

Draft

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 28, 2002

6:30 P.M.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Thursday, February 28, 2002 in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall and called to Order by Chairman Robert F. Parisi at 6:37 P.M. Answering present to the Roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary A. Rascati were Councilors Brodinsky, Doherty, Farrell, Papale, Parisi, Rys, Toman and Vumbaco. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Town Attorney Janis M. Small were also in attendance. Comptroller Thomas A. Myers was absent.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the following document is a draft transcription of the minutes of a regular meeting of the Town Council held on Thursday, February 28, 2002. This summarized transcription is being filed with the Town Clerk to comply with F.O.I. guidelines. A detailed transcription will follow and will be filed as the permanent record of proceedings of the meeting.

ITEM #2 Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the IX Industrial Zone requested by Mayor Dickinson

Approximately 3 hours of discussion ensued during which the Mayor displayed several maps exhibiting land in the North Farms and Tankwood Roads area, outlining a proposal for the Town to purchase the land in the hope of placing a road through a portion of it for the purpose of creating an industrial park to control development of the area.

Many residents in the North Farms Road and a few from the Tankwood Road area voiced strong opposition to the plan, each taking a turn at the microphone to let their positions be known.

Some Councilors expressed concern over the proposal, stating that more detailed information and analysis should be provided to them before they can adequately assess all aspects of the proposal and therefore make an informed decision.

No action was taken at this time.

Motion was made by Farrell to Adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Doherty.

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2002

6:30 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call
2. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the IX Industrial Zone requested by The Mayor

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 28, 2002

6:30 P.M.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Thursday, February 28, 2002 in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall and called to Order by Chairman Robert F. Parisi at 6:37 P.M. Answering present to the Roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary A. Rascati were Councilors Brodinsky, Doherty, Farrell, Papale, Parisi, Rys, Toman and Vumbaco. Mr. Knight was traveling out of state. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Town Attorney Janis M. Small were also in attendance. Comptroller Thomas A. Myers was absent.

ITEM #2 Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the IX Industrial Zone requested by Mayor Dickinson

Correspondence from Mayor Dickinson to the Council dated February 22, 2002 was read into the record at this time (Appendix I).

As the Mayor's letter reports, the economic return to the Town, based just on property tax dollars, would materialize after an estimated 25 years. The Town would be able to recover some of the \$7 million it will pay for the property, through assessments for the improvements (roads and utilities) constructed. The payback is not immediate but the value of having a planned industrial park to encourage business and employment is important to the long term health of the community. The municipal cost would potentially be phased in over a multi-year time period with acquisition of right-of-way, a first phase; installation of utilities, a second phase; and construction of roadway a third phase.

The recommendation to the Council is that the Town proceed with the project which is endorsed by the Town's Economic Development Commission. The first phase of the project will require funds for surveying, engineering and appraisal services and acquisition. The estimate for phase I is \$1.4 million. Property owners will be asked to sell right-of-way property to the Town, however, condemnation may be necessary since it is obviously necessary to complete the first phase for there to be any second or third phase.

It should be noted that the greater expense to the community occurs in phases II and III, however, given the complexities of the first phase, this alone could take two to three years with subsequent phases commencing over as much as ten to fifteen years. Again, it is important to recognize that the project will take many years. It has, from the outset, been identified as a long range undertaking that will provide for the Town's future economic base.

Many residents in the North Farms Road and a few from the Tankwood Road area voiced strong opposition to the plan, each taking a turn at the microphone to let their positions be known.

At this time Mayor Dickinson referred to several maps prepared by Milone & McBroom (of Cheshire) on display exhibiting land in the North Farms and Tankwood Roads area. The maps outlined a proposal for the Town to purchase the land in the hope of placing a road through a portion of it for the purpose of creating an industrial park to control development of the area.

Mayor Dickinson explained, the subject property is comprised of approximately 270 acres and is the only remaining IX zoned property that is vacant of any real size in the community. The Barnes Industrial Park, located to the south, was initiated somewhere around 1968. The benefits of the industrial park are experienced by the community, today. The park did not develop overnight; it required a significant period of time. The plan outlines roads extending from Fairfield Blvd. and Sterling Drive to serve the area. The reason being that if this is to be a planned industrial park, there is a desire to keep the traffic, or most of it; we cannot keep all of it; some of the property has frontage on Tankwood as well as North Farms Road. But to the degree possible, keep traffic off of North Farms Road and Tankwood Road and have the traffic from this IX zoned be routed through the existing industrial park. The desire is to have an industrial park similar to what we see as Barnes Industrial Park. The first phase involves the Town purchasing that right-of-way for that road and utility route. Water would have to be brought up Northrop Road and then into the property to be connected in order to provide proper pressure. Wastewater/sewer connections would be off of that same route, although sewer connection would not come up Northrop Road, only water. Total cost was estimated at this time to be approximately \$7 million. That does not include potential recovery from assessments for the improvements to benefit the property that results from the improvements as a result of the public highway and utilities being installed. State assistance on this is not likely; we have investigated it and, at this point, we cannot report that there is any state assistance that is likely. We have not been able to identify a private developer who would be of assistance. This approach, with the Town acquiring the right-of-way and then the construction of utilities and road allows the properties to be used as they are. It does not have the Town purchasing all of the property which would potentially end existing uses. The desire is not to have an immediate industrial park there. This is meant as an investment for the future so that there is an area for development as industry and businesses require. We are about 80-85% full on the industrial parks currently. We have 15-20% vacant area in existing industrial parks. Our belief is that now is the time to begin planning for this so that it is a benefit in the future. The other benefit is our ability to dictate where roads and utilities will be constructed and installed. Without that the property will develop but it will be more of a haphazard, piecemeal fashion, with it occurring as property owners want to sell their property. At that point there is not the ability to really control where roads go or how utilities are ultimately connected. Our effort is for a planned, industrial park. There is additional industrial park area that is IX zoned on Northrop Road but, obviously, that all has frontage on Northrop Road. This is interior area and

we believe the best way to plan for this is to follow the design that is shown on the map which shows the roads and utility connections will occur within these roads. The highway would not come out onto North Farms Road.

The Mayor concluded his presentation at this time.

It is noted that members from the Utility, Engineering and Planning & Zoning departments were present in the audience, as well as members of the Economic Development, Planning & Zoning and Public Utilities Commissions.

Ms. Papale asked, how many of the properties are we looking to sell for the right-of-way?

Mayor Dickinson answered, there are potentially five or six separate property owners and the right-of-way crosses their property.

Mr. Farrell stated, it was mentioned that part of the effort is to minimize traffic impact on the residential area by routing traffic for potential industrial development back to those existing roads in the Barnes Park. If that is the case...why can't the properties that are closer to North Farms Road; why can't there be some type of restriction that impedes access out onto North Farms Road; whether that is through some type of deed restriction that gets placed because of us developing this or whether it is through an amendment to the IX zoning regulations? Is that possible?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I can't say it is impossible; there already is an application for some of this property which would access North Farms and Tankwood Roads. I am not sure there is an ability to prevent access onto a road which bounds a property. At the point there is an industrial park road with utilities in it, that may change the value of properties and whether Planning & Zoning has an ability to encourage orienting one direction rather than another, that can be looked at.

Mr. Farrell stated, we do that on route 5; impede access so that there is not a great deal of cuts into the roadway.

Mayor Dickinson answered, it can be looked at. Without an alternative there is no ability to affect that at all.

Mr. Farrell stated, my recall is that Tankwood Road; there is something about Tankwood that it is not a true street or part of it is not a true street; am I recalling that correctly?

Mayor Dickinson answered, there has been discussion about Tankwood; how long it is; what the Town's rights are in various parts of it. I don't know if that has been resolved, to my knowledge.

Mr. Farrell commented, we should try and look at how we, if we are going to proceed with this, how we almost eliminate access onto North Farms Road. If this is going to be developed, that's too much traffic to put on a residential rural road.

Mayor Dickinson replied, I agree with you and I think we should strive for that.
(applause)

In response to Mr. Toman's request for clarification on current industrial park capacity, Don Roe, Economic Development Coordinator stated, overall our IX industrial parks are about 80% full, meaning that 80% of the parcels are developed. As you are aware, however, each parcel has different buildings and sizes on it, so some of those can be expanded. Basically in terms of raw acreage, we are at about 80%.

Mr. Toman asked if Mr. Roe's figures include the 270 acres being discussed?

Mr. Roe answered, no.

Mr. Toman asked, when you add these 270 acres to the total...

Mr. Roe added, that would obviously increase the availability. I think the total number of IX acres is approximately 1,200 acres.

Ms. Bush stated, the total number of IX zoned industrial acres in Wallingford is 1,845. The total number of I industrial acres; both of the Town's I zone is North Plains are 1,600 acres. The last time my office did a vacant land analysis was in June of 1991; we are getting ready to do it again. In June of 1991, we had 381 vacant I zoned industrial acres and 584 acres zoned IX vacant. That does not include properties that are expandable such as Bristol Myers; we don't consider it vacant but they can expand.

Mr. Toman stated, with the addition of these 270 undeveloped acres for IX, we have left roughly a total of over 500 acres of undeveloped IX, probably closer to 600 acres of IX?

Ms. Bush stated that she could sit down tomorrow and much more accurately figure the number. It is probably close. On the other side of North Farms Road, on the east side, there is 100+- vacant IX zoned acres; the former "auto auction" property is also zoned IX.

Mr. Toman stated, there is, at this point, a substantial number of undeveloped IX acres vs. the total we have developed and undeveloped; 30-35%.

Ms. Bush stated, 30% maybe, right.

Mr. Vumbaco asked for a breakdown of what the \$7 million cost entails.

Mayor Dickinson answered, I believe that \$1.4 million was identified for right-of-way...

Don Roe continued, other than the \$1.4 million, the balance is in the construction costs for road and utilities. The \$1.4 million includes acquisition and engineering costs.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, do we know what the breakdown of the utility is vs. the sewer, vs. the roadwork? We are being asked to appropriate \$7 million and no one is even telling us what we are going to be spending it on, besides phase I, which we are still not sure what Phase I is. To follow up on that; you have \$1.4 million for right-of-way purchase of land. What per acre land cost was used?

Mr. Roe replied, \$1.4 million is for Phase I and that includes acquisition for right-of-way as well as the engineering for design.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, right-of-way where?

Mr. Roe answered, of the right-of-way.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, in all of the roads or just Phase I roads?

Mr. Roe answered, not Phase I. Phase I is acquisition of the right-of-way for the entire concept.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, how much land are we buying?

Mr. Roe answered, the total that that represents is approximately 20 acres.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, what value per acre have you placed on it to come up with the figure?

Mayor Dickinson answered, we don't get into that here. That would involve appraisals and I don't think it would be appropriate for us to expose what we feel values are on a general basis when we would have to be negotiating with property owners for the right-of-way.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, you are asking us to spend \$7 million and we don't know what we are spending it on; and the assumptions and comments regarding the real estate analysis is using \$25,000 per acre that you sent out to the Council last Friday. Is that the number that we are using or is that just an estimate? The property that was purchased in this zone, which by the way, that one piece that you indicated there was a development on... I think that land has been purchased by a developer already. I don't think there are any restrictions unless the developer gives you the restrictions that he is not going to go onto North Farms. I think there is a

developer that owns that land already. He paid \$40,000 an acre for it; \$25,000 versus \$40,000; there is a big difference in how you calculate your tax revenues.

Mayor Dickinson stated, some properties are worth more than others. In public we are not going to disclose what the overall...

Mr. Vumbaco replied, I am not trying to be argumentative but you are laying out a situation here, asking the Council to make a decision to go forward on something that we have no idea; is it half this value; twice this value?

Mayor Dickinson stated, I don't understand your question. We are saying that there is acquisition for rights-of-way including the appraisal and surveying will approximate \$1.4 million.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, what if it comes in at \$2.4 million and we make a decision to go forward based on an estimate that someone is giving us of \$1.4 million?

Mayor Dickinson answered, if it reaches a point that is more expensive than what we have expected, I suppose we could not purchase a given or not go forward with it. All we can deal with are estimates at this point.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, how do you expect to facilitate the campus-style development up there once you get this part going? If you recall, the Barnes Park was done by a private developer and through his own personal or private deed restrictions, they set the campus-style development up there. How is the Town going to ensure that we are going to have "campus-style development" similar to the Barnes and non-Sterling Drive Barnes I am assuming that you are talking about?

Mr. Roe answered, the EDC (Economic Development Commission) has previously been before the Planning & Zoning Commission with a series of recommendations to upgrade our public standards. Some of those recommendations were adopted several years ago and the EDC, very recently, submitted additional recommendations for Planning & Zoning to consider that would, once again, revisit an effort to try and have our public regulations come closer to the private ones. The one difference being on the design side; we do not necessarily have the ability to dictate design or direct design.

Mr. Vumbaco asked that the regulation changes be shared with the public for the sake of those residents in attendance from the subject property area. When you get into the design phase of this, we could be thinking that we are going to have another Barnes North here but when you get down to where the people start buying that land and living within our regulations, we end up with something that we really don't think we are trying to accomplish this evening or over the next six months, ten years, whatever the period of time will be.

Mr. Roe stated, the last time and this time what is being visited is sideline and buffering regulations; building regulations; number of buildings per lot. The proposal actually is to do one building per lot. Also, to revisit, again, the open space requirement. The IX zone under public regulations previously had no open space requirement and the Planning & Zoning Commission now does have an open space requirement in the IX and I believe that the EDC is asking them to revisit that as well.

Ms. Doherty asked, concept B, Don, does that mean the right-of-way?

Mr. Roe answered, yes. The report exhibited three concepts and concept B is the second one. It shows a road layout. One of the differences is; in concept C, the connection would be through Tower Drive. That did not make a lot of sense.

Mr. Brodinsky asked the Mayor, are you looking for a vote from the Council tonight? If so, what measure are you looking to have passed or endorsed?

Mayor Dickinson stated, either tonight or at a subsequent meeting, we need to approve of the concept of looking to acquire right-of-way for utility and road purposes. It would mean that we would begin negotiating, determining where the road should go and negotiating with the property owners as far as that acquisition. That would be the action that I suggest is necessary.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, are you pushing hard for a vote tonight?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I think everyone should feel comfortable; it does not have to occur tonight. I don't think we can wait six months either. I don't have a problem with a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I would like to go back to what exactly we are trying to accomplish with the proposed industrial park; with the moratorium. Is this driven by the financials of this? Is this driven by the fact that if we put in \$7 million, what we get back will be worth it from an investment perspective or is there some other motivation?

Mayor Dickinson answered, the purpose of the moratorium is to give the Town time to properly plan this industrial park or the placement of roads and utility rights-of-way. We need the time to do that if development is occurring while that is happening, there could be complications and conflicts between what someone wants to build out there and where a road is to be located. I think we need the time to identify where that road will go and be able to acquire it.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is our motivation to build an industrial park or to force the development of an industrial park driven by the finances; driven by what we think we will get back over the \$7 million in tax revenues invested? Is that what is driving this?

Mayor Dickinson answered, what is driving this is that, if there is an assumption that the IX zone property is of benefit to the Town. There is an assumption that the existing industrial parks are a benefit to the community. Given that, this area was identified as a concern as far as how it would develop. It is a large site zoned IX. That is why we commissioned the study; it was performed; we have gotten that result and now we are presented with, how will we dictate; how will we determine where the roads will go; where the traffic is routed; how the utility connections will be made. We play a role in that because either it will develop in a very planned way or it will, in my opinion, develop in a more haphazard way. We are presenting that this is a way of having it develop in a planned way and in a manner that we feel will be a benefit to the community over future years. It is driven more by the land use designation and our belief that the industrial park is a benefit to the community then by, will we receive "x" dollars in "x" time. The \$7 million as was stated in the information, we don't know how much of that will be offset by assessments for the improvements. The exact cost over a period of years is difficult to pinpoint. Obviously, the cost may be higher five years from now than it is today. There are a lot of factors involved, but for us, I believe the issue is, we have an IX zone, we have a plan that shows how it is best developed for the community; are we going to do it that way or not?

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I think what you are saying is, if we get our money back in twenty years; thirty years; even if we never got our money back, you would still be recommending it because the money isn't the point. The point is to get a planned, aesthetically pleasing, industrial park, is that what you are suggesting?

Mayor Dickinson answered, no.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, the money aspects are important then?

Mayor Dickinson answered, they are important but they don't completely drive it.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, if this was an economic "loser" you would be not recommending it, would that be right?

Mayor Dickinson answered, if we could show that this was just not an economic benefit to the community, I think we certainly should take a second look at it.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, where does the burden of proof lay? Is it up to you, Mayor, and the EDC who recommended this; the proponents of the industrial park, to establish an economic benefit... is it your burden of proof to show that we do have an economic benefit or is it up to the opponents to show that there is none, and we know that if there is no planned industrial park, the property, in time, will generate revenues anyway. In order to show an economic benefit, which you say is important, it seems to me that proponents of the park would have to

show an increase in revenues, over those which we would get in any event, even though there was no planned industrial park, true?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I don't think it is a matter of having to prove a case.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, you don't think you have to show an economic benefit in order to make the case for the industrial park. The economical case, for letting it develop as is, if it is roughly the same for an industrial park, that doesn't concern you?

Mayor Dickinson replied, I do not believe with the Barnes park that there was a similar proof. The use of the land is IX zoned. I believe that will return a benefit to the Town. There are many variables involved. Given what we know and what we stated here as a course of action, I believe there will be a benefit to the community. I am sure there are people who will believe that that will not be the case. I don't think there is any way to prove the case at this point because all costs can't be known now, all of the problems; and issues that may arise as rights-of-way are acquired, as construction activities actually may occur, all of that involves a lot of unknowns. What we do know, however, is that, if we do not determine where the roads are going and how utilities will serve that area, it will never develop as the kind of industrial park that we are familiar with, such as Barnes. You will have many smaller uses there; warehouse uses, etc., but there is no way that can be a prime industrial park without water and sewer services. We have gotten the report that shows what is necessary to put those services in this area. It also shows how we can route the traffic from this area, hopefully most of it away from North Farms Road and Tankwood Road. We are achieving results, even though I don't think it is possible to present with certainty exactly what year all costs are covered.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is the use of the money or interest that we might pay on the \$7 million included in the \$7 million? The bonding cost or interest cost; is that included or is that in addition to the \$7 million?

Mayor Dickinson answered, no, that is not included, as the assessments that offset that cost are not included. There are definitely variables.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, you are asking us to approve an expenditure of \$7 million and I think what you are saying is that it is not up to you to show that getting the \$7 million back in a reasonable amount of time; and even a positive return on the \$7 million; it is not important for you to show that getting the \$7 million back in a reasonable amount of time is material. We invest the \$7 million; there are a lot of business involved; we may get it back in 20, 25, 30 years, maybe not. You are mildly concerned about that but no terribly concerned.

Mayor Dickinson answered, don't try to characterize what my level of concern is. I am as concerned about money as anyone in this room. I do not like to waste money and still I am here

recommending this action. I have never taken or considered an action in this town without seriously considering the monetary issue. I take the same approach here.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, if there is a \$7 million investment that is being proposed, I would have like to have seen some sort of cash flow analysis; some pro forma, some sort of definite plan that we could study and analyze to show something more than faith that shows this to be a good investment for the Town. I challenged your assumptions... and I really didn't get, in my opinion and with all due respect, a hard answer. I am left with an expenditure of \$7 million and my comfort level hasn't been raised that from an economic point of view, this is a good deal for the Town. We haven't even started mentioning the risk factors involved. Linda Bush and Don Roe started mentioning some, that we have capacity in the industrial parks which aren't being used now; Research Parkway had some trouble filling up their parks; we don't know what the market is like; we don't know if people are interested in this kind of thing; we don't know how long we have to wait to get in customers; we don't know if restrictions we are putting on the park is actually going to limit the ability of the property owners to sell. There are a lot of risk factors involved and that concerns me and, after two or more years of study, I was hoping for some sort of financial analysis or marketing survey; assurance other than, "have faith, this will work out; if we build it they will come." seems to be what is happening. From a financial point of view I am having great difficulty with that. I am not satisfied that there is any real hard thinking out there that it is a financially good deal. I think the burden of proof is on the administration to show that.

(Applause)

Mayor Dickinson responded, the Town built North Plains Road and put in utilities. There were no guarantees that anyone would develop along that highway; obviously they did. The Town participated in putting the highways in the Barnes Industrial Parks as well as Research Parkway. Is there any guarantee that anyone will come along; no. Wallingford has been and will continue to be an attractive place if for no other reason, Route 91, Route 15, the access to I-84, the center of the State of CT. We are in a position to attract good business here and we have. The question for us is, are we going to plan for the development in this area? Are we going to let it occur in a haphazard way? There can be debate and disagreement about that but, if we don't do something, I think there should be a clear decision because if we sit back and never discuss it and never have a plan to move forward, then I think we are rightfully subject to criticism in the future why we didn't do something. We can't prove all things. There could be debate about it and certainly disagreement but, if we do not do something, then I think there should be a clear decision because if we just sit back and never discuss it and never have a plan to move forward, then I think we are rightfully subject to criticism in the future of why we didn't do something. There is a lot of work that has to be done on this but I think we move ahead with the faith the that community is a good community and will remain a place that people want to be and we are doing our job to try and plan for the future of the community. That can take various viewpoints and those who do not agree with taking this approach can say legitimately that they are planning

for the community also and they don't think this is appropriate and that is fine. We all act on what we think is good for the future of the community and that could have different visions, I don't have a problem with that.

Mr. Toman stated, Will Rogers said, with regards to land as an investment, "they're not making it anymore." Land is getting very scare in Central Connecticut, just look at what is happening with residential development. We buy up land for future generations and not let it be developed and then we only approved twenty-six residences last year. The average cost of a new house goes up something like \$100,000 in twelve months. Something similar could happen and will happen on the industrial side. I look at these 270 acres and some of it is topography; they have three large wetland areas in there, not all of the twenty two lots will house a corporation or site on it. That 270 acres represents approximately half of the land that is still IX undeveloped. If you put some simple math to it, and I think that Mr. Brodinsky was looking for, you might have somewhere between 30 and 50 corporate establishments of various kinds on less than 600 acres left to be developed. The future has a way of sneaking up on us. On the one hand we have a lot of land to be developed; on the other hand, time may surprise us on how fast it is developed. I do think that the Mayor's proposal has a lot of merit but I also think that there should be a little more analysis as to the return on investment. There is such a thing as the law of diminishing returns. Even though I don't think this case fits it, the time frame that Mr. Brodinsky was talking about does have its impact and that is why I would also want a little more analysis as a return on investment on these 270 acres.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, how would the utilities work under this plan? I understand that water and sewer would go in my reason of eminent domain and that the Town would then attempt to recover the cost through an assessment?

Mayor Dickinson replied, going in by eminent domain would only occur where there were unwilling owners of property as far as the sale of right-of-way.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, we are going to put in water and sewer and we are going to assess the owners of the properties, is that true?

Mayor Dickinson answered, highway also. There is assessment for the benefit to the property, the appreciation in value.

Mr. Brodinsky answered, that is roughly \$7 million.

Mayor Dickinson answered, no, we don't know that. That would be the subject of appraisals. It would be a matter of what an individual piece appreciated in value as a result of access to highway and the utility issues.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, the assessment that would be made against the property owners would not be based upon the cost of the water and sewer going in?

Mayor Dickinson answered, water cost; that would be true but for sewer and highway, it is based upon the increase in value to the property as a result of access to the highway or the sewer. There is not way to compute that at this time.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, has that been estimated?

Mayor Dickinson answered, that is the difference between \$7 million and \$1.4 million as far as the cost of putting it in. The increase in the value to the property is the subject of an appraisal.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, hasn't anyone thought of what the impact would be to the property owners by way of this assessment, both the water assessment based on costs and their increase in value, the benefit assessment based on the other, hasn't someone gone into that?

Mayor Dickinson replied, I don't think there is any way to determine that without an appraisal once that construction occurs. Other than the cost of water, that would be assessed, given the cost of the water. We don't know at this point.

Mr. Brodinsky replied, in your letter dated January 17th and the more recent one, you said that you reviewed, you had a large group, you had every expert in town; you had the Engineer, Town Planner, Planning & Zoning and one of the things to review was the impact on the property owners; a review of the impacts. I would, as part of this analysis and what I am looking for and hope to find at this meeting was some analysis of how these assessments would impact the property owners; how much is the town going to charge after we take some of the property by eminent domain. I was hoping some analysis would have been done but you are saying it hasn't been done, it is impossible.

Mayor Dickinson answered, I don't think it is possible to provide; it is the subject of an appraisal for the highway and sewer. Sewer costs are not recovered 100%. It is a question of what is the increase in value to the property based upon appraisal.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, as we go deeper and deeper into the meeting, the more "I don't know" and "we haven't figured that out, yet" we get and the more "gee, we will figure that out later" and the more, "gee, it is impossible to know at this time", the more I doubt that we really have a plan of development. I think what we have is a pipe dream and how we get there is either something that is being withheld or no one has thought about and if no one has thought about it or we have too many reasons why we can't calculate it, I am losing enthusiasm for it the more and more I hear that we haven't come to grips with some of these questions which appeared in your letter.

Mr. Parisi stated, maybe some of us haven't lost our enthusiasm.

Public comment was called for at this time.

Dave Moore, 926 North Farms Road asked, how far down North Farms Road do you expect any utilities to go?

Mayor Dickinson replied, the plan does not have utilities running on North Farms Road. This plan has the sewer connection coming off of Tower Road and the water is coming up Northrop (Rd.). To my knowledge there is nothing in North Farms Road.

Mr. Moore stated, I lived on Tankwood Rd. for twenty-three years and seeing how this property has sat there, at first it was kept up very nice by Kogut and then he went belly-up and it has been in a state of disrepair for the longest time. There is trash dumped all over it; people dump in there all the time. On the other hand, it is a beautiful area. One bad thing that did happen a few years ago was connecting Midland to Tankwood. We ended up with a mini-I-91 with a stop sign and intersection at Rockledge. Cars forever just fly through that stop sign. I have spoken to the police who do not want to know anything; low crime area. I cannot believe that anything you do, whether it is the Town doing it or a private developer, that you are going to keep traffic off of either one of those two roads. You have already ruined that character of the area with that warehouse; the new businesses that went in. They are lit up like a roman candle every night. I can't see how nearby residents can leave their blinds open in the evening without being blinded by that light pollution. The Town is buying up land, in my opinion, like drunken sailors. In reading this morning's paper about the Cooke properties that we bought and he (Mr. Cooke) being very indignant that he is leasing it back and that he can do what ever he wants with it...

Mr. Parisi asked that the speaker stay on the subject at hand.

Mr. Moore replied that it is on the subject matter. He stated, this is my time to talk.

Mr. Parisi replied, your time to talk on the item on the agenda. That is the way we run our meeting.

Mr. Moore answered, Mr. Parisi, I think you have been at this a little bit too long, let me speak.

Mr. Parisi replied, I don't mind you speaking to the issue.

Mr. Moore stated, I am speaking to the issue if you would let me finish.

Mr. Parisi stated, I just don't want to have personalities in the discussion. That's all.

Mr. Moore replied, it is my opinion and I will say, as long as I am not saying off-color, I will say...

Mr. Parisi interrupted to say, no, our rules, we don't have discussions about...

Mr. Moore interrupted to say, for the record, you have done enough to gag people in this town talking to you and I don't appreciate you're trying to gag me. I'm talking...

Mr. Parisi responded, I am not trying to gag you, I am trying to follow the rules.

Mr. Moore stated, If you would let me finish; you go around buying land like drunken sailors and what it appears as is, the one deal that I referenced before...but it is the Cooke property...that you now have issues as to how truthfully it was represented to the Town. When you go out and spend money with hopes of doing something or having an expected benefit to me, is just another slip-up. I feel that what should happen here is that the Town should not do anything at this point. Let the market do what it is going to do. There are other issues in town that we need to take care of. You want to put more traffic onto Rt. 68 and we have that bottleneck in Yalesville that we never hear any mention of it. There is a bottleneck going into Yalesville from the Stop & Shop area in the evenings and in the morning coming the opposite way. I think you need to let this property lie or the other benefit to the Town, I feel, if you want to buy some land, buy this land and put it to public use, then you won't have to worry about any of this.

(Applause)

Joe Rusczek, 983 North Farms Road stated, once again we have to defend our homes and neighborhoods; a political trip to wear us down and defeat us but we will fight on. It is considerate of the Town to let us voice our opinion on a foregone conclusion that has already be decided on. The Town is spending millions to acquire open space while here, on North Farms (Rd.), the Town has free, open space which they are trying to take from us. The reason the Mayor says is to build a tax base for the Town. If that is the reason, how come our taxes keep going up. This year, if we don't get it because the mill rate has not gone up, we will get a big increase because of the revaluation. The land, free open space, that the Town is trying to acquire, has one of the few area dairy farms which we put out of business; also a horse riding facility that will disappear. It is a good place for young people to come and ride for the horses and to learn to love animals. This is better than having youngsters hanging around on the streets with nothing to do; keeping them off drugs and other vices. I ought to know because this horse farm bordered our property. We are told that this industrial park will be a campus-like facility and the EDC and Councilors didn't think we would object or be against it. Well, think again. We do not want it in our area. We love it as it is. We pay our taxes, demand nothing from the Town, just leave our area alone. We do not need another industrial parks. There are so many undeveloped, open lots and empty buildings in other parts. We have a lot of open

space which they can re-classify as IX zones on Whirlwind Hill (Rd.) East Center Street and Grieb Rd. Not one of the Town officials, the Mayor, Planning & Zoning, Town Councilors, EDC, Town Planner live in the North Farms Road area so why should they and the rest of the town residents care as long as it is not in their neighborhood or near their homes. It was stated in the newspapers that if we do not sell the Town would take it by eminent domain. This could be a legal hassle for this type of facility. The Town in the real estate business? This is a form of threat. They need this industrial park like they need a whole in the head. It is probably the only place they get manufacturers to move in there is from China. Campus-style, baloney. We get a view everyday when passing by the three ugly warehouses recently built on North Farms Road. How could the Town Planner, EDC, P&Z allow this to happen? They should use better judgment on this type of building. Everything to favor the developer and to heck with the neighborhood or people living in the area. This is the most beautiful area in Wallingford, why destroy it? What the Japs and Germans couldn't do to take this country away from us and take our land away from us, the Town is doing it.

(Applause)

Joe Geremia, 415 Barnes Road, owner of property on 90 Tankwood Road stated, there is no consideration for the businesses in the area. The Mayor called it "vacant land" but there are businesses operating on there. He is not calling the factories in the Barnes Park vacant because there are businesses there. There is no consideration for the farms in the area. Without us being able to add onto our farms; I am a greenhouse farmer and right now there is a plan to have a road go right through the property that I bought to put greenhouses on. I can't use that land if you put that road in the middle. The greenhouses can't just be put down the hill, they have to be on a nice, flat piece of land. I expressed that to the Mayor at a meeting that we had. It is also an incomplete map. There is another twenty acres of industrial land that is not on the map, it has been land-locked by this plan. If you stop the ability of the farmers to expand their farms in the area, they have no choice but to go out of business. A farm in America needs to expand. In order to keep the price of produce and all farm products the same price for thirty years, the government, the state and even the town knows a farm has to expand. This limits the expansion and pretty much ends it. This is forcing industrial zone in the area. These farms will have to sell; I will have to sell and go somewhere where a town is going welcome my business and not try to put a road through it. If my name was Bristol Myers you would not be talking about putting a road through me. Even if I was a no-name factory, there would not be talk of putting a road through me. But because I am just a farmer, it is o.k., or because it is just dairy land, it is o.k. to put a highway through a dairy farm. There are not highways through dairy farms. You just don't operate this way. The Mayor or someone has to say that if we are going to call it vacant land, we've got to get rid of these farmers; get rid of us, tell us that we are not wanted in the area because this is doing it through the back door. If you don't want me to put up more greenhouses and you want a road on the land, I think you should tell me that because I have plans of keeping future generations here and this really eliminates that and eliminates other future generations on other farms. If you are going to have all of this vacant land on the market,

because farmers have to expand, so if we are not expanding we had better get the heck out before we go out of business. You are now putting another 290 acres on the market at a reduced price. You are going to get whatever development is able to come in. Right now it is not campus-style buildings. I live in Barnes Park and it is a decent park but we have mini-storage, steel buildings; there is no difference between those buildings except that the Town is getting a little more tax money off of it. If you drive through there you will see the same type of steel structures and warehousing, big warehousing, much bigger warehousing than what is there right now. The plan routes all the traffic onto Barnes Road and down onto Rt. 5 and Rte. 68 which can't really handle it. My opinion is, if you just left this one piece that is going to be sold now to develop, the traffic may go right into Meriden. They may take a left out of the driveway going to Meriden. They will go onto Northrop Road, you will split the traffic up. I know this plan is set to appease the homeowners but this is going to devalue the land on North Farms Road, all the land, all the houses. When you are forcing a factory park, and that is what it is in the backyard of these houses, it is going to devalue every piece of property and the homes in the area.

(Applause)

Ed Loughlin, 158 South Main Street stated, I want to make it clear that I am here this evening strictly as a private citizen. I am not speaking on behalf of anyone who owns a square foot of property anywhere in this area. I usually avoid meetings like this because of the presumption that I do represent someone's interest. However, this is so important to the Town that I felt that I would come over here. Whether my opinion is worth anything or not, I will feel better having expressed it. There are so many conflicting interests here and so many conflicting talents that I don't think it is possible for this legislative body to come to a real firm, logical, solid conclusion on what should happen here, based upon what we have seen this evening. As far as the future, Mr. Brodinsky, if you look back at Wallingford over the past 100 years, there is no question as to what is going to happen in Wallingford during the next 20. In all due respect to Mr. Geremia and Lord knows they are a valuable citizen in this town and I hope you are here for many more generations. The trends, the construction of infrastructure, be it I-91 or Rte. 15 or the new airport at Tweed (New Haven Airport) or to cross I-691 or the railroad, you name it, we are bound to increase in population and we are going to increase in our industrial development. I have to agree with the Mayor, this is going to be developed. It is a risk that any reasonable developer will take. However, how we plan this; I think it would be vital to the interest of the Town and every property owner in the area, and with particular reference to the people on North Farms Road who, if anyone has a legitimate interest, those homeowners do. Let me suggest, I think we are addressing half of the problem or opportunity. I do not think we can take an intelligent viewing of what we would recommend as reasonable development of this property by talking only about the west side of North Farms Road. If you take the people just on North Farms Road living in residences, they are affected by any development west of I-91, north of Rte. 68 and east of North Main Street Extension. You are leaving out a huge block of land bound on the east by I-91, on the north by Carpenter Lane and on the west by North Farms

Road. The lack of attractive development that has recently taken place on North Farms Road is, in fact, on the east side of North Farms Road. If this moratorium is going to be continued to give an opportunity for proper planning, it seems brutally obvious that we must address that property bound on the west by North Farms Road and North by Carpenter Lane and east by Northrop Road down to Rte 68. We need the utilities on that side of the street just as much as we need them on the west side of the street. We will not be able to control the traffic on North Farms Road unless we treat the property on both sides of North Farms Road. The people who own residences on North Farms Road I am afraid, will suffer the same fate that people suffered in residences on Thorpe Avenue when everything around them was zoned industrially with no planning for the preservation of those property owners and the houses on Thorpe Avenue. You will never keep traffic off of North Farms Road by addressing only the west side. It certainly should be addressed as one huge parcel. Anything else, to me, is totally illogical. For the benefit of the people and the preservation of those residences and for a logical highway plan in routing of traffic coming off of Rte 68 and looping around to get back on I-91, and for the routing of proper utilities, you can't address a half of a pie. It would seem that we have considerations of fiscal responsibility...the Economic Development Commission naturally is interested in an industrial and commercial development of the town. It would seem that all of us citizens of the town, residences in the area, people interested in business and the development of our town, in a proper planning. Not just of our finances, but of our way of life, that we would get together in the proper forum which is more logically the Planning & Zoning Commission. This is their job. I think we need time. To rush to judgment and to put a band-aid on the west side of North Farms Road while we abandon the east side and let it develop willy nilly like it has already started and I agree with the gentleman who said that we are never going to get significant attractive development on the east side of North Farms Road because there are no utilities there. Until there are, we are not going to get anything of any significant value. It makes no sense. I would take some issue with the fear that we should not make an attractive development out of these huge parcels of land. Other communities have, within their zoning codes, required certain building and design standards. It takes a little time but it can be accomplished. Through very legitimate fears of the people who have spent their lives and a large part of their fortunes in developing their homes on North Farms Road, I think a lot of those fears can be allayed if the entire area is planned and they know that the residential character of North Farms Road is going to be preserved and that any traffic of any size and industrial nature will be diverted by a logical highway program that will pick up the traffic as it comes off of I-91 and circulate it in a northerly and westerly direction and dump it back on Rte 68 to the west of them so that those homes can be preserved. They won't have to have a fear of shacks and cheap development taking place because we lack utilities. I have a lot of confidence in the future of this town, if it is planned properly. I have a lot of confidence that the best interests of everyone here can be served if we address this in a logical and reasonable fashion. Unless we treat it in its entirety, I am afraid that we are all going to be losers.

(Applause)

Rita Rapuano, 995 North Farms Rd., owner of Rap-a-Pony Farm stated, fifteen years ago my husband and I moved to Wallingford and a year later he died of cancer so I have been running the farm by myself. This seems so senseless. We don't need any more traffic; we don't need anyone making anymore dirt, look at what Rte 68 looks like. The traffic is ridiculous and the cars coming up and down our road is nothing compared to what we will be getting pretty soon. All my neighbors have been so great and I want to thank all of you people for sticking up for us because you wouldn't want this in your backyard.

Lou Maglione, 977 North Farms Road stated, I came here tonight and I'm scratching my head wondering why I did because, although it is just my opinion, I believe, except for maybe a couple of people on the Council, everyone knows how they are going to vote on this proposal whether it be tonight, tomorrow night or next week. It is just my opinion but that is really the way I feel about it. I had a chance to take a ride through some of the industrial parks. Not only did I notice quite a bit of vacant property but also vacant buildings. Why not have the EDC go after the owners of these properties and see if they can get them to develop these properties? This would bring more tax base into the town. As I look out my backyard and I look over to the left-hand side approximately 500 yards away is Fairfield Blvd. A lot of my neighbors here work five days or six days a week. Six o'clock in the morning, especially in the spring and summertime and early fall when our windows are open all the time, dumpsters are rattling and there is some facility down there that has some God-forsaken pump that runs forever. We listen to that and haven't complained. Now basically what you want to do is put that right in my backyard. This really disappoints me. The Mayor talks about haphazard development. There is a reason for that; take a look at our Town Zoning regulations. Look at what is on North Farms now. Who do we blame for that? Us. I think you have to take a look at our Plan of Development and what we are really doing with that area. What has started is something that the Town has started, not what we have started. The Mayor said that with these improvements our taxes will go up. The only people who will benefit from this are people who own several acres; ten, twenty, thirty acres who can sell it for development. For those of us who have a couple of acres, the property will be worth nothing. We have to wait 25 years for a return on our \$7 million investment. Put it in a bank and you can start making money tomorrow. The Mayor says that Wallingford is an attractive place. I understand that things are going to change and things are going to get developed but if we keep on trying everything into an industrial park, what people will eventually say is, "I work in Wallingford but I live in Southington" or "I live in Cheshire" or "I live someplace else; I wouldn't want to live there." There are a lot of people in this audience here, tonight, that have lived on North Farms Road longer than some of you are old. They don't want this park; we don't want it. We want it to be left alone. We want the development in that area to stop. We don't want any more warehousing. That's up to the P&Z Commission and your Plan of Development and you are the guys who can make it happen. Do it the right way.

(Applause)

Diane Cwirka stated that she is representing her mother, Julie Cwirka, and her sister, father, brother who live at 1017 Northrop Road. She stated, it is unfortunate that I have to come tonight because we often times find out things in the newspaper. I know that Mr. Werbiski found out that his land was scheduled to be developed via the newspaper. We also found out via a letter from the Mayor that they want to put water; water only, down Northrop Road. We are interested to know how that is going to happen? We want to know if it is going to devalue our property and whether or not there is anything on the map on display that describes how it is going to happen. I don't believe there is from what I have understood so far.

Mayor Dickinson answered, this map does not show Northrop Road. We have a representative from the utility here to describe the connection. I believe it is from Carpenter Lane and then moves westerly along Northrop and then connects into the property.

Raymond F. Smith, Director of Public Utilities explained, the water connection for this whole area would originate from the corner of Carpenter and Northrop Road. The line would then circle around Northrop Road, connect where North Farms and Northrop Rd. meet, come down North Farms slightly and then go into the property. Ultimately it will connect back into Fairfield Blvd. and Tower Drive.

Ms. Cwirka asked, only water, not sewer?

Mr. Smith answered, right.

Ms. Cwirka stated, when those plans come out I would like to see them. I am also interested in the flow of traffic. The Mayor said that he would do everything to divert traffic away from North Farms and Tankwood. Does that mean that Northrop Road becomes a racetrack? All the traffic will then get routed on Northrop Road? I want to understand this because I don't right now. I don't think any of the people in the audience do either, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Dickinson referred to a map stating, this map shows the identification of the new roads, of the proposed roads all within this IX area. The purpose of this is to encourage most of the traffic that would be generated in this industrial park area to move out over Sterling Drive and Fairfield Blvd. so the traffic cannot come out to North Farms Road and it would not have access under this plan to Tankwood Road. It would move in the industrial park area, through the Barnes Industrial Park area. There is no connection that would allow traffic to come down Northrop Road. The study was done on the area given that the area is obviously a great deal of acreage that is interior; not fronting on an existing Town road. The area along North Farms and Northrop, most of that fronts on a Town road and was not the subject of a study done by Milone and McBroom. That is the reason for the comment regarding traffic. The effort is to have the traffic use the existing industrial park highway system and encourage the non-use to as great a degree as possible of North Farms and Tankwood.

Ms. Cwirka asked, you are going to discourage more traffic on Northrop Road by these new roads you plan to build?

Mayor Dickinson answered, the new roads would avoid having any connection with easy access to Northrop. The traffic could not go in that direction unless people exited out onto Barnes Road and then came back up North Farms Road and then down Northrop.

Ms. Cwirka asked, what is the legal definition of eminent domain?

Atty. Small answered, generally speaking, it is the taking of land for a public purpose.

Ms. Cwirka asked, public purpose can be...?

Atty. Small answered, it could be the development of an industrial park, that would fall within a public purpose.

Ms. Cwirka asked, by condemnation you mean the use of eminent domain in this case?

Atty. Small answered, yes, it is the same thing.

Ms. Cwirka stated, I would like to remind the Council that farming is a permitted use in the IX zone. That is something that is happening there now and in a useful and valuable way to many families. I know our family has a working farm and so is Mr. Werbiski's. It is unfortunate to think that all of a sudden their lives will be in turmoil, as we presume ours will be someday, too, but not like this. This is something that really isn't the way to do it and I think there is a lot of intelligent people here; there are a lot of resources in the town that it really could be done in a different way, so that one person doesn't have to suffer so greatly that all of these people on one road does not have to suffer the building of this industrial park. As a person who grew up in Wallingford, there are many "brown" areas that should be considered re-used. They really could be considered as places that could bring businesses in. Right now, as someone from the audience said, there are no guarantees that this is going to be a success. There are no guarantees in life as a general rule, but I really think there are a lot of areas in town that should be considered to be re-used in a sensible way. I think the public would appreciate that consideration, thank you.

Ken Kogut, 84 Tankwood Road stated that he operates a nursery at 84 Tankwood Road. He stated, we bought our property in November of 1995 and one of the deciding factors for us to move our family and our farming operation from Meriden to Wallingford was an article that we read in the newspaper in September of 1995. I will read an excerpt from it. It was an article concerning tax abatement and the loss of farming in Wallingford. There was a quote from the Mayor which said, "I think that we do recognize the importance of farms and I think that there are other things that can be done to maintain farming in the community. I don't think we have

exhausted all of our efforts. I certainly think it is in the best interest of the community to maintain as much farmland in town as possible and I think farms are very important to the town and play a significant role in the history of the town.” The council also agreed and stated that every time a farm is turned into a paved road, it is a lost opportunity. Here we are now, seven years later and what we will experience, if everyone has their way, is a lost opportunity and more lost farms. To answer Mr. Brodinsky’s question about the return of tax dollars on the \$7 million; all the land that the roads are going to pass through are right now actively farmed. If I am not mistaken, tax on farmland is based on use value, not actual value. The roads going through Mr. Webiski’s property; Mr. Geremia’s property; going past my property, is not going to increase our property at all as far as tax revenues are concerned. That was a point that was failed to be mentioned. I think it is a terrible shame that out of the 270 acres that is in front of you right now for an industrial park, 181 of those acres is actively farmed right now. I think a lot of efforts are being made by the Town to prevent the sale of a 59 acre parcel and the Town is willing to spend \$7 million to put road easements in and put farmers out of business to prevent unwanted development on 59 acres. You would be much better off taking the money and just buying that 59 acres because if it is such a good investment for the Town, it would be a good investment for the Town to own it. Then you can control, as property comes up for sale, you could purchase the property then by deed restrictions you can put on the property that you want open land; buildings like Barnes Industrial Park, not what is going to happen otherwise. I just think it is a very unfair thing and I am sorry I ever moved to this town.

(Applause)

Atty. Thomas McKeenan, unlike Mr. Loughlin, I am not a resident here but I am here on behalf of parties who own acreage within the proposed plan, being Kogut Enterprises. The Town, through its Planning & Zoning Commission, Town Planner, had determined that certain areas are to be zoned industrial, some are residential, some are IX. We already have an IX zone here which I assume was put into effect after some study and not piece meal. Unfortunately, when you live on the border between one zone and another, certain individual’s rights or their way of life becomes a little bit disturbed because of the planning that went on. I am not here to say that this property should not be zoned IX; the Town, in its wisdom, said it was IX. Then the P&Z Commission decided that if these people have this property and have owned it for many years, but we want to now make sure that it gets developed right. The Town put a moratorium on any of the development within this area, until they could complete a study. This isn’t a study that is being presented to you now and I submit to you that the Town is trying to back into an industrial park. If you want to develop a sound industrial park, you do your studies, you make your analysis of what the market is, what it is not, and then the property. Then you develop it, place what ever restrictions you want on it, but that is not the approach we are taking. What they are taking is an approach that, if this proposal is accepted will for effectively a minimum of ten years and if I could believe some of the other numbers, twenty-five years, someone who has owned this property whether it be for farming or whatever, will be unable to do anything with it. Who would purchase it, not knowing where the roads are going to be; when they are going

to be installed; when the sewers are going to go in? But on the other hand you are not going to let anybody develop it. That action is tantamount to a taking of this property. The Mayor indicates that we are going to allocate so much money to take this road. There is not one person that owns any of this property that is going to give it to him willingly. You have heard them all; they are all opposed to the project. Why should they now sit back and determine that they are going to let the Town do what they want so the Town can come back later and hit them with an assessment for the water. It is not going to go down easy, therefore I think the \$1.4 million is probably totally inappropriate. On behalf of my clients, I recommend that this plan not be approved and if it is part of an overall plan for developing all of the IX property in the area as Mr. Loughlin indicated...it's wrong. Make a sound plan. Develop both parcels in conjunction with one another and not on a piece meal basis. To proceed in this manner is, from a property owner's point of view, someone wanting to sell, for whatever their reasons. You are putting these people in a position now of having property which they can't even dispose of because no developer in their right mind would be purchasing a piece of property in an IX zone which you may not be able to develop for twenty-five years and that is the timeframe that we heard talked of tonight. This is not the proper way of doing it and I would, on behalf of my clients and the other ones, recommend that this proposal not be accepted. I thank you.

Mr. Parisi stated, I want to remind everyone that this is, at present, a proposal and that is all it is, a proposal. There are, to the best of my knowledge, no votes committed for or against it. This meeting was called as a special meeting so that this one item could be discussed and the presentation could be made so that the Council would not be distracted by other items on the agenda. As far as notices (agendas) go, they were not mailed out for this meeting and they never are. This is a special meeting of the Council on this one item and, happily, you read it in the paper and you were able to attend it. There is no attempt to sneak this through or to be slick about it; this is a very, very open process. I want to make sure that is very clear.

Mayor Dickinson stated, we did mail notices regarding the meeting to those along North Farms Road, those on Northrop Road, the owners of the property and I believe on Tankwood Road. We did make an effort to mail to all the property owners in the area.

Trinda Bush, Town Planner explained, the property today is private property, that is why the warehouses were approved. Several of the property owners talk like if the industrial park plan was not approved, the land would stay the way it is. That is not the case, unless the Town buys it or someone else buys it and wants to leave it the way it is. As long as it is private property and the Town sends a tax bill to the property owner every year, they have a legal right to develop their property. Today, they can only develop it industrial because that is the zone. The Planning & Zoning Commission could change the zone to residential or some other zone but the property, unless the Town buys it, at some time is going to be developed because it is private, it is not going to stay the way it is. I hope everyone understands that.

Councilor Farrell asked, how was it that the area was re-zoned for IX at some point in time when there seems to have been fairly broad opposition out there? When did this happen? It seems to have slipped by us.

Ms. Bush answered, in the early 1980s, the Town hired a consultant, it was before my time, to update the Plan of Development. It was RPPW out of Hamden, CT. Part of the Plan of Development which was adopted by the Planning & Zoning Commission the month after I was hired so I had no knowledge of Wallingford at that time, was a recommendation that this whole area be re-zoned IX. The entire area from Barnes Park over to I-91 was proposed to be re-zoned as IX. During my interview for my job, the Plan of Development was already completed and one of the things I remember distinctly during my interview was that one of my first jobs was to implement the recommendations in the Plan of Development and work with the P&Z Commission. That is what we did, if you look at the P&Z minutes back in 1984, 1985 & 1986. There was workshop after workshop after workshop on implementing the recommendations in the 1984 Plan of Development which, this was one of them. In early 1986 this was re-zoned to IX because that is what you do; adopt a plan and find a way to implement it. P&Z implementation usually means changing your rules. At one point in time I recommended to the P&Z Commission and they had a public hearing to re-zone this back to residential. It was some time in the late 1980s and we were concerned about traffic impact on Rte 68. At that public hearing and I have a petition in my office, virtually all of the residents of North Farms Road signed a petition asking that it remain industrially-zoned, not to re-zone it to residential. I think the feeling was, that if it was re-zoned to residential, it would develop. If it stayed IX, it would stay vacant. That is not necessarily the case, but at that time the P&Z Commission voted to keep the land zoned industrial. I think Mr. Toman was on the commission then, that is why he is shaking his head. But industrial zoned acres doesn't mean vacant acreage. I just want to make sure that everyone understands that for a long time this has been vacant industrial land but, as we have seen what has happened in the last year, it is not going to stay that way. It is up to you (Council) to decide what it will stay. Just because it has stayed vacant, the Town has no way to keep it vacant. The P&Z Commission cannot legally deny applications because the neighbors don't want it developed. That is definitely a taking. I agree with Mr. Kogut's attorney on that.

Mr. Farrell asked, what handicaps are there on the (P&Z) Commission that if the Commission wanted to revisit the public opinion and re-zone this area?

Ms. Bush answered, there is none. The P&Z Commission can recommend that this be re-zoned to another zone and have a public hearing, take public input; P&Z Commission decisions are not popularity contests. They have to be based on a plan and a reason, not just because it is popular. What is basically in the best interest of the Town is how most decisions are made. They could have a public hearing and re-zone this back to residential or to any other zone.

Mr. Farrell stated, you already have some industrial uses out there, where does that leave those?

Ms. Bush answered, there are three warehouses and they are not on this 270 acres; there are some other warehouses that have been approved but not built.

Frank Wasilewski, 57 N. Orchard Street stated, I am hearing a lot tonight "people of Wallingford" and there are a lot of people in Wallingford but I don't think they are going to be treated like the people of Wallingford if this park goes through. I am against the park for a number of reasons; they are going to have two exit roads, one to Fairfield Blvd. and I forget what the other one is. That is going to exit to Barnes Road. Have any of you ever been on Rte. 68 from 3:00 P.M. to about 6:00 P.M.? It is non-stop traffic, take my word for it. I have driven up to the Hudson Bank parking lot and watched the traffic going down Rte. 68, and they are moving. To go by Fairfield Blvd. where our Recreation Center is, is adding a little more danger to the people that are using Fairfield Blvd. Another reason is water; supply water to this park. They are not saying anything about sewers. Are we going to do any ground studies? Has anyone ever noticed what kind of rock formation we have out there? It is pretty hard digging and I don't think the Sewer Division would want to put sewers in and have problems with the sewers like we do in some parts of town. These are the bad parts of this whole project. Leaving it undeveloped is the best way to go, but there is an old saying, "we learn by our mistakes"; the C.F. Wooding Property; 88 South Main Street; American Legion.

Ted Burdacki, 160 Midland Drive stated, if you have ever tried to drive down North Farms Road with an 18 wheeler coming at you taking up three-quarters of the road, you know that there is something wrong. I know we have to accept the industrial change and everything because it has been zoned for that but to shove it right next door to these people is not fair. It is a clashing of agriculture, industrial, kids being let off of school buses, cows crossing the road, you need a buffer zone, not an IX zone to keep these areas; high fences make for good neighbors. You need a zone to buffer these people from one another. It is like a war zone there right now.

Nicky Ambro, 1093 North Farms Road stated, after my encounter in front of a panel (auto auction proposal for same area), I did not plan on coming up here again. That is when I found out I had absolutely no rights. I went to a meeting for that plan and we were told that absolutely, positively the Town would not take anything by eminent domain. Now it seems because the Town wants something, they are threatening people that they are going to take their properties by eminent domain; or pieces of their property. What is really sad is, when this turned into the IX zone, you did your studies and everything but you made no allowances. I live in a 300 year old house. I put my life into that house thinking that I would be there forever. I moved here; this has been a nightmare; I hate this place. I can't wait to be out of here. Mr. Webiski, who has lived here all of his life, no allowances were made for him when the IX zone came in. We have no rights. Why don't we have rights? I pay taxes like everyone else and I have no rights. That stinks. Now there are warehouses across the street from me. There are little kids in the area and tractor trailer trucks and everything else. No thought was put into it; it just got pushed

through. I called to find out why a perc test was being done and no one knew anything. The next thing you know, three buildings went up, just like that. You wanted me to fight the auto auction, I came here and fought the auto auction; too much traffic; too much this; too much that. I am living in this house watching all of these people going through all of this garbage because someone wants to put this in and take their property. They pay taxes and have been living there all of their life. Thank God I haven't been because I am crushed. I got offered \$25,000 for my piece of property from one of your developers. Do you know what that feels like? I have no place to go. I have less than an acre of land and it is worth \$300,000. I got offered \$25,000. What is going to happen? I got told by Engineering that only two feet in front of my house will be dug up. Do you know what?, there's four feet to the garden that has been there for twenty years. There is total disregard for me; throwing pipes up into the garden. Is this how everything is going to happen with everything that goes on? There's no trust. I can't wait to be out of here and I feel bad for these people. I don't know how or when it is going to happen for me, but I pray to God every day and I think this is wrong. You say this zone got pushed through and everyone got to come to this meeting, I have talked to all our elderly people in the neighborhood and nobody ever got to come to the meeting for the IX zone. I want to meet someone who went to the meeting when this go approved because I can't find anyone.

Mr. Parisi answered, no one has addressed the IX zone.

Mr. Ambo replied, I have. I have asked and asked and asked and they said that there was a big meeting; everyone from town came. I can't find one person who came to the meeting. It is pretty scary.

Ms. Bush stated, the change to IX that was done in 1986 was not done in the dead of night. There was public hearing after public hearing after public hearing, not on this particular zone change but on all of them that were proposed as part of the plan. I have minutes in my office and people are welcome to come down and look at them.

Mike Pulanski, 971 ½ North Farms Rd. and 1039 North Farms Road asked, who owns the 270 acres that is in this IX zone?

Mayor Dickinson answered, it is five or six owners we believe. Some pieces or parcels have changed hands in recent months. I believe there are five or six owners.

Mr. Pulanski asked, of the 270 acres, is a lot of it landlocked that is not accessible? Is that why you are seeking these easements?

Mayor Dickinson replied, the purpose is to provide public highways and utility structure for the industrial-zoned property. As it is now, if we do nothing, the primary highways to use would be Tankwood Road to North Farms Road, unless private parties or multiple private parties put highways in that connect to Sterling and Fairfield Blvd. A lot of this area is interior. Highways

would have to go into that area in order to have it be developed and, at the point that happens, the question is, does the Town want to determine where the highways go or will it become an issue of whatever occurs; whoever owns whatever piece, determines where the highways go.

Mr. Pulanski asked, with regards to these pieces, if the Town doesn't jump on it and develop it, private developers may come in. Private developers cannot use eminent domain to claim property to develop, correct?

Mayor Dickinson answered, right.

Mr. Pulanski stated, if we don't develop it as a town, then private developers can't come in and develop it because they can't claim eminent domain?

Mayor Dickinson answered, that is correct.

Mr. Pulanski asked, why is there a rush to develop Wallingford? Why can't we stay the way we are? It seems like we are talking about a foot race to stay competitive with surrounding communities to garner all of this business. Once you garner this business you probably have to offer tax abatements to get them to occupy these structures, which means reduced taxes coming in from these properties which we laid out money to bring them in. It is like we are pushing farmers out just to say that we have all of this big capital improvements. I understand it will be a feather in your cap, sir (Mayor), because you want to do great things for the town, but look at the big picture; kick the farmers out, kick off all the homeowners, deface the rural structure which I think this town was found upon is ludicrous. I understand a rush to be big and strong but what is wrong with the way we are; staying the way we are; have pride in what we are? With regards to Ms. Bush's comments about it not being a popularity contest, baloney. People are the populous. We have a saying in what goes on. It should be a popularity contest, where everyone would have a say in what goes on and what happens in our community.

Mr. Farrell stated, we don't debate personalities.

Mr. Pulanski continued, eminent domain is a form of bullying to get what you want; a means to an end, which I think is wrong. I don't like any type of bullying or pushing around because what you think is right; a small group of people deciding this is the best things because A,B,C. Mr. Loughlin pointed out that our population will grow and expand. How are you going to feed those people? The farmers are going to be pushed out so they are not going to be around to offer food and produce. You still have to have the means to support people. You are not going to have the dairy products from Mr. Wibiski's farm because you took his land and kicked him off and now you have asphalt, pavement and concrete. What is so wrong with having nice, open land and a pleasant view and keeping the structure the way it is, protecting aquifers?

(Applause)

Ms. Pulanski stated, I am a third generation living on North Farms Road. My parents home is 978 North Farms Road, my grandmother's is 971 ½ North Farms Road and my home, which my husband and I just purchased is 1039 North Farms Road. I have a sister who lives at 955 North Farms Road. This is not conducive to anyone on this street. We have heard about the detriment that it will be to the farms. I am speaking on behalf of the moms and dads on the street. I have a 3 ½ year old and 16 month old twins. My husband and I did not purchase 1039 North Farms Road recently to have a speedway in the front and an industrial park out the back of our window. I grew up on this road; it should stay the way it is. It is going to be really sad when three generations who have dreams of raising family on this road, have to move out of town because of what is going to happen. If you are going to do something with the land, down the road, why not put a baseball field there since it is near the Recreation Center. Put it in the back area so it won't impede any of the residential neighborhoods, views, sites, properties. It is really disheartening what is going on and I can see you two (Councilors) laughing at me but I am speaking from my heart.

Mr. Parisi stated, I don't think anyone is laughing at you. Just make your statements.

Ms. Pulanski stated, I am just asking; imploring you to please, please consider the homeowners, the farm owners and would any of you like to raise your children, like to see your grandchildren raised on a road that has an industrial park in the back and a speedway in the front.

(Applause)

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville stated, it is pretty clear after hearing all the comments tonight that people are much more interested in developing farms than industrial parks. This country was founded on the basis of a democracy. A democracy means that majority rules. You can tell by reactions from the crowd here, tonight that the majority speaks beyond a shadow of a doubt; they don't want this proposal. It is very clear. The will of the people has to be honored. Let us show the proper respect for it. Our traffic is getting worse and worse. A lot of people came here to live in a town-like environment as opposed to living in a city. There are a lot of vacant industrial buildings in this town. That shows that we really don't have the demand for an industrial park. More and more companies are moving their businesses out of the country to take advantage of cheap labor. Develop more farm lands, forget about industrial parks.

Robert Sheehan, 11 Cooper Avenue stated, progress is a good thing but, this administration over the last two or three years has made a point of purchasing open space. This is a good example because it would act as a buffer between industry, commercial property and residential. Somewhere along that whole area out there, the only buffer out there now is I-91. That is not a very good buffer, you should have a little more and this even affords us somewhat of a buffer to our neighbor to the north, Meriden. I haven't heard anything; it is speculation to go ahead with

this proposal and then go out and find people to come in. We have some empty buildings existing now in industrial parks that require a little more effort to get them filled rather than starting one somewhere else. I have been hearing, "open space, open space" but the open space is getting smaller and smaller in Wallingford and the only place there seems to be a lot of it is on the east side of town and that is rapidly being developed. Some farms are disappearing and the Town just bought one; the Williams property and that is fine, too. This happens to be three times that size and possibly a little better land. It has been made a point that we are looking at open space for fifty years, one hundred years from now, what the town will look like. Here you have a great opportunity for open space. I don't think you need to develop anymore. We have a lot of industry in this town; we have some that is leaving, and we should take care of the empty buildings that they are leaving from.

(Applause)

ty. David Weiss, representing Mr. Geremia stated, it hasn't really been mentioned by anyone here, tonight, but maybe I am the only one living in a recession. It seems to me that there are not a lot of businesses out there right now that are looking to expand and they are sure not going to do it knowing that they have to compile a minimum of six different properties which is currently being used by individual property owners who have no intention of wanting to move. What you are doing here is an industrial development plan in reverse order. Normally, a developer will buy his land, decide where he is going to put his buildings and then put his driveway in to where the buildings are going to be. You are putting the road in first and then you are hoping that the people are going to show up on your doorstep when there is no market to do so and just snap them up. Based on concept B, you have divided this parcel which you haven't even compiled yet, into thirty different average nine acre pieces. That is not going to foster campus-style development. It is going to foster lots and lots of warehouse buildings because people who buy these lots are going to develop them to the maximum extent possible. They are going to build the biggest building they can build; they are not going to put in buffers; you don't even have P&Z regulations in place to determine how these lots could be developed. The right way to do this and the way it is normally done is to compile a parcel, obtain bonding from the state or from some other source, a private developer, purchase the entire parcel, either let the developer put in the improvements or bond the improvements and have people prepared to move into your site. Otherwise you will end up with a situation like you we have had in East Haven where it takes year upon year upon year to even get yourself to 80% occupancy level, way beyond the time it would take for you to recoup any investment, not to mention the fact that doing it in reverse order is going to give rise to the maximum, the absolute maximum amount of risk possible. You have six property owners here running operating businesses who are not going to give up willingly. You can end up with a Fort Trumbull situation like New London has where they just decide to go in willy nilly for economic development purposes and their case is sitting with the supreme court after five years. You could end up with a situation of ten years worth of litigation from a dozen different property owners, not to mention the adjoining homeowners and still be nowhere. If your object is to delay the process as much as

possible, this would be the way to go. You don't even know whether there is any potential financial benefit at the end of the line. The least the Town should do is to go out and get a marketing report to find out if there is a market to market these lots. You don't even know. That is all I have to say.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street asked, how much money are we talking about spending on this operation?

Mayor Dickinson answered, it is estimated, over a period of a minimum of ten to fifteen years, approximately \$7 million.

Mr. Wright asked, how do we governmentally do this? Is this going to be something that will be put out to a vote on a ballot or is a majority of the Council going to have the say and \$7 million will be spent?

Mayor Dickinson answered, it would be done in phases. The first phase is the purchase of right-of-way for highway and utility purposes. Once that is completed, then installation of utilities, construction of highway would occur.

Mr. Wright asked, I was thinking of a referendum. You can't initiate a referendum because it is not a large enough amount of money or what?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I believe referendum is possible on the appropriation of funds for the purchase of the right-of-way or probably any other facet of it.

Mr. Wright asked, then the public could have something to say about this other than the Council, if they took it to referendum?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I believe so.

Mr. Wright asked, any attorneys want to offer confirmation of the Mayor's statement?

Mr. Parisi answered, we will get that information for you; not at this minute but, we will get it for you.

Mayor Dickinson stated, the only appropriation not subject to referendum is the budget. Otherwise actions are subject to referendum.

Mr. Wright asked, this is going to be a \$7 million project?

Mayor Dickinson answered, in the neighborhood, hopefully.

Mr. Wright stated, \$7 million the Town will be committed to by a vote of the Council?

Mayor Dickinson replied, there will be a series of votes. An initial vote would be to authorize us to seek acquisition of the rights of way for highway and utility purposes. There would have to be other votes taken for funding and other purposes along the way. It would not be one vote that would accomplish the whole project.

Mr. Wright asked, the first acquisition, the first step would be subject to referendum?

Mayor Dickinson answered, the first step is an approval to negotiate and seek acquisition of rights-of-way without the appropriation of funds, I'm not sure if that would be subject to referendum or not. It may or may not be. Definitely at the point funds are appropriated, it would be subject to referendum.

Mr. Wright stated, I would like to say that I don't necessarily oppose this project, I am just trying to shed a little light on it for those who may have more interest in it than I do.

Roger [redacted], Midland Drive stated, I have a wild idea and sometimes you have to throw out wild ideas to make people think. Between this piece of property and Rte. 15, I believe there is a large piece of property managed by Wallingford Land Trust. It seems that the meaning of this project, partially if not at all, is to take traffic away from North Farms and residential areas. What if the Town were to purchase a piece or a couple of pieces along Tankwood that strategically buffer this area from the residential areas and it would prohibit any access to these areas and when these people decided to sell their pieces of property, then the new owners can develop them and they would be restricted to access into the Barnes Park area. It is just a thought.

Jack Agosta, 505 Church Street, Yalesville stated that he has mixed emotions about what to do with the property. I haven't heard any of the residents say that they have been hounded by people who want to buy the property to put in an industrial park so why would we take it, bring water lines and build roads and then ask people to come and take a look at it? Who is going to come and take a look at it? These residents haven't gotten any replies from anyone. They are not looking to sell and no one has come looking to buy it, as far as what I hear. It would be a good idea to buy the property and keep it for open space because we are looking for 21% open space acquisition. Maybe in the future if you want to do something with it, fine. I don't think we should do this right now, not this way. We don't have any plans for developers coming in. Down the line it is going to take twenty-five years to get our money back. We are going to have to pay for a piece of land for twenty-five years. I don't see any logic in this at all.

John Grammatico, 997 North Farms Road stated, I would question the driving force behind the Mayor's support of this proposal since seven years ago you thought that farmland was so desirable. I think the traffic issue is painfully obvious in that area and I think Councilor Jim had

the strongest argument for a negative vote. You are asking for initiating a commitment to a \$7 million proposal that you don't have a complete plan for.

Wes Lube 15 Montowese Trail stated, I think that it is obvious from the comments that were made that we are looking at the northeast quadrant of our town, the \$7 million project probably should be expanded into \$10 million or more in order that it is all encompassed. I think that when we talk about \$7 million or \$10 million, we have to bear in mind that the Mayor is expecting this expenditure to be over a 10-15 year period and then you have to plug in some very serious inflation. You're \$7-10 million is going to be far in excess of today's dollars. If we are talking about a project of that consequence, I think in all honesty, the presentation that was made tonight was a bit of 1950 vintage and a little bit on the ham and egg side. I think that if you are going to try and do something on this scale the graphics should be far more professional and the missing mathematics; financial projections to substantiate what is going to be done over 10-15 years in terms of expenses and what is going to be done over 25 years in terms of revenue. These things have to be formulated and set down on paper to be looked at and studied, not just picked out of the air. I think the entire concept should be the province of the Planning & Zoning Commission. We think of them as being zoners but they are the planners, the ones who are supposed to be deciding the direction in which our town goes. I question why the Council has been burdened with this. We already have a ten year plan that involved forty and fifty people that were in committees and sub-committees who came up with great ideas of what should be done with our town and our open space. We have abandoned those plans, we have ignored those plans. They are now gathering dust down in Ms. Bush's office. The Town wants to become a developer. We want to omit the likes of F.I.P. and we forget what made Barnes Park and what made F.I.P. a success; a team of solicitors who went out after industrial prospects. We didn't a road in and wait for industry to come knocking on the door. That is what made Barnes a success and that is the only way we would accomplish our industrial park within a twenty-five year period, as if we had a team of salespeople going out beating the bushes and finding the companies that are headed for Connecticut. I think it is only fair that you listen to the rest of the people and do the rationale act; table this for future consideration by the P&Z. Thank you.

Rod Dubois, 1083 North Farms Road stated, this is prime open space land. You don't get much better than this. I asked everyone on the panel here to take a road down North Farms Road some time next week. It is prime land. Some of the land that has been purchased in the past few years is questionable. Some of the deals that have been made; there was a Realtor...whatever. This is prime land. I would much rather see baseball fields or a golf course rather than industrial development. If the Town decides that industrial development is the best purpose for this land in the future, we have farmers here; three generations; they have to be considered. We can't pay to put a road in and leave pavement in the middle of their field for ten or fifteen years. If that is the way this is going to go, we can't stop them from operating their business to leave the land vacant. If this proposal is to be accepted, which, for the record, I am

for open space, I really do not want to see a road sitting there for ten or fifteen years, impeding the farmers from crossing it on their own land.

Dawn Geremia, 415 Barnes Road stated, my husband is an owner of one of these pieces of property. I want to point out that my understanding is that a piece of this property is owned by Kogut and has been on the market for between two and four years and no one has approached him to develop that. Today, I drove through Barnes Park North and just in a quick drive-through I see over 50 acres of raw acreage available that has not been touched. I have lived on Barnes Road almost ten years and during that time I have witnessed maybe two new buildings being put up in Barnes Park North. How much is allotted for the first phase, \$1 million?

Mayor Dickinson replied, an estimated \$1.4 million.

Ms. Geremia stated, someone up here stated that when the residential area became very limited the prices of homes skyrocketed up to \$100,000 more, you can't expect these land owners to sell the last piece of residential property in Wallingford for \$25,000 an acre. If you up that to \$40,000 which I think is still low, that is \$800,000 of your allotted budget and I think that the budget just doesn't fit. I am not a mathematician, I don't know a lot about math at all but it does not take a genius to see that the budget does not fit.

Mr. Farrell stated, I don't fault the Mayor for bringing up this proposal. Part of his job is to have a vision of where the Town is going in the future to provide a stable tax base and I think by bringing this forward he is doing his job. I didn't like some of the criticism of him on that basis. I do, however, think that there is a major distinction between what is being proposed here and what occurred with the past industrial parks. There was Town involvement in past industrial parks. Having sat and held many a conversation with Dave Ferguson who was Mr. Parisi's long time ago predecessor and was the Council Chairman when Barnes Park was developed. The distinction was this; at that time you had willing participants; willing buyers; willing sellers; people who wanted to see Barnes Park happen. I believe the same was true for the North Plains Industrial Park. The people who owned the sand pits out there were willing to participate in such an endeavor. That isn't true here. If I understand everything that has been said, we don't have growing participants. I look at Mr. Geremia in particular. His family has been here a lot of years and have farmed the land and if I understand this correctly, we are going to be condemning the middle of one of the major portions of his farm. It strikes me as wrong that we are forcing an industrial park where he has a going agricultural concern. He ought to be praised for that. We have lots of people who have gotten out of the farming business because it has been made so difficult and so unviable. I also look out at the audience and see all of the people on North Farms Road who I have the utmost respect for because they have been at so many of these public hearings and they have fought very hard against the auto auction and it seems like somehow they are having to revisit that nightmare maybe in slightly more muted tones but this time the Town is the person they are up against. That is just not where I want to be. I know some of these people have been at hearing after hearing. Mr.

Maglione, Mr. Rosick, Ms. Cwirka; these people have been back time and time again. I just don't see ...the people aren't willing why we are there. I understand all of the economic development arguments but until I hear that this is a much rosier picture; that people really want this who are the property owners out there. It is not something that I believe I can favor at this time. Again, I don't want to fault the Mayor; I don't want to fault the Economic Development Commission that you guys have also followed through and that is your job. I do commend you, in part, for proposing this and getting it open to public discussion.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I am not persuaded by the plan that is presented for a couple of reasons, I will not list them all because most of the people in the audience have spoken more eloquently than I ever could and many of them raised some very excellent points. I thought I was going to come to this meeting and be presented with a fairly tight case; a case that examined all of the complications and presented solutions to the complications and that looked at all sides of this. After hearing the presentation by the Mayor and hearing some of the answers, I am not convinced that this is a real plan with enough concrete details that has been thought out well enough that could be pulled off for an awful lot of reasons. There are a lot of question marks. The sentiment of the public certainly is a very important factor and after hearing concerns and valid concerns, put that together with I believe is the weakness of the case presented for the plan, I am just not persuaded by it. I do appreciate the time put in by the EDC and Mayor's Office and Don Roe and Linda Bush and everyone else involved in this but I have a no vote here.

Mr. Vumbaco asked the Economic Development Commission why they recommended Plan B over Plan C?

Jim Wolfe, EDC Member replied, the primary reason was the roadways and going down through the existing Barnes Park. There is not a lot of difference Plan B & C. The layout had approximately the same amount of lots.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, I can see the difference; how you bring the back road in. You are coming in right off of Sterling Drive in Plan B and on Plan C you are coming off of Tower and swooping down. The reason I am asking is, Plan B comes through an awful lot of wetlands which is; if this was to be approved and was going forward, there would be some disturbance there that you would not have in Plan C with that second road coming in. Also, in speaking with a developer and road contractors this past couple of weeks, it is a lot more costly to bring roads over wetlands than it would be not to. I am miffed at why we picked Plan B over Plan C.

Mr. Wolfe answered, those are questions we do not have answers to yet. It hasn't been surveyed by Inland Wetlands and we didn't have answers for those at this time. That could change. Assuming that this was going to move forward, that could change.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, I appreciate the hard work that volunteer committees do so please don't take this the wrong way but I would assume that that would be one of the questions that you would want answered before a plan gets pushed. We don't know if Plan B is more cost-effective to do than Plan C when you are getting approximately the same number of lots, it is just the way the roads come in. What consideration was given to; it has been mentioned tonight by some of the citizens which I personally appreciate their coming tonight and giving us some very valuable input; the traffic on Sterling Drive and Fairfield Blvd.? I know that dumps out onto the old Rte. 68, especially where one of them comes off there; one of them is not really a great spot to even come out on. I would assume that if this was to pass, the Town would have to spend more money on fixing that portion of Barnes just to accommodate the increase in traffic. Do we even have the ability to fix that part of Rte 68? These are issues that haven't even been discussed, addressed or dollars put to it. That is the reason why Mr. Brodinsky and I were trying to get after the dollar figure about all of this.

Mr. Wolfe answered, the beginning of this survey does not give any consideration to traffic studies, quite honestly and that is something, when we get into this, and that is why some of the answers are vague tonight. Part of the EDC's concept is to extend the Barnes Park as a campus-like atmosphere. What is happening out there now is, we have development in a frame of twenty first century Quonset huts, if you will and we were trying to stop this not only for the neighborhood but for our tax revenues in the future. If you compare Barnes Park to North Plains and look at the tax revenue difference, there is a large difference of what we have, not to mention the quality of life that you could get out of Barnes versus an industrial park like North Plains. Looking at all of this; the survey does not have all of the answers and it says that in the front of it. Time is of the essence here because, if some action is not taken by you (Council) or by the Town, that area is going to develop. They have buildings that are going up now. I understand there are developers that, as soon as this ends, if there is no action taken, they are going to put up a few more of those right on North Farms. We are stuck in the middle here and maybe we are all late on this but we are stuck in the middle of it. That area is going to develop, whether we have an say on it or not. We are trying to help the community on what is going to happen.

Mr. Vumbaco replied, I understand that; that is your charge and I have no problem with that at all. I do question why we didn't start looking at this a long time ago when Fairfield Blvd. starting building up those types that are non-campus style anyway. All of a sudden this has become a hot topic when a long time ago it should have been on the radar screen. I still think that, in order for this thing to become anywhere near an option for myself to support, I need some cost data; how much this is going to go; what it's going to do. I can't believe it is impossible to run mock-ups on what value this is going to affect the property. We can go out and do assessments when we are buying land for open space and we have numbers of lots and what the values are. I can't see why we can't do assessments on what this is going to do to residential properties or what value is going to be increased by putting these roads into these lots here. We have a layout and in this age of technology I don't think it is that difficult to do. I

dispute the fact that we are being told that it is impossible to run those numbers because I think there can be some estimated numbers provided to this Council before a decision is even talked about. I have a question for Mr. Geremia; I was trying to figure out....you said there was another twenty acres that is not part of this. Can you indicate to me where it is?

Mr. Geremia replied, it is an empty piece of industrial property that we intend to farm. We have it under contract. I don't own it yet but will be closing on it in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Vumbaco asked about the topography of the property.

Mr. Geremia answered, the top portion is nice and flat.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, why wasn't that piece wrapped into this whole park?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I believe it was for topography reasons, that piece is also one that the Town looked at for a period of time.

Mr. Vumbaco asked for specifics.

Mayor Dickinson replied, I believe there are issues regarding how to connect to it from any roadway in that area.

Mr. Geremia pointed out a road (without identifying it by name) that would service the property.

Mayor Dickinson stated, I can't speak to that with any exactness. At one time we were looking at purchasing that.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, if we did go through with this plan, wouldn't we be land-locking that person's property and making it undevelopable?

Mayor Dickinson answered, currently the piece is land-locked and it does have a right-of-way to Tower Drive, so it is not land-locked in the sense of not being able to reach it but there is no way to reach it with a highway currently.

Mr. Vumbaco asked Mr. Geremia what lot numbers he was currently farming?

Mr. Geremia pointed them out on the map.

Mr. Toman stated, I am trying to zero in on return on investment. In this real estate tax assessment you gave us, there are three models. In the second model, the one that is a

combination of the Barnes and Centract areas, if you just look at that return on investment which I am assuming; who put this together?

Mayor Dickinson replied, it was primarily by Don Roe.

Mr. Toman asked, all three models were put in to try and give us an idea of what other developments have given as a return on investment. I am picking the one that I think is the most relevant; Barnes & Centract. Maybe you disagree but that is because it combines more property; would you give me that?

Mr. Roe answered, it combines more property but certainly in Centract, what that developer did was essentially comply with our public regulations which, at that point in time, allowed additional coverage; additional square footage that the private regulations that are applicable to Barnes restrict.

Mr. Toman stated, I come from the investment world, too; not real estate, intangible investments. If you try and project beyond five years it gets pretty murky so I have a problem projecting out to thirty years. Give me ten years; let's project out ten years. Instead of fifty acres under development in this 270 acre parcel, if we develop 200 acres, you could then guess that somewhere around \$1.2 or \$1.3 million in taxes could be realized based on current valuations.

Mr. Roe answered, you would need to scale back the developable acreage. Out of that 270 acres, there is a net number. What is taken away from the 270 acres are wetlands and topographically-challenged property. The net number under those assumptions is 170 acres.

Mr. Toman rounded up to 200, taking into consideration that there would be second floors to the buildings. He went on, if you take the 200 acres and you have a \$1.2 - \$1.4 million return on investment in the tenth year... Wallingford is now a known commodity; a known entity; good highways to service it; we have a reputation... I am going to be more optimistic. That \$1.2 - \$1.4 million would you say might be a reasonable assumption, a positive assumption after a ten year period of development of these 170-200 acres? I want to remind everyone that it costs 7,000 per year, per student in this town. We spend most of our money on the education of our children. The Mayor wants to spend over thirty years, \$7 million. That is 1,000 students supported in our school system for one year. When you start comparing what is desired to be spent versus what we spend regularly, it puts it a little bit in perspective. I campaigned this fall for this office and I won't forget one of the houses that I went to; a gentleman said to me, "I don't have any kids in school; I am retired. I pay \$5,000 in taxes on this property. My next door neighbor has three kids in school. That means that the Town pays \$21,000 to educate those three kids." You have to go to Turnberry Estates where some of the biggest homes in this town are to find anyone paying \$28,000; \$35,000; \$45,000 in taxes. Most people in this town don't pay that much in taxes on their residences but, everyone in town pays for the education of

these children. After you deduct all the grants we get from the state, it is about \$7,000 a kid. We've got to develop this industrial land that we have sooner or later. The pressure is on us to develop it. On the other hand, I think we have to see a better model from someone...several different scenarios in order for us up here to consent with going forward with this \$7 million plan. I am not saying we shouldn't, I am saying we probably should but I want to see a little more analysis based on the tax return. Now, you agree, that it is reasonable to assume that a \$1.2 - \$1.4 million return for this land after 10-12 years. If I go by these figures, the return on investment is not that good.

Mr. Roe answered, what we did was to not want to be overly optimistic or optimistic at all. What we looked at in probably the second set of documents in your packet is, what has been the Town's experience with our existing industrial parks. There should be a couple of attachments that track over the 2 ½ or almost 3 decades of Barnes existence; what has happened, decade by decade. No one can guarantee that the future is going to be like the past, we then use that as being somewhat of our guidance in developing our assumptions.

Mr. Toman answered, if we only had residents in town with kids and we had no one without kids and we had no industrial or commercial property to tax, we would really be in trouble wouldn't we? So we need to have these kinds of developments to take up the slack. The figure that you have in here only supports 45-48 kids a year in school. I would want to see more optimistic figures and several different scenarios and not just over thirty years. I think that is too conservative.

Ms. Papale stated, our agenda mentions that there would be a discussion and possible action regarding the IX zone. I am really getting the feeling that we are not going to vote on this tonight which is a good thing because if I had to vote on this tonight I wouldn't have any way in my mind and judgment to vote on this industrial zone request. I am not saying it will never happen and that I won't be one to vote for it but, right now, I could never vote for it for many, many reasons. First of all, the things that I heard tonight, I am so uncomfortable with. I am not putting the blame on anyone; believe me I am not faulting anyone. The way this came over to us tonight, we really were not given the information that we needed and then I listened to the people who live in the area. I could just never, right now, vote for what they feel are so important to their lives. We have two situations here as I see it. We have people that live on North Farms Road...it is the most beautiful area. People have lived there forever and I can imagine how they hate...how they dislike to see their lives change. Then there is the people that are the farmers and the greenhouse owners. I know about greenhouses; I know how hard you work, I did it for many years. It is a profession that you really love. Right now, my heart is out for the people of Wallingford. All my years as being a councilperson, I have always tried to look out for what is good for the town...it is a true comment. I realize and I think someday it might happen, that this might go through because tax revenues are very important to the people. But the way of life in the Town of Wallingford is what is really important to me. Right now I would not want to see the way of life change for many of the people who are sitting out there. I

really feel bad for the people on North Farms (Rd.). I went to many of the meetings when the other problem occurred and now we are sitting on the other side of the fence. I understand that we, as the Council, are the financial body of the Town but Mayor, why didn't it go to Planning & Zoning and if they approved it then come to us to make the decision of spending the money?

Mayor Dickinson answered, at this point you are dealing with a concept of negotiating for acquisition of property. It can go to Planning & Zoning, we are doing this in harmony with the zone of development. The property is currently zoned industrial and it would make little sense to go to Planning & Zoning and find out that the Council had no interest in proceeding with any acquisition. Planning & Zoning would not have a lot to say about it. If we were changing the zone, I can see going to P&Z first but the critical issue here is, what are we going to do regarding the future of this property. I would hope that it doesn't develop quickly. There really isn't a desire to put people out of business as to what they are doing now. The issue is, if nothing is done, what will happen over the next several years. We are already seeing development. I don't think there is a lot of time to wait to make a decision. The things we are talking about could occur and hopefully the current uses on the property would continue. No one will guarantee that the uses that they now pursue will be ones that will be there ten years from now, that is where the dilemma comes in for the town. I think that is why it is important to discuss this. As long as it is discussed and we reach a conclusion to go forward or not go forward, we can all feel that we did our job or are acting in a manner that is most responsible for the community. I do feel that this is the appropriate place for the discussion. Planning & Zoning have already determined that this was IX zoned and the proposal is saying that we are looking to pursue that as the Plan of Development land use for that area. If we don't do that, that is a decision but that decision is appropriate here.

Ms. Papale stated, as far as voting on this, I think everyone up here would agree that we are just not ready to do that yet; I can't speak for everyone but from what I have heard so far. I think it is a very healthy discussion; it never hurts to bring things out in the open, to see how people feel about it. I am sure it will come back to us at another time and I am not comfortable with it now and we will have to wait and see what happens. I wish everyone out there luck.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, as this has been presented, I whole-heartedly agree with Mr. Brodinsky. I don't have anywhere near enough information to try and make an intelligent decision on this. I would not support it if there was a vote tonight. Now what? What is next? I understand there is a potential for a little bit of development out there? I suggest that the EDC and the Mayor's Office follow what Mr. Loughlin suggested and maybe get together and see if the pieces that are every being considered for development, you can work through people who are taking the options out on the property and see if maybe you can work together with buffering and roads, etc. to at least trying to make something that is there better for you. As Ms. Bush said, there are private property owners out there that have sold or are willing to sell in the near future to certain developers. I would suggest that if this does not go through tonight, that maybe to mitigate the circumstances, we would try to have a meeting of the minds. I think that most of those people

who are out there who may be doing the development are Wallingford-based residents too so they are not out there to through whatever up they can. I think you can work with them. It is my understanding that some of them have approached our EDC office and offered to work with the Town and I was told that they did not get a full response out of that office. I would suggest that we work with them and see what happens as we go forward.

Ms. Doherty stated, we have had this informational meeting tonight and have learned a lot. I still have a lot of questions as far as utilities are concerned. I would like some P&Z input; perhaps a compromise between open space and the IX zone. Right now I have too many questions that are unanswered to go forward with this tonight.

Mr. Parisi stated, I would like to thank the commissions for their work in promoting this and bringing it to a point so that it could be presented to the Council. I am glad I decided to put this on a special meeting because there has been a lot of excellent input. I thought your suggestions were interesting, Atty. Loughlin and should be taken under advisement. I have always felt that government should work for people, not that people work for government. I also, as Mr. Farrell stated, understand what the Mayor has tried to do; trying to look far into the future and to put this Town in a healthy position to deal with that future. I agree also with my colleagues that perhaps we need more information before we can make a decision. I don't think anyone up here is afraid to make a decision but we need all the information we can get to make as good of a decision as we can. It is a very, very important situation, not only for its impact on the people but for the impact on the Town. I would hope that everything that has come forward tonight can be digested and perhaps we can find something that comes down somewhere in the middle. I don't know that all of the people involved in any situation like this can be 100% satisfied. I would like to get as close to the middle and perhaps a little above as we can. Last of all, I want to feel in my heart that what we did was the right thing and what we did was the fairest thing. The people who proposed this did their job; they gathered the information as much as they could and presented it to us. It is absolutely no problem for me to recommend that we have no action tonight and that we just adjourn the meeting and let this thing go forward. Having said that, if there is a motion....

No action was taken at this time.

Motion was made by Farrell to Adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Doherty.

VOTE: Knight was absent; all ayes; motion duly carried.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:41 P.M.

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:

Kathryn F. Zandri
Kathryn F. Zandri
Town Council Secretary

Approved by:

Robert F. Parisi (by RR)
Robert F. Parisi, Chairman

4-23-02
Date

Rosemary A. Rascati
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

4-23-02
Date

RECEIVED FOR RECORD 4-16-02
AT 10 H 5 M 10 M AND RECORDED BY
Rosemary Rascati TOWN CLERK



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
TOWN OF WALLINGFORD
CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM W. DICKINSON, JR.
MAYOR

February 22, 2002

Wallingford Town Council
45 South Main Street
Wallingford, Connecticut

ATTN: Robert F. Parisi

Dear Council Members:

The EDC presented to the Council at your September 26, 2000 meeting a report on the development issues for use of 270 IX-zoned acres in northern Wallingford. Town offices have been reviewing the issues associated with implementing the development of the area in accordance with Concept B of the report. Among elements of this review have been the following:

- a review of the costs identified in the report for infrastructure and refinement of such cost estimates;
- review of statutory provisions to recover cost for such utility and road improvements; preliminary appraisal work for such; review of the methodology(ies) for such recovery; and impacts to property owners;
- preliminary appraisal work needed to estimate acquisition costs;
- a review of project costs and property tax benefits to the community ;
- a review of opportunities for other sources of assistance for industrial park development including state assistance and/or private developer;
- a review of impacts to the community, property owners of the acreage and neighbors;

In order for this acreage to be developed in accordance with the plan, it will be necessary for the Town to make a significant commitment of Town resources to a project that extends over a long period. The cost is now estimated at \$7 million. The economic return to the Town based just on property tax dollars would materialize after an estimated 25 years. The Town will be able to recover some of the \$7 million through

Wallingford Town Council
Page Two
February 22, 2002

assessments for the improvements (road and utilities) constructed. The payback is not immediate but the value of having a planned industrial park to encourage business and employment is important to the long-term health of the community.

The municipal cost would potentially be phased in over a multi-year time period with acquisition of right-of-way a first phase, installation of utilities a second phase, and construction of roadway a third phase.

The recommendation to the Council is that the Town proceed with the project. This is endorsed by the Town's Economic Development Commission. Moving ahead will require funding and commitment. The first phase will require funds for surveying, engineering and appraisal services, and acquisition. The estimate for Phase 1 is \$1.4 million. Property owners will be asked to sell right-of-way property to the Town; however, condemnation may be necessary since it is obviously necessary to complete the first phase for there to be any second or third phase. It should be noted that the greater expense to the community occurs in Phase 2 and 3. However, given the complexities of the first phase, this alone could take two to three years with subsequent phases commencing over as much as ten to fifteen years.

Again, it is important to recognize that this project will take many years. It has, from the outset, been identified as a long-range undertaking that will provide for the Town's future economic base. Attachments have been provided that highlight the experience with Barnes Parks as well as the estimated property tax revenues to the Town and the estimated return.

Should you have questions or need a new copy of the report, please contact the Economic Development Commission office at 294-2060.

Sincerely,



William W. Dickinson, Jr.
Mayor

lmw

Attachments

REAL ESTATE ANALYSIS FOR IX PROPERTIES

Assumptions and Comments

Development assumptions:

1. Total acreage: 270
2. Total developable acres: 170
3. Number of lots: 22
4. Total costs for acquisition of right-of-way and infrastructure: \$7 Million
 - Does not include any downstream sewer costs or telecom and gas utility costs.
5. Costs per acre: \$25,926

Assumptions for real estate tax calculation:

1. Assume absorption rate of 1 lot/year (at 5 acres/lot).
2. Assume per acre real estate taxes as follows:
 - \$4,800/acre – Barnes
 - \$6,200/acre – Average of Barnes and Contract
 - \$3,715/acre – Using selected sample
3. Assume constant mill rate: 26.5.
4. Assume constant valuation/assessment.
5. Assume constant dollar.

Other comments:

- Assumes no other economic benefit(s) to the community (jobs, personal property taxes, etc.).
- Assumes no cost recoveries.

**Real Estate Taxes Based on Barnes
(\$4,800/acre)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Development Acres</u>	<u>Real Estate Taxes/Year</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
1	5	\$24,000	\$24,000
2	10	\$48,000	\$72,000
3	15	\$72,000	\$144,000
4	20	\$96,000	\$240,000
5	25	\$120,000	\$360,000
6	30	\$144,000	\$504,000
7	35	\$168,000	\$672,000
8	40	\$192,000	\$864,000
9	45	\$216,000	\$1,080,000
10	50	\$240,000	\$1,320,000
11	55	\$264,000	\$1,584,000
12	60	\$288,000	\$1,872,000
13	65	\$312,000	\$2,184,000
14	70	\$336,000	\$2,520,000
15	75	\$360,000	\$2,880,000
16	80	\$384,000	\$3,264,000
17	85	\$408,000	\$3,672,000
18	90	\$432,000	\$4,104,000
19	95	\$456,000	\$4,560,000
20	100	\$480,000	\$5,040,000
21	105	\$504,000	\$5,544,000
22	110	\$528,000	\$6,072,000
23	115	\$552,000	\$6,624,000
24	120	\$576,000	\$7,200,000
25	125	\$600,000	\$7,800,000
26	130	\$624,000	\$8,424,000
27	135	\$648,000	\$9,072,000
28	140	\$672,000	\$9,744,000
29	145	\$696,000	\$10,440,000
30	150	\$720,000	\$11,160,000

**Real Estate Taxes Based on Average
of Barnes and Contract
(\$6,200/acre)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Development Acres</u>	<u>Real Estate Taxes/Year</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
1	5	\$31,000	\$31,000
2	10	\$62,000	\$93,000
3	15	\$93,000	\$186,000
4	20	\$124,000	\$310,000
5	25	\$155,000	\$465,000
6	30	\$186,000	\$651,000
7	35	\$217,000	\$868,000
8	40	\$248,000	\$1,116,000
9	45	\$279,000	\$1,395,000
10	50	\$310,000	\$1,705,000
11	55	\$341,000	\$2,046,000
12	60	\$372,000	\$2,418,000
13	65	\$403,000	\$2,821,000
14	70	\$434,000	\$3,255,000
15	75	\$465,000	\$3,720,000
16	80	\$496,000	\$4,216,000
17	85	\$527,000	\$4,743,000
18	90	\$558,000	\$5,301,000
19	95	\$589,000	\$5,890,000
20	100	\$620,000	\$6,510,000
21	105	\$651,000	\$7,161,000
22	110	\$682,000	\$7,843,000
23	115	\$713,000	\$8,556,000
24	120	\$744,000	\$9,300,000
25	125	\$775,000	\$10,075,000
26	130	\$806,000	\$10,881,000
27	135	\$837,000	\$11,718,000
28	140	\$868,000	\$12,586,000
29	145	\$899,000	\$13,485,000
30	150	\$930,000	\$14,415,000

RETaxesbyPark
7/11/2001

Real Estate Taxes Based on Barnes
 (Based on Selected Sample: \$3,715/acre)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Development Acres</u>	<u>Real Estate Taxes/Year</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
1	5	\$18,575	\$18,575
2	10	\$37,150	\$55,725
3	15	\$55,725	\$111,450
4	20	\$74,300	\$185,750
5	25	\$92,875	\$278,625
6	30	\$111,450	\$390,075
7	35	\$130,025	\$520,100
8	40	\$148,600	\$668,700
9	45	\$167,175	\$835,875
10	50	\$185,750	\$1,021,625
11	55	\$204,325	\$1,225,950
12	60	\$222,900	\$1,448,850
13	65	\$241,475	\$1,690,325
14	70	\$260,050	\$1,950,375
15	75	\$278,625	\$2,229,000
16	80	\$297,200	\$2,526,200
17	85	\$315,775	\$2,841,975
18	90	\$334,350	\$3,176,325
19	95	\$352,925	\$3,529,250
20	100	\$371,500	\$3,900,750
21	105	\$390,075	\$4,290,825
22	110	\$408,650	\$4,699,475
23	115	\$427,225	\$5,126,700
24	120	\$445,800	\$5,572,500
25	125	\$464,375	\$6,036,875
26	130	\$482,950	\$6,519,825
27	135	\$501,525	\$7,021,350
28	140	\$520,100	\$7,541,450
29	145	\$538,675	\$8,080,125
30	150	\$557,250	\$8,637,375

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT: Barnes Parks

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Sq. Ft. ¹</u>	<u>Acres/Year</u>	<u>Sq. Ft./Year</u>
<u>First Decade - 15 Projects</u>				
1968	5.91	40,900		
1969	11.63	64,200		
	3.48	26,700		
1970	0.00	0		
1971	0.00	0		
1972	0.00	0		
1973	8.21	41,800		
1974	10.95	104,918		
1975	14.15	54,522		
	51.25	180,467		
1976	5.06	20,598		
	5.91	52,820		
1977	6.02	24,941		
	6.43	30,138		
	3.00	10,850		
	23.50	191,766		
	<u>19.20</u>	<u>154,066</u>		
	174.70	998,686	17.47	99,869

Second Decade - 17 Projects

1978	22.38	174,050		
	11.75	61,873		
	9.22	40,710		
1979	5.00	20,200		
	7.08	20,700		
	6.61	38,900		
	3.00	28,100		
	7.06	28,700		
1980	5.89	38,010		
1981	5.50	30,000		
	10.00	52,000		

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT: Barnes Parks

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Sq. Ft. ¹</u>	<u>Acres/Year</u>	<u>Sq. Ft./Year</u>
1982	0.00	0		
1983	5.13	18,500		
1984	3.41	14,804		
1985	0.00	0		
1986	4.90	33,728		
	6.25	39,488		
	5.35	32,000		
1987	<u>12.02</u>	<u>65,968</u>		
	130.55	737,731	13	73,773

Third Decade - 10 Projects

1988	5.90	45,747		
	4.00	24,250		
1989	26.15	93,700		
1990-97	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0</u>		
	36.05	163,697	4	16,370

¹ Square footage shown, while accurate, is not necessarily in decade when built due to data limitations.

SumDevBarnes
2/19/2002