

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: GASLIGHT VILLAGE AD HOC

DATE: OCTOBER 7, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS MONROE
MERLINO
THOMAS
KENNY

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR BELDEN

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
REPRESENTING ELAN PLANNING, DESIGN & LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE:
LISA NAGLE, PRINCIPAL
JERE TATICH, PRINCIPAL
DANIEL G. STEC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
NICOLE LIVINGSTON, DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD
SUPERVISORS STRAINER
TAYLOR
WOOD
ROBERT BLAIS, MAYOR, VILLAGE OF LAKE GEORGE
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
THOM RANDALL, *ADIRONDACK JOURNAL*
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST
Please see sign-in sheet for additional meeting attendees.

Mr. Monroe called the meeting of the Gaslight Village Ad Hoc Committee to order at 11:00 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the prior meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the meeting agenda were distributed to the Committee members and a copy is also on file with the minutes.

Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of Public Works, began the agenda review with a request to amend Resolution No. 514 of 2011 to include the consulting fee and budget authorization for said fee. He explained that Elan Planning, Design and Landscape Architecture, PLLC had submitted a fee proposal of \$6,500 for completion of NYSDOS (New York State Department of State) Waterfront Revitalization Program grant applications to develop the West Brook Conservation Initiative (WBCI) and Festival Space on the Gaslight Village property. He expounded that although Resolution No. 514 of 2011 authorized submission of the grant application, it inadvertently excluded the fee amount as well as an indication that said fee would be paid from parking revenues and authorization for the Chairman of the Board to sign the grant applications.

Paul Dusek, County Administrator, advised that two resolutions were actually necessary to rectify this matter, one to provide authorization for the Chairman of the Board to sign the grant applications and another authorizing Elan to prepare them and provide for payment of the associated fee. Mr. Tennyson stated a resolution was not necessary to contract with Elan for the grant preparation work as he was authorized to do so by virtue of a prior resolution; however, he added, clarification was necessary to approve the fee amount associated with the work, identify the source of funding and authorize the Chairman of the Board to sign the applications. Mr. Dusek concluded that while Resolution No. 514 of 2011 could be amended to provide the Chairman authorization to sign the grant applications, a second resolution would be necessary to authorize payment to Elan from parking revenues.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend Resolution No. 514 of 2011 to include verbiage authorizing the Chairman of the Board to sign the NYSDOS grant

applications and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to authorize payment for \$6,500 in grant preparation fees to Elan Planning, Design and Architecture, PLLC to be paid from parking revenues received from the Gaslight Village property and the request was referred to the Finance Committee.

Continuing, Mr. Tennyson announced Agenda Items 2-4 pertained to updates on the WBCI and Festival Space plans and he said Lisa Nagle and Jere Tatich, both of Elan Planning, Design and Architecture, PLLC, were in attendance to present these items.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Ms. Nagle and Mr. Tatich who distributed several documents which included aerial maps and design schematics for the Festival Space and WCBI, as well as construction cost assessments and funding information; *copies of all documents distributed are on file with the minutes.* Mr. Tatich then proceeded with a thorough review of the information for the Committee's benefit.

During this review, Mr. Monroe commented that the conservation easement would need to be amended to account for the revised Festival Space area as reflected in design documents presented. Mr. Tennyson advised a base survey had been performed for the property and noted the County had a surveyor on contract who could be used to provide the revised documentation, as well as a physical mark-out on the property, if necessary. He added that he would assume parking revenues would be used to fund this work and said he did not feel it would be very expensive. Ms. Nagle advised the Master Plan concept should be included in the revised easement also because it had not been updated in some time.

Referring to the documentation distributed listing the proposed phases for site construction, Mr. Tatich advised Phase 1 consisted of the necessary work to introduce the Festival Space, including temporary fencing, grading, electrical and water service, gravel walkways and turf establishment, at a cost of \$161,300. He further noted the Phase 1 Supplemental section included turf stabilization measures to allow parking on the site without causing damage to the turf, as well as permeable asphalt walkways, at an additional cost of approximately \$379,500.

Mr. Monroe stated the turf stabilization measures were important and should be implemented as quickly as possible to allow the site to be used for parking with minimal damages, which would raise revenues to support maintenance costs. Ms. Nagle advised that at a recent meeting of the PMEC (Project Management Executive Committee), the LGA (Lake George Association) noted a GIGP (Green Innovation Grant Program) opportunity through the Environmental Facilities Corporation which might apply to this project. She said she was working with Randy Rath, of the LGA, on the grant application which would be sponsored by the LGA to seek funding for the Phase 1 Supplemental project plans. Ms. Nagle explained the grant was intended for stormwater projects and would include 90% funding with a 10% Local Share; she further explained the turf grass stabilization plans were eligible in this case as it would provide a full permeable surface to deal with stormwater, as per the conservation easement agreement associated with the project, and would benefit the water quality of Lake George. She noted that due to restructuring at the State level, grant opportunities were much more competitive, but she said they were hopeful their application would be approved and the requested amount provided.

Mr. Monroe questioned whether the amount sought was within the maximum limits and Ms. Nagle responded no funding caps had been placed on the grant because larger projects were being sought in this grant opportunity. In response to an additional inquiry by Mr. Monroe, Ms. Nagle advised the LGA would be serving as the grant applicant and they would likely seek a letter of support for both this grant, as well as for the application being submitted to the NYSDOS Waterfront Revitalization Program; she noted that, incidentally, both grants shared the

same October 31st submission deadline. Mr. Tennyson said the municipal parking lot proposed for construction on West Brook Road might be another possibility for the GIGP grant and he questioned whether its inclusion in the grant application would affect the LGA's ability to sponsor it. Ms. Nagle responded that it could possibly affect their sponsorship ability and said she would contact the LGA to make this determination during the following week. She said her concern was that the grant amount sought already totaled \$500,000 and she was hesitant to apply for more funding without first consulting her contact at the grantor agency to ensure there were no objections. Mr. Tennyson advised he would establish a rough estimate of cost for the parking lot construction which he would then provide to Ms. Nagle in order to make this inquiry. Mr. Monroe suggested filing the grant application in such a way that it provided for alternate project ideas, one with all the work cited for the Festival Space and the parking lot and another for just the Festival Space updates. Mr. Tennyson cautioned that further research needed to be performed to ensure the grant language would not prevent the property from being used for parking or lease of space for special events to raise revenues to sustain maintenance costs.

Mr. Taylor questioned whether plans had been made to introduce fencing to the property that would allow it to be secured during private events and Mr. Tatich replied that permanent boundaries were not included in the Phase 1 section of the project plans, but noted a temporary snow fence type of structure could be used when needed. Mr. Monroe interjected future plans would include permanent fencing that could be opened or closed as necessary. Secondly, Mr. Taylor inquired as to the restroom facilities required to support a crowd of 1,000 or more and Mr. Tatich advised this was a difficult subject as State Building Codes primarily pertained to interior spaces and did not provide much dictation for outdoor facilities. He said they were in the process of performing research to determine the restroom necessities and had found a typical rate to be one restroom stall for every 300 people. In consideration of this information, Mr. Tatich said they had initially developed two separate building plans, a smaller structure somewhat removed from the Festival Space that would include four stalls in the women's section and two stalls and two urinals in the men's section, as well as two family restrooms. The second concept, he advised, would be a larger facility with double the capacity of the smaller structure, located centrally between the Festival Space and the parkland area. Mr. Tatich stated that a decision on the facility had yet to be determined and would be made based on the finances available; he added that, when necessary, portable restroom units could be brought in for large events and festivals.

Mr. Tennyson pointed out that the implementation of irrigation facilities was included in the Phase 2 section of the project and he suggested that they be moved into the Phase 1 Supplemental section, prior to the turf stabilization work, as otherwise he foresaw issues with installing the necessary piping. Ms. Nagle advised that while she was agreeable to the idea and felt it would be more sensible to change the Phase order for this work, she was not sure that it would be applicable to the grant opportunity, but said she would inquire on the matter.

Mr. Monroe announced that a resolution would be necessary to accept the enhanced design plans presented by Elan and Mr. Tennyson reminded the Committee that another would be needed to modify the Festival Space boundaries and make the necessary conservation easement changes. He added it was his assumption the Village of Lake George would need to adopt similar resolutions, as well. Mr. Dusek clarified that three resolutions would actually be necessary, which he listed as follows:

1. Resolution approving the entire revised conceptual plan presented by Elan;
2. Resolution redefining the conservation easement; and
3. Resolution naming a source of funding to pay for the additional survey costs.

Discussion ensued.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to approve the revised conceptual plan presented by Elan Planning, Design and Architecture, PLLC and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to redefine the conservation easement in accordance with the design plans provided by Elan Planning, Design and Architecture, PLLC and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Relative to determining a source of funding for survey costs, Mr. Tennyson said he assumed parking revenues would be used but said he was unsure whether sufficient monies were available. In order to have the work completed without delay, he advised he could dispatch the Surveyor already under contract with the County using funds from his Departmental Budget and request reimbursement from parking revenues once a determination on the availability of funds was made. Mr. Dusek said that unless expenditures he was not aware of were made, he would estimate the parking revenue to be approximately \$30,000, which would certainly be enough to cover the survey costs. Mr. Tennyson noted \$5,000 had been spent to rehabilitate the parking area from the DPW Budget and he had already prepared a request for repayment of those funds which he intended to present at the next Public Works Committee meeting; he further noted that prior payments had been made for maintenance work performed by the Town of Lake George. Mr. Tennyson concluded that while he believed there to be sufficient funds to cover the survey costs, he would research the matter and provide an answer at the upcoming Finance Committee meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Thomas and carried unanimously to approve the additional survey work and refer same to the Finance Committee to determine a source of funding.

In response to an inquiry made by Mr. Monroe as to the anticipated source of funding for the different phases of the project, Mr. Tennyson apprised that the phased approach had been intended to group portions of the project and then seek grant funding for each. He added they were unsure how big a project they would be seeking grant funding for and further discussion on the matter would be held by the P MEC to make these determinations. He then questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Committee to authorize the P MEC to work with Elan to develop the final grant applications. Ms. Nagle advised her firm sought to use funds attained through the NYSDOS grant opportunity to cover areas not eligible for funding under the TEP (Transportation Enhancement Program) grant, such as signage, at grade crossings and sidewalks outside of the park boundaries but within the County's right-of-way. She added that although confirmation had been received that these initiatives were eligible under the NYSDOS grant, the proposal had yet to be considered by the P MEC. Mr. Monroe questioned who would serve as the applicant for the NYSDOS grant and Ms. Nagle replied the County would. Mr. Tennyson reminded the Committee a resolution had already been approved to authorize Elan to proceed in completing and submitting the NYSDOS grant application; therefore, he added, if the Committee was in agreement with the items specified by Ms. Nagle for inclusion in the application, there would be no need for further Committee action.

Mr. Monroe noted that although the prior resolution had authorized Elan to submit the grant application, it did not specify what the grant would be for, nor the amount. Referring to the handout distributed which identified funding sources, he stated \$100,000 would be sought for signage, \$125,000 for at grade crossings and \$125,000 for sidewalks within County right-of-way, for a total of \$350,000, and he recommended a resolution be approved to this affect. Mr. Dusek agreed this would clarify the issue, if the Committee was agreeable. Mr. Tennyson interjected he was concerned with the use of the "outside of County right-of-way" verbiage since they were not sure what measures would be implemented in connection with the proposed parking lot for West Brook Road that might include pushing the sidewalks outside of the right-of-way area to maximize parking space. Ms. Nagle clarified their intent was to indicate they were seeking funding for projects outside of the TEP boundary and she had no issue with changing the language of the documentation to make this designation. In order to avoid any constrictions, Mr. Monroe suggested further changes to remove the location designation all together, to simply state that "sidewalks" would be included,

and both Ms. Nagle and Mr. Tennyson were in agreement.

Mr. Thomas noted the Phase 1 total of \$212,956 and questioned how this portion of the project would be funded, to which Mr. Tennyson replied that a source of funding had yet to be identified. Mr. Thomas then asked whether this portion of the project should also be included in the NYSDOS grant application and Ms. Nagle replied in the negative, advising that it could not because, on occasion, the Festival Space would be fenced and a fee charged when used for private gatherings or those with admittance fees, which she believed made it ineligible for grant funding. Mr. Monroe advised that although the County would certainly prefer to use grant funds for as much of the project as possible, if the Phase 1 aspect was determined to be ineligible, a solution might be to use a BAN (Bond Anticipation Note) to fund the Phase 1 plans, and possibly the proposed municipal parking lot, and use revenues received from parking and use of the festival space to repay the BAN over a short term. Ms. Nagle stated she would contact NYSDOS during the following week to confirm whether or not the Phase 1 portion was eligible for funding.

Mr. Monroe suggested the NYSDOS be contacted to relay the County's preference to seek grant funding for the Phase 1 plans totaling \$212,956 and an additional \$125,000 for the at grade crossings; he added that in the event the Phase 1 plans were determined an ineligible expense of grant funds, they should proceed in seeking funds for the expenses recommended by Elan which included \$350,000 for signage, at grade crossings and sidewalks.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to further amend Resolution No. 514 of 2011 to outline the expenses to be covered by the NYSDOS grant as per Mr. Monroe's suggestions, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 21st Board meeting.

In the event that the Phase 1 costs were determined to be ineligible, Mr. Monroe reiterated his prior suggestion to use a BAN to cover the costs with a short-term repayment using revenues received in association with the property. Mr. Dusek interjected since there was no County funding available to cover the costs, a referral to the Finance Committee would be necessary to further consider the BAN suggestion. Mr. Monroe advised that if this determination was made, they should consider including the costs associated with the municipal parking lot, as well. The only other solution available, he concluded, would be to refrain from constructing the Festival Space altogether, which he did not think was sensible, as its completion would generate sufficient revenues to cover the construction costs in a short time.

Resuming the agenda review, Mr. Monroe noted Item 5 pertained to the Land Swap Update and he asked Mr. Dusek to expound upon the matter. Mr. Dusek said they were ready to proceed with the land swap and his only concerns at this point were that part of the swap affected the conservation easement and because the movement of the Festival Space did as well, it seemed both issues should be addressed and filed simultaneously. Additionally, he advised the swap in its current structure had been in existence for a number of months and he wanted to ensure its provisions were consistent with the project plans. In order to do this, Mr. Dusek recommended a meeting be held between all of the attorneys involved in the project to review the matter and confirm everything was appropriate before proceeding. Ms. Nagle apprised they had recently received the newest version of the existing conditions survey for the Gaslight Village property and were applying it to their revised master plan; she added that she agreed with Mr. Dusek's suggestion for a final meeting to confirm necessary boundary information and advised herself or Mr. Tatich would be glad to attend, as well, to assist with this review. Mr. Dusek stated he would schedule a meeting between the attorneys, Mr. Tennyson and Elan staff to begin the final review as quickly as possible. As a final note, Mr. Dusek advised a 30' strip of property located along West Brook Road that had initially been included in the land swap agreement had been retained by the Lake George Steamboat Company as it was no longer necessary since plans to move West Brook Road had been abandoned.

In connection with the review of the conservation easement, Mr. Monroe said they should be sure to preserve a corridor between the Festival Space and the Lake George Steamboat Company parking lot so these areas could be coupled with the westbound lane of West Brook Road for events that exceeded the occupancy of the Festival Space. Robert Blais, Mayor of the Village of Lake George, noted that Americade was one example of an event that was larger than the Festival Space could accommodate, necessitating connections with the adjoining areas. Additionally, a viable pathway for pedestrians to easily access the Festival Space from the Steamboat Company's parking lot was also desired, he said, and he suggested a gate be placed at the lower southwest corner of the lot to allow for this. Mayor Blais stated that Bill Dow, owner of the Lake George Steamboat Company, was agreeable to this arrangement and it simply needed to be included in the verbiage of the land swap agreement. Mr. Dusek said he would be sure that this was included.

Continuing to Agenda Item 6, West Brook Road Parking Plan, Mr. Tennyson advised the agenda included a copy of a concept proposal for the implementation of metered parking, noting that the fifth and sixth options shown were the newest to be presented; *a copy of this document is on file with the minutes*. He then proceeded with a review of the two new parking options available which consisted of the following:

- a) Closing the north lane of West Brook Road to create a municipal parking lot and altering the south lane to convert the existing 24' of asphalt into a two lane road. This option would allow for 55 metered slant parking slots and two pedestrian crossings at a total estimated cost of \$80,000 for road improvements and meter installation; estimated annual revenues of \$49,500; and
- b) Closing north lane of West Brook Road to traffic and widen to the extent of the highway ROW to include an additional 18' which would allow parking on both sides of the road with a single lane of traffic running through the center. This option would allow for 110 metered slant parking slots at a total estimated cost of \$210,000 for road improvements and meter installation; estimated annual revenues of \$99,000.

Mr. Tennyson apprised this information had been presented at a recent Public Works Committee meeting, following which the Committee had expressed their preference for the sixth option and had referred the issue to the County Attorney's Office for legal review to determine the County's authority to construct a municipal parking lot and collect revenues to support maintenance of the park and serve as a source of funding for the Local Share of any grants received.

Mr. Monroe pointed out that if the costs of the option six proposal and the Phase 1 plans were covered by one BAN, a four year term could be used to repay it, based on the amount of parking revenue projected; he added that if the Phase 1 plan costs were determined grant eligible, he said the BAN term could reasonably be reduced to two years. Mr. Monroe noted that longer terms could be used in connection with either option to allow for part of the parking revenues to be used for BAN repayment and the remainder placed in a fund that could be used for Local Share grant and maintenance costs. However, Mr. Monroe advised, the first step was to determine whether the County was legally able to construct a municipal parking lot and retain the parking revenues collected.

Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, advised he had reviewed the property title and found that although there would be no issue with the County building a parking lot and retaining revenues, further review was necessary to determine whether the County had the authority to convert the road into a parking lot. In light of the information provided by Mr. Auffredou, Mr. Monroe said that no action was necessary, but he encouraged the Committee to maintain the idea that securing a BAN for the construction of the parking lot could actually lead to a positive cash flow. Mr. Tennyson stated that no Committee action was needed on this item, regardless, as the Public Works Committee had the authority to approve a resolution in this instance, but noted he would appreciate an indication

from the Committee as to whether they concurred with the preference towards the sixth proposal option presented so that he could continue to work with the LGA in an effort to include this initiative in the GIGP grant application.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that they agreed with the determination made by the Public Works Committee in that the sixth parking option listed was preferred.

Ms. Nagle advised the use of pervious pavement for the parking lot area could be included in the GIGP grant application as it would address concerns with the water quality of West Brook.

Referring to the parking capability figures included in the proposal, Mr. Tennyson pointed out that the DPW Engineering Division was currently working on a plan to incorporate the necessary at grade crossing locations, as well as an unloading zone for school busses, which could affect the parking capability numbers listed. He added that all of the figures listed were conceptual but it was their intent to maximize the amount of parking provided in the space available.

Moving on to Agenda Item 7, Mr. Tennyson announced that several discussions had been held by the P MEC relative to the possibility of releasing an RFP (request for proposal) to allow naming rights for the various features proposed for the Gaslight Village Property, as well as for the entire park. He advised this issue had been introduced following inquiries made by area businesses interested in sponsoring elements of the park or the facility as a whole. Mr. Tennyson said he felt they needed to proceed with the RFP as quickly as possible, but was unsure whether there were any legal impediments to be considered.

Mr. Dusek advised that under normal circumstances they would have the ability to allow naming rights; however, he added, he was unsure whether the use of grant funding to construct the park would prevent them from doing so. When asked for clarification on what the RFP would include, Mr. Tennyson suggested that an open format be used, allowing for respondents to provide proposals on the areas they would like to name, the name they intended to use, and the amount they were willing to sponsor; he added that these proposals could range from naming the entire park, to naming a foot bridge or bench. Mayor Blais agreed with Mr. Tennyson's interpretation, saying he also felt the RFP should be worded very loosely and be made open to individuals, organizations, businesses and anyone else wishing to bid on naming rights. Mr. Dusek advised that although the RFP could be structured in any manner chosen, the terms of the grant funding used in connection with the park might prevent them from attaining sponsorship in this manner. He said he recalled this issue had been discussed in the past, at which time they had decided to bid naming rights for the Festival Space area only to avoid this issue. Mr. Tennyson requested that more research on the matter be performed as the TEP grant requirements did not prevent them from instituting charges for use of the property improved using the funds, it just said the charges had to be reasonable and that any funds received must be used for maintenance of the park. Mr. Monroe pointed out there were other facilities, such as the Pepsi Arena in Albany, NY, that bid their naming rights and might have faced similar issues; he added that this might be a good place to begin their research and determine how other entities handled the matter. Mr. Dusek countered while this might provide some insight on how to bid the naming rights, he did not know whether similar grant funds had been used which would impose the same restrictions, but advised he would look into it.

Following discussion on the matter, motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to release an RFP for naming rights of the park and its elements, assuming that Mr. Dusek's further review determined they were legally able to do so.

Proceeding to the Items of Interest section, Ms. Nagle advised the WBCI Public Information Meeting would be held

at the Lake George Village Fire House on October 24th at 6:00 p.m. She said they would be presenting the revised concept plan presented to the Committee and would serve as the first formal presentation of the plan. Ms. Nagle added they would also discuss the proposed funding sources, as well as the additional plans that could be funded with other potential funding sources. Mayor Blais questioned whether the meeting could be scheduled on a different date and Ms. Nagle responded affirmatively and advised that she would contact him after the meeting to discuss an alternate arrangement.

Mr. Dusek apprised the Village of Lake George had submitted the parking revenues to the County, as well as a bill for the expenses incurred, as was their typical arrangement; *a copy of the revenue and expenditure accounting is on file with the minutes.* He said he had reviewed the documentation provided and had no issue with the information presented, noting there was an expense for the County's portion of the legal costs for the \$400,000 bond the Village of Lake George had taken to purchase the Town of Lake George's portion of the Gaslight Village property. Mr. Dusek pointed out that although he had not researched prior agreements, it was his recollection that the County had agreed those costs would come from the parking revenues. He concluded that if the Committee did not object to the information provided, they could act upon the request and authorize the Treasurer's Office to reimburse the Village for their expenses, as requested. Mr. Monroe said he recalled an agreement had been made to pay the bond fees from parking revenues and Mayor Blais stated the amount included in the invoice consisted of the County's portion of the fees, as the Village had already paid their 38% of the costs, plus the bond fees.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Thomas and carried unanimously to authorize the Treasurer's Office to reimburse the Village of Lake George for expenses incurred in the amount of \$5,507 and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Concluding the agenda review, Mr. Tennyson outlined the Referrals section, as follows:

1. Discussion on naming rights for the Festival Space and parkland areas planned for the Gaslight Village property was held earlier in the meeting;
2. Mr. Tennyson advised he had not received any updates from Dave Decker, Project Manager, relative to a long term plan for maintenance of the stormwater treatment area of the Gaslight Village property and said he thought this information would be revealed after the final design elements were revealed;
3. Discussion on metered parking proposed for West Brook Road was discussed earlier in the meeting; and
4. Mayor Blais advised a meeting would be scheduled during the current week with representatives of two companies interested in making donations to the Gaslight Village project.

Mr. Monroe noted that because they had been addressed, Referral items 1, 3 and 4 should be removed.

As there was no further business to address, on motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Kenny, Mr. Monroe adjourned the meeting of the Gaslight Village Ad Hoc Committee at 12:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist