Lord stated part of the remediation work could be determined by the type of use developed on the property.

Ms. Gelston suggested having an article in the paper notifying people when Mr. Riley would be presenting because there would be interest and citizens would have questions. It was noted that the Revitalization Agency meets the 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month, the agenda is posted on the town website and recorded on YouTube to watch live or later. During the live meeting, attendees' questions can be emailed to the Chair which will be read during the General Discussion.

Ms. Shaltiel encouraged public outreach, so townspeople are engaged in the process. Chair Kolek noted she had contacted the editor of the paper and shared the importance of public input during the process. Mr. Sevigny agreed the Agency needed a community engagement process whether it be a charrette or other process, instead of just waiting for a developer to come and present a plan and seeing if it would be something citizens are looking for. He stated it would be best to develop a consensus which is what a charrette

process does. Chair Kolek asked if the cost of the charrette could be included in the TIF. Mr. Sevigny explained the funds would first come from the Town and then be reimbursed through the TIF once a developer starts the project. Ms. Taylor agreed on the importance of engaging the community in the process.

Mr. Cotter stated Goodspeed seemed to cater their offerings to an older age group and suggested talking to the Goodspeed Board about opening offerings to younger groups. He stated that this might help with the success of the project moving forward.

Mr. DiCristofaro stated it would not be appropriate to disregard the Revitalization Committee's work. He stated they had gone through a lengthy process involving citizen input, and hours of outreach. Mr. DiCristofaro stated the Agency had never pre-determined Centerbridge's proposal. He stated it would be irresponsible and send the wrong message to any developer, whomever they are, if the Agency went through a legal process in our town and then later changed course and then just dismissed them outright.

Referencing Mr. Smith and Ms. Gleeson's letter, Mr. Dill clarified he was not against charrettes, but that the cost of $120,000 was considerable. He stated the Revitalization Committee had public meetings with the community and their work should be reviewed by the Agency. Chair Kolek stated the Revitalization Committee had spent 12 years doing public research. Chair Kolek stated she was not against a charrette but wanted more information. Mr. Sevigny stated a charrette would take 5 days instead of 12 years.

4. Old Business

A. Status of RFP for TIF consultant

The Agency reviewed and edited the draft RFP for TIF consultant. Chair Kolek thanked Ms. Zemienieski and Mr. Sevigny for developing the draft RFP for a TIF consultant. Responsive to a question by Mr. DiCristofaro, Mr. Sevigny replied that a Master TIF Plan would be written by the TIF consultant based on Agency input and include all the financials. The Master TIF Plan will require Agency, Board of Selectman, and Town meeting approval. The approved Master TIF Plan is a legal binding document. The final edited RFP will be available for Agency approval at the next scheduled meeting.

B. Status of RFP for hiring of environmental consultant

Mr. Lord is contacting Environmental Consultants with experience with remediation standard regulation. He explained remediation standard regulations allowed an alternate criterion for background levels that are naturally higher than the cleanup standard requiring a statistical test. Background levels that are naturally higher could reduce remediation requirements. Work over $15,000 needs written RFPs. Mr. Lord expects the cost for the Environmental Consultant to be about $5,000, which would not require an RFP. Mr. Lord expects to have three proposals for the next scheduled meeting for Agency review and approval.

C. Follow up regarding Village property map

-Contact the Board of Selectman about how to proceed with the Redevelopment Map accuracy when Mr. Bogan has stated he does not want his property involved in the

development project. Changes to the Redevelopment Map would require BOS and Town approval.

D. Status of Centerbridge Group presentation

Mr. Riley will be presenting a revised presentation at the November 10th meeting.

5. New Business

A. Next steps pending additional information

Action Items:
-Contact DOT-Kolek
-Additional information for the website from Rob Smith.
-Review Guiding Principles provided by Ms. Gleeson and Mr. Smith.
-Review statute about Redevelopment Plans.
- Contact the Board of Directors or Trustees of Goodspeed to review the project with them.
-Develop an outline that is a process document/road map-Lord
-Make a list of unknowns.
-Involve the BOF with the TIF Consultant planning process. Ask BOF to provide a liaison.
-Investigate other sources of project funding: State/Federal Grants. Connecticut Main Street Group may have this information.
-Invite Pat McMahon/or Pullman and Comley from Connecticut Main Street Group to a RA meeting.
-Inform the BOS of the Environmental Evaluations once available and discuss the Brownfield Grant opportunities.

6. General Discussion

There were no emails to the RA Chair.

7. Adjournment at 8:45 p.m.
Curtin/Nowell **Passed Unanimously**

Respectfully Submitted,

E. Ruth Ziobron
Recording Secretary