

From: [Sherwood, Nina](#)
To: [Rosenson, Valerie](#)
Subject: Fw: 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting MINUTES attached.
Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 11:15:09 PM

Dear Valerie,

Please share the following correspondence with the Legislative and Rules committee and add it to the legislative history for item LR31.024.

Thank you,

Nina

From: J. R. McMullen <jrmcmullen.stamfordbof@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 10:42 PM
To: Freedman, Richard
Cc: Donoghue, Tracy; McMullen, J.R.; Dennies, Sandy; Mahoney, Dennis; Alswanger, Geoff; Mannis, David; Mary Lou Rinaldi; Curtis, Jeff; Fedeli, Mary Lisa; Sherwood, Nina
Subject: Re: 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting MINUTES attached.

Richard,

My bad, going forward I will make it a point to regularly ask if (and where) what is being represented is actually captured in the contracts we are being asked to approve.

In the case of 35 Crescent Street, I guess it will be up to the Board of Representatives to decide whether or not they exercise their power, from Sec. 9-6.A. (2), to change the contract to make sure the City realizes the property tax revenue the Administration "implied"? (pretty much promised) the city would receive. Members of the Board of Representatives should review the Board of Finance's April 13 meeting video starting at minute 18 and then again at minute 23 and the June 9 meeting video starting at minute 60 (or 1.00.00) to understand what was presented as far as property tax revenue is concerned.

For representatives concerned about affordable housing, they might want to listen to the June 9 meeting starting at minute 1.09.00 It is a little confusing but I believe the point being made (in error?) is that residents of this new project will be paying rents similar to the people across the street who are paying the market rate. The Board of Representatives may want to clarify these numbers because they do not make a lot of sense when you consider the income levels talked about later; you can't pay \$28K in rent when your take home pay is based on a \$40K income.

Here is the link to the April 13 video where the administration talks to the Board of

Finance about the property tax and why this buyer was

selected: http://cityofstamford.granicus.com/player/clip/11593?view_id=4&redirect=true

04132022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting

cityofstamford.granicus.com

Live and Recorded Public meetings of 04132022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting for City of Stamford, CT

Here is the link to the June 9 video where the administration again tells the Board of Finance about the property tax and why this isn't really affordable

housing: http://cityofstamford.granicus.com/player/clip/11782?view_id=4&redirect=true

06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting

cityofstamford.granicus.com

Live and Recorded Public meetings of 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting for City of Stamford, CT

To reiterate, right now there is nothing to prevent the buyers, or the people they sell the property to once it is developed, from submitting their application for a property tax waiver the day after they close. They would be crazy not to ask for the property tax abatement given the Assessor estimated property taxes at something over \$100K a year; that is an extra \$100K a year straight to their bottom line.

Thanks. J.R.

On Wed, Jun 29, 2022 at 12:55 PM Freedman, Richard <RFreedman@stamfordct.gov> wrote:

J.R. - I disagree. The analogy, in a legislative body, is the difference between the legislative history and specific words in an ordinance or statute. You were on the BOR, you know those two are very different. The words in a statute are binding and consequently debated in great detail. The legislative history is directional but non-binding.

The ordinance for special sales allows any board to make a "material change in the terms and conditions". The terms and conditions are in the Purchase and Sale Agreement, which is silent on the payment of property taxes going forward. That's what the agenda said we

were approving, that's what we voted on. If we were going to make a material change, there was nothing preventing you from proposing this change and the six of us would have had to deliberate the specifics. The building should pay taxes, I said that in the meeting. However, had you proposed what you state below as a change to the terms and conditions, the board might or might not have supported it in exactly that form. I don't know. No one proposed it and so we never discussed it. You can't, after the meeting, assert that something said during the meeting is a material change, something that no one proposed and we never deliberated, and then direct the administration to follow your assertion. That process I definitely don't support - material changes aren't formally proposed and debated, just whatever someone said during the meeting.

The minutes will reflect whatever was said during the meeting about the payment of taxes. It's on the video, it's easy enough for the minutes to reflect exactly what was said.

thanks

From: J. R. McMullen <jrmcmullen.stamfordbof@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:08 PM

To: Freedman, Richard

Cc: Donoghue, Tracy; McMullen, J.R.; Dennies, Sandy; Mahoney, Dennis; Alswanger, Geoff; Mannis, David; Mary Lou Rinaldi; Curtis, Jeff; Fedeli, Mary Lisa; Sherwood, Nina

Subject: Re: 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting MINUTES attached.

Sorry Richard but I cannot agree.

I still want the minutes updated to reflect the fact that the Board of Finance was told the bidder selection was based the representation that this buyer specifically did not request a property tax waiver.

Whenever we vote on an item, the administration is bound by their representations. The administration must take the steps necessary to ensure the city receives the benefit they have committed. In this case that requires a deed restriction that binds not only the initial purchaser of 35 Crescent Street but also any future owner; without the deed restriction something like \$2M+ of the consideration is at risk. I don't really think you want a process that requires members to make sure everything the administration represents, that board members have relied on, is included in our resolutions. The current process is cumbersome enough.

Sandy,

I still expect the administration to memorialize the property tax representation in the

form of a deed restriction, whether or not it was in our resolution, it was included in the benefits presented.

Thanks J.R.

On Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 2:55 PM Freedman, Richard <RFreedman@stamfordct.gov> wrote:

J.R. - If there are any restrictions on the terms of the sale that were going to make it into the deed, they would have had to have been outlined explicitly as part of the resolution to approve. I made the motion and don't recall including any terms along the lines you describe. You'd have to check the tape. We did talk about how they were selected in part because they were going to pay taxes. That can be noted in the minutes, but not the deed.

Also, on something like this, it's not necessary to cc a long list of city officials. Our board and Sandy is sufficient.

thanks
Richard

From: Donoghue, Tracy

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 9:52 PM

To: McMullen, John

Cc: Alswanger, Geoff; Mannis, David; Freedman, Richard; Mahoney, Dennis; Mary Lou T Rinaldi - Government Services (marylourinaldi@optonline.net); McMullen, J.R.; Arenas, Margarita; Berta, Lee; Bishop-Pullan, Jody; Blessing, Ralph; Boards and Commissions Minutes; Brink, William; Caban, Cynthia; Capp, Lesley; Carpenter, Anita; Casolo, Louis; Cava, Alfred; Curtis, Jeff; Dalena, Douglas; Dell, Theresa; Dellaselva, Chris; Dennies, Sandy; DeRubeis, Louis; Fealey, Ryan; Fox, Bridget; Gami, Bharat; Giglio, Julie; Gonzalez, Jennifer; Gordon, Emily; Gurciullo, Brianna; Hun, Felicia; Isidro, Judith; Jankowski, Ted; Josh Esses; Larson, Erik; Lazcano, Juliet; Lucero, Tamu; McCarthy, Kevin; Murphy, Barbara; Napoletano, Bill; News 12; Noone, Joanne; OPM Department; Pankosky, Valerie; Pensiero, Mike; Petise, Frank; Pollard, Michael; Quiñones, Matt; Redd, Silas; Roach, Trevor; Romano, Anthony; Rosenfeld, Susan; Rosenson, Valerie; Ruther, Kathy; Simmons, Caroline; Sinani, Elda; Sobkowski, Isidore; Soules, Christopher; Sripa, Wareeya; Stackpole, Gregory D; Turk, Thomas; Villalva, David; Viscariello, Teresa; Yanik, David

Subject: Re: 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting MINUTES attached.

Ok. No problem. I would like an additional directive from Richard.

Enjoy the evening.

Tracy

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: J. R. McMullen <jrmcmullen.stamfordbof@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 9:22:26 PM

To: Donoghue, Tracy <TDonoghue@stamfordct.gov>

Cc: Alswanger, Geoff <GAlswanger@stamfordct.gov>; Mannis, David <DMannis@stamfordct.gov>; Freedman, Richard <RFreedman@stamfordct.gov>; Mahoney, Dennis <DMahoney@stamfordct.gov>; Mary Lou T Rinaldi - Government Services (marylourinaldi@optonline.net) <marylourinaldi@optonline.net>; McMullen, J.R. <JMcMullen@stamfordct.gov>; Arenas, Margarita <MArenas@stamfordct.gov>; Berta, Lee <LBerta@stamfordct.gov>; Bishop-Pullan, Jody <JPullan@stamfordct.gov>; Blessing, Ralph <RBlessing@stamfordct.gov>; Boards and Commissions Minutes <BoardMinutes@stamfordct.gov>; Brink, William <WBrink@stamfordct.gov>; Caban, Cynthia <CCaban@stamfordct.gov>; Capp, Lesley <LCapp@stamfordct.gov>; Carpenter, Anita <ACarpenter@stamfordct.gov>; Casolo, Louis <LCasolo@stamfordct.gov>; Cava, Alfred <ACava@stamfordct.gov>; Curtis, Jeff <JCurtis@stamfordct.gov>; Dalena, Douglas <DDalena@stamfordct.gov>; Dell, Theresa <TDell@stamfordct.gov>; Dellaselva, Chris <CDellaselva@stamfordct.gov>; Dennies, Sandy <SDennies@stamfordct.gov>; DeRubeis, Louis <LDeRubeis@stamfordct.gov>; Fealey, Ryan <RFealey@stamfordct.gov>; Fox, Bridget <BFox@stamfordct.gov>; Gami, Bharat <BGami@stamfordct.gov>; Giglio, Julie <JGiglio@stamfordct.gov>; Gonzalez, Jennifer <JGonzalez@stamfordct.gov>; Gordon, Emily <EGordon@stamfordct.gov>; Gurciullo, Brianna <brianna.gurciullo@hearstmediact.com>; Hun, Felicia <feliciahun@msn.com>; Isidro, Judith <JIsidro@stamfordct.gov>; Jankowski, Ted <TJankowski@stamfordct.gov>; Josh Esses <joshua.esses@gmail.com>; Larson, Erik <ELarson@stamfordct.gov>; Lazcano, Juliet <JLazcano@stamfordct.gov>; Lucero, Tamu <TLucero@stamfordct.gov>; McCarthy, Kevin <KMcCarthy@stamfordct.gov>; Murphy, Barbara <BMurphy@stamfordct.gov>; Napoletano, Bill <BNapoletano@stamfordct.gov>; News 12 <news12li@news12.com>; Noone, Joanne <JNoone@stamfordct.gov>; OPM Department <OPM.DEPT@stamfordct.gov>; Pankosky, Valerie <VPankosky@stamfordct.gov>; Pensiero, Mike <MPensiero@stamfordct.gov>; Petise, Frank <FPetise@stamfordct.gov>; Pollard, Michael <MPollard@stamfordct.gov>; Quiñones, Matt <MQuinones@stamfordct.gov>; Redd, Silas <SRedd@stamfordct.gov>; Roach, Trevor <TRoach@stamfordct.gov>; Romano, Anthony <ARomano@stamfordct.gov>; Rosenfeld, Susan <SRosenfeld@stamfordct.gov>; Rosenson, Valerie <VRosenson@stamfordct.gov>; Ruther, Kathy <KRuther@stamfordct.gov>; Simmons, Caroline <CSimmons@stamfordct.gov>; Sinani, Elda <ESinani@stamfordct.gov>; Sobkowski, Isidore <ISobkowski@stamfordct.gov>; Soules, Christopher <CSoules@stamfordct.gov>; Sripa, Wareeya <WSripa@stamfordct.gov>; Stackpole, Gregory D <GStackpole@stamfordct.gov>; Turk, Thomas <TTurk@stamfordct.gov>; Villalva, David <DVillalva@stamfordct.gov>; Viscariello, Teresa <TViscariello@stamfordct.gov>; Yanik, David <DYanik@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: Re: 06092022 BOF Regular Monthly Meeting MINUTES attached.

Hi Tracy,

I would like the minutes to be updated for item 4. It should be noted that one of the commitments made to the BOF, where the sale of 35 Crescent Street is concerned, is that the city will collect property tax based on the appraised / assessed value of the property. That commitment should be memorialized as a deed restriction filed with the Town Clerk.

Thanks. J.R.

On Mon, Jun 20, 2022 at 1:04 PM Donoghue, Tracy <TDonoghue@stamfordct.gov> wrote:

*Tracy Donoghue
Clerk
Board of Finance
City of Stamford
(203) 977-4699
(203) 219-3931 (cell)*