Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Aldermanic President John Anglace called the meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7 p.m. All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President - present
Alderman John “Jack” Finn - present
Alderman Stanley Kudej – present
Alderman Joseph Lanzi - present
Alderman Kenneth Olin - present
Alderman Christopher Panek - present
Alderman John P. Papa – present
Alderman Randy York - present

Administration:

Corporation Counsel Thomas Welch

There was a quorum of 8 present, 0 absent.

Public Session

Alderman Anglace asked if any member of the public wished to address the Board.

Maggie Boyce, 6 Sportsman Drive

I’m here with my husband Bill and we have a son that is physically disabled who is very involved in the Shelton community. I am also an advocate for people with disabilities and I work at the Disability Resource Center in Stratford. With me is Fred Frank, who also works at the Center with me. And Stan Kozlowsky, he was the State ADA Coordinator in the 1990s.

We were asked to provide some expert advice on how to make the doors at the Senior Citizens Center accessible so that people with disabilities can gain access to the Center independently. We made some prospective recommendations that we gave to Mr. Finn. At this point we would like to ask Shelton to consider installing push pads to make the doors power assisted at the Center.

Thank you.

Stan Kozlowsky

Good evening. I’m not a resident of Shelton, but I have had significant experience with the Americans with Disabilities Act – I was the State ADA Coordinator for several years in the early 90s. I’ve conducted numerous workshops on the Americans With Disabilities Act over the last 16 years.
I guess I’m here mostly as a resource person because there seems to be an issue with whether or not the doors and access to the Senior Center should be automated or not. If anyone has any questions about that issue, I can try to answer them as best I can.

The Americans with Disabilities Act does require, not just for Shelton but for any municipality that the programs and services that the municipality offers be accessible to all people with various kinds of disabilities that live in the community. Certainly, it would seem to me that certainly allowing people with disabilities – we’re an aging population – a lot of our senior citizens are already disabled in many ways – whether they use wheelchairs, or canes, or walkers, or just have arthritis, if Shelton is similar to any other community, older people generally have problems with exterior doors – gaining access to a building. I’m a little bit puzzled as to why this has it become the issue that it has been. To me, it just seems that this is something that Shelton would want to do to make sure that anybody in town that needed, that had difficulty with an exterior door could gain access to the programs that are offered at the Senior Center.

Again, I’m here as a resource, I know there is an item on your agenda and I don’t know if you have any questions for me now; I’ll certainly be available later if that will be necessary.

_Arlene Clancy_

I thought that the ADA Commission was an agenda item; not that we would be taking up public time. I’ll hand it over to Mr. Drozek and wait until our turn on the agenda.

Alderman Anglace stated, as Chairman of the American With Disabilities Commission in Shelton and the ADA Coordinator for Shelton, you two will be invited to participate with us in our discussion.

Mrs. Clancy thanked Alderman Anglace.

_Walter Drozek, 12 Wilson Lane_

I’m a member of the ADA Commission. I’m not privileged to be able to speak to you relative to the item at the time. The only comment I would make at this juncture is the fact that Americans with disabilities want to be as independent as possible. With the structure that is set up at the Senior Center now, they need to be able to have someone open the door for them once they push a button, which takes away their opportunity to be independent to have access to the Senior Center. Thank you.

_Letter from Irving Steiner to be read into the Public Session_

“Dear Board of Aldermen,

Unfortunately because of other commitments I could not personally speak this evening. I felt that I could make everyone concerned happy by not only entertaining my guests at home but by also providing you with the feeling of tranquility that my absence would invoke.”
It is unfortunate, but I cannot and will not accept the Mayor’s resolve that his hands are tied and he is unable to do anything regarding our chronic blasting problem. This problem will only get worse as population density increases, and only property requiring blasting remains.

Residents have suffered too much as a result of the lack of controls placed on developers by both the Planning and Zoning Department and the Fire Marshal, who, by the way, is the Mayor’s appointed official. The solution for holding our citizens out of harms way is to insure that basic pre- and post-blasting safety procedures have been met to insure proper performance by the developer and to hold his neighbor’s safe from financial damage before our local Fire Marshal signs the blasting release. Once signed, the State Fire Marshal assumes control of onsite blasting.

For starters, when blasting is required, a geological study should be mandatory before the application can be accepted. This will determine the probability of collateral damage to nearby residences. Residence inspections would be required both before and after blasting – the radial distance from the blast site being determined by the geological study.

The State of Connecticut would not challenge these additional protective measures to protect our residents from harm. But every developer in the City of Shelton would. You already must know why – because it places the financial burden of responsibility on their shoulders for their blasters mistakes and that is exactly where it rightfully belongs.

Call it the price of doing business. That is the sticky point. The Mayor cannot step on the toes of his developers, which is the reason why the Mayor will not take this course of action. Just as he did when I asked in the previous speech, that the Mayor take the position on his developer/Chairman of Inland-Wetlands who brought the two Avalons into our City, the Mayor will respond to this letter with stone cold silence and a Cheshire cat smile on his face.

I thank you for your time. Sincerely, Irving N. Steiner, 23 Partridge Lane, Shelton, Connecticut

Alderman Anglace asked if any other member of the public wished to address the Board. Being none, he declared the Public Session closed.

**Agenda Items**

Alderman Papa MOVED to add the following item to the agenda:

9.6 EMS Building Re-roofing

SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

Alderman Finn MOVED to amend the agenda and move item 9.1 Senior Center Doors to the beginning of the agenda; SECONDED by Alderman Papa. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.
9.1 Senior Center Doors

Alderman Finn stated, I’d like to thank you for allowing this to be placed on the agenda. I placed this on the agenda out of courtesy for the Americans with Disabilities Commission, so they have an avenue to express their findings and concerns to the Board of Aldermen pertaining to the subject. Originally I had a motion tonight for us to approve the doors with funding through LOCIP. After discussion, I felt it was necessary that some of the other Aldermen might need more time to think about this before we do have a vote. I would ask that this be placed on the May agenda to take a vote one way or another for the installation of the doors.

Tonight we have the ADA Coordinator for the City of Shelton here as well as the Chairman of the ADA Commission. I’d like to turn it over to them right now to make a presentation. Hopefully we’ll have a lot of dialogue with the Aldermen. If any of the Aldermen have any reasons why they don’t think the doors should be installed, I hope they speak up tonight so we can try to understand their thoughts.

Alderman Anglace stated, first of all, I’d like to invite the ADA Commission Chairman to make a presentation to the Board and then we’ll go from there.

Arlene Clancy, 70 Congress Avenue
Chairman, ADA Commission

Just let me explain one thing about the ADA Commission. We only meet when there is a grievance. If any citizen comes to the Coordinator of the ADA here in Shelton, Mrs. Gannon takes care of it in 99 percent of the cases. If a grievance is filed, then the Commission meets. We haven’t met until this past February for approximately two years. There have been no grievances filed during that time. On February 12, 2006 I received a phone call from Mrs. Margaret Keane expressing her frustrations in getting a power access door at the Senior Center to allow her some ease in getting her wheelchair-bound husband into the Center. I told her what the procedure was that she had to file a grievance, which she did by sending me a letter. I called the meeting of the Commission, we sat and she presented to us letters that she had sent. She started out when Mr. Finn knocked on her door soliciting her vote. She explained to him what was happening, she then went to the Senior Citizens Commission and she went to Public Health & Safety.

Our Commission said, let us investigate, find out what we can about what kind of doors; what needs to be done.

Commissioner Jones, who is on the road and goes to many places, volunteered to look into various options. Mrs. Gannon took great pains to make a presentation showing us all kinds of ways that, did not work. In one of our travels, Commissioner Jones saw a door that looked exactly like the ones at the Center now where a push pad was installed on the right hand side – there were double doors there – and the left hand door opened. This is done by the Stanley Corporation. [Mrs. Clancy presented the information to the Clerk for distribution to the Board members].
Marilynn Gannon, ADA Coordinator for the City of Shelton, joined Mrs. Clancy at the podium.

She reviewed with the board all of the ideas that she presented to the ADA Commission, as well as three proposals she received from three different companies to remedy the matter. She noted that all three companies tested the doors. Mrs. Gannon strongly encouraged the Board members to personally visit the Senior Center and assess the current situation before taking any vote on the matter. She encouraged them to sit in a wheelchair that is provided at the Center, and practice going in and out of the doors as they currently are set up, as she has done. Mrs. Gannon was able to get in and out of the doors while seated in a wheelchair – independently.

Mrs. Gannon concluded that the doors that are there are handicap accessible. She has stated this to the ADA Commission at both meetings. Her only opinion would be to do install the power pads in a location that is safe for everyone. She has been back there since the last meeting trying to come up with another solution. It is the double door that creates the problem. Another solution may be to put another door along the side of this area that protrudes out - a single door along the side - but the heating registers run across the whole strip. She also looked into an automatic eye and all three door vendors said it wouldn’t work because of the double doors. Another idea was to place the power pads on a post about six feet away from the doors – but this would create an unsafe barrier in a location where there is no barrier now. It was suggested to mount the power pads on the existing pillars in front of the building, but this area slopes back into the parking lot and would create another unsafe situation.

When a grievance comes to ADA, and there was never what I consider a grievance, as far as our grievance form states, what building or program are you denied access to? She was able to access the building. As a grievance, I have 15 working days to come up with a solution. If I can’t in 15 days, it goes to ADA commission and they have 90 days. I’m glad that Arlene went today to check this out. If they can’t come up with a solution, it’s the Board of Aldermen’s responsibility.

Extensive discussion ensued in regard to the pros and cons – possible locations for power pads – different entryway designs – visits to the Senior Center Building.

It was the consensus of the Board that it’s not much of a cost. Money isn’t the issue; safety is the issue. As it stands now, the current setup of the doors is not in violation as far as the ADA is concerned. The Board of Aldermen wants to look at this and come up with a good solution – including checking with other cities and towns.

TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO

Mrs. Gannon explained that a person in a wheelchair can get through the doors now by themselves. Colleen Finn was able to access the building by herself in a wheelchair. Mrs. Keane was having difficulty pushing her husband and opening the door. There are door stops at the bottom of the door that were put in afterward to help. If you are sitting in a wheelchair, the door stop falls and holds the door open for you. She reiterated that she has no problem with putting a power door in, but that it must be done correctly and safely.
Alderman Panek asked, is it your opinion that the three quotes we got are no good?

Mrs. Gannon felt, in her opinion, that none of the proposals were safe enough. This is why she is encouraging the Board of Aldermen to go there and try the different options for themselves.

Alderman Finn thanked Mrs. Clancy and Mrs. Gannon for their report, and for their willingness to further investigate the matter. He noted that he also has received a phone call from Bill and Doris Stervinsky, who also would like to see power pads installed.

Alderman Anglace thanked Mrs. Clancy, stating, I know your passion for the disabled, I know your accomplishments over the years, I enjoy working with you on the Commission, you are an apt leader and I have the utmost confidence in the kind of things you look into and say. I know that Marilynn Gannon is a tireless worker and she turns over every stone to make sure you have all the information to make a good decision – a smart decision. I thank you both. My questions are designed to get at the facts, and I believe are necessary to decide this question.

We must first agree on the facts before we can deliberate and come up with the right decision. That's why this meeting tonight was so important to have this kind of dialogue and not make a decision until maybe a month from now to allow – there are people in this audience that have expertise in this area - and if they wish we would welcome follow up correspondence and we'll share it and it will be considered.

To verify the complaint – In the February 28th ADA Commission minutes, the complaint is stated as “difficulty pushing her husband through the doors at the Shelton Center.” Is there any other record of the complaint, any written record of the complaint?

Mrs. Clancy stated, a February 12, 2006 letter from Margaret Keane with the complaint. She did not fill out the form which Mrs. Gannon was referring to. [Mrs. Clancy gave the letter to the Clerk for copying for the Board members].

Alderman Anglace continued, I will verify that the ADA Commission held two meetings on this subject – February 28th and March 14th. Next, in the February 28th minutes, the ADA Coordinator stated, “the City of Shelton is in compliance with the ADA laws and regulations.” There is no record in the minutes of either meeting of any Commissioner disagreeing with that statement, nor is there any record of any action taken by the ADA Commission to the contrary. Can we rely, then, on the statement as being the position of the ADA Commission that the City of Shelton is in compliance with ADA laws and regulations in this specific complaint?

Mrs. Clancy replied, yes. Mrs. Gannon presented us with pages of facts from the ADA regulations stating the kinds of door handles, the kinds of doors, etc. that made it compliant. We did not disagree that it was in compliance.
What we did think was, and we did put that in our minutes, that whether or not we were in compliance, it was still causing problems for individuals to get into that building. We have heard that nobody complained. Well, we don’t know how many people don’t go there because they can’t get in.

Alderman Anglace reviewed the two sets of minutes with Mrs. Clancy and Mrs. Gannon.

Alderman Anglace asked, would everyone agree that if the City is in ADA compliance with the Senior Center door, that no change is required to be made, and any contemplated changes would be outside the purview of the ADA law – that is the recommendation that you’re making?

Mrs. Clancy stated, I would say that’s true.

Alderman Anglace continued, and if the City was not in compliance, then a corrective action would be necessary.

Mrs. Clancy stated, would have to be done. Absolutely.

Alderman Anglace stated, I really want to thank you and everybody else that participated and came. This is a serious subject that deserves deep consideration. I could have said, ‘it’s only $4,000 – do it’ with no regard for what that meant in the big picture. I think it’s much better to know and go through it and learn there is a lot more to it.

Alderman Finn stated, it sounds like there’s a barrier here and that barrier has to be removed.

Mrs. Gannon stated, and my problem was putting a pole in the middle of an open room, creating a barrier.

Alderman Finn stated, I was referring to the barrier as being the door. I would like this placed back on the May agenda for us to take a vote. If we need meetings in between I’ll be happy to show up. If we want to go on field trips looking at doors we can do that.

Alderman Anglace stated, this can be arranged with the Public Health and Safety Committee.

Corporation Counsel Welch stated, for the record, if you do have a “field trip,” you have to post it as a workshop.

Minutes for Approval

Alderman Papa MOVED to waive the reading of and accept the following meeting minutes:

1. Regular meeting of March 9, 2006
2. Special meeting of March 21, 2006
3. Special meeting of March 28, 2006
4. Public hearing of March 28, 2006
5. Public hearing ordinances March 28, 2006
6. Special meeting of March 30, 2006
SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

5.1 **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Alderman Kudej MOVED per the recommendation of the Finance Committee to waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular Finance Committee meeting of March 28, 2006; SECONDED by Alderman Papa. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

### 5.1.2 Statutory Refunds

Alderman Kudej MOVED, per the recommendation of the Finance Committee that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of $33,177.61 be approved and that the Finance Director be directed to make payments in accordance with the certified list received from the Tax Collector. Funds to come from the Statutory Refunds Account #001-0000-311.13-00; SECONDED by Alderman Papa. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

### 5.1.3 Invoice Approval – Clough Harbor – Phase 2 Implementation of Improvements

Alderman Kudej MOVED per the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Energy Management Building Committee to approve the partial payment of the invoice dated February 21, 2006 to Clough Harbour for a partial payment of $9,750 for Phase 2 of the Energy Asset Assessment Study – Implementation of Improvements. Funding to come from LOCIP; and further, Moved to add this item to the Capital Improvements Plan; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

### 5.1.4 Police Pension Contribution - Funding

Alderman Kudej MOVED per the recommendation of the Finance Committee to approve the over-expenditure of the police pension contribution account #001-0200-411.20-04 through the end of fiscal year 2005-2006; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

### 5.1.5 Community Center Pool Deck Shower

Alderman Kudej MOVED per the recommendation of the Finance Committee to accept the low bid of T.C.’s Plumbing & Heating, LLC for the installation of a shower on the pool deck at the Community Center with funding of $4,200 to come from LOCIP; and further, Moved to add this item to the Capital Improvements Plan; SECONDED by Alderman Papa. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

### 5.1.6 Anthem Demutualization Legal Bill

Alderman Kudej MOVED, per the recommendation of the Finance Committee, to recommend to the full Board that $125.87 (Shelton share of the Anthem Demutualization lawsuit) be paid to Sullivan, Schoen,
Campane & Connon, LLC with funds to come from Professional Services account 001-1900-411.30-01; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7 Yes, 1 No (Finn).

5.1.7 Maintenance Agreement – Police Firing Range

Alderman Kudej MOVED per the recommendation of the Finance Committee to waive the bidding and award the contract to Meggitt Defense Systems Caswell for a total of $1,500; and further,

MOVED to authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign the Police firing range maintenance agreement; SECONDED by Alderman Papa.

Corporation Counsel Welch noted that before the Mayor signs, the Purchasing Department would have to provide documentation relative to the waiver.

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

5.2 PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE

No items.

REPORT OF THE MAYOR

None presented.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

None presented.

6.0 LEGAL REPORT

6.1 Corporation Counsel Billing

Alderman Papa MOVED to authorize a total payment of $2,190.04 to Corporation Counsel Winnick, Vine, Welch, & Teodosio, LLC for services rendered per statement dated April 1, 2006 with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

| Legal Fees                  | 001-1900-411.30-03 | $ 2,169.38 |
| Misc. Fees                  | 001-1900-411.80-03 | $ 20.66   |

SECONDED by Alderman Olin. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

6.2 ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL

Alderman Papa MOVED to authorize a total payment of $630 to Assistant Corporation Counsel Ramon Sous for services rendered per statement dated March 1, 2006 with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

| Legal Fees                  | 001-1900-411.30-03 | $ 630     |

SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.
7 LEGISLATIVE - OLD

7.1 PUBLIC HEARINGS

7.1.A Amendment to Ordinance #776 – Alarm Ordinance

Alderman Papa MOVED to adopt as proposed, the Amendment to Ordinance #776 – Alarm Ordinance – as presented at the March 28, 2006 Public Hearing on Ordinances; SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

Ordinance #

Amendment toOrdinance #776. Changes highlighted in red.

Ordinance #

Alarm Systems

Adopted by the Board of Aldermen: Date

Approved by the Mayor: __________________________

Date Mayor’s Signature

Attested to: __________________

City/ Town Clerk

ORDINANCE #

Alarm Systems

Approved by the Board of Aldermen on 12-02

ARTICLE V. ALARM SYSTEMS*

Sec. 9-101. Definitions.

The intent of this ordinance is to encourage the proper functioning of alarm systems in order to avoid the necessity of taking personnel away from their regular duties and dispatching police and/or fire apparatus to respond quickly.

[For purposes of this article the following terms and phrases shall have the meanings ascribed to them:]

(1) Alarm system means any device or equipment which is capable of automatically calling and relaying recorded emergency messages to any state police or municipal police or fire department telephone number, or which is capable of automatically calling and relaying recorded emergency messages or other forms of emergency signals to an intermediate third party, which shall thereafter call and relay such emergency messages to a state police or municipal police or fire department telephone number, as well as any audible sounding device or equipment which does not automatically call or relay as described above.

An alarm system shall include, but not be limited to, a burglary alarm, fire alarm, and a carbon monoxide detection and warning equipment which are defined as follows:
(a) **Burglar alarm** means any alarm system falling within the definition of paragraph (1) above which is designed to transmit a signal in the event of an intrusion, hold-up, or other type of emergency situation.

(b) **A fire alarm** means any system which falls within the definition of paragraph (1) above which is designed to transmit an alarm relating to fire.

(c) **Carbon monoxide detection and warning equipment** means any system which falls within the definition of paragraph 1 above which is designed to transmit an alarm relating to carbon monoxide.

An **alarm owner or user** means any person, firm, corporation or other business entity who owns, controls, operates, or maintains any alarm system as defined in paragraph (1) above.

**Automatic telephone dialing service** refers to an alarm system which automatically sends over regular telephone lines, by direct connection, or otherwise via a pre-recorded voice message that indicates the existence of an emergency situation that the alarm system is designed to detect.

**Central station operating company** refers to a company equipped to receive a burglar, fire, panic, intruder, or hold-up alarm from each of its customers which then transmits to the Shelton Police Department or the Shelton Fire Department the location of any such alarm the central station operating company may receive.

**Chief of Police** refers to the chief executive officer or the acting chief executive officer of the police department of the City of Shelton.

**False alarm** includes any transmission or relay of a message, signal or warning to police or fire authorities caused by error, mechanical or otherwise, or malfunction of an alarm device, or resulting from the test of such alarm device without prior notice to police or fire department officials.

A false alarm is the unintentional activation of an alarm system as hereinbefore defined as a result of negligence, mechanical failure, malfunction, improper installation, improper operation, ignorance, inadvertence, or other cause excluding activation caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, or other abnormal weather events or other abnormal events which are generally referred to as acts of God; also excluded is the intentional activation of a system with criminal, malicious or mischievous intent which would be a violation under the applicable criminal statutes.

**Fire marshal** refers to the duly appointed fire marshal of the City of Shelton.

**Time period** is January 1 through December 31, of any calendar year.

**Hearing officer** means the person or persons designated to hear appeals pursuant to section 7-152c of the Connecticut General Statutes and the city ordinance entitled “Ordinance Relative to Hearing Procedure for Municipal Ordinance Citations.”

Sec. 9-102. Requirements.

(a) Any person, firm, corporation or other business entity who owns, controls or operates an alarm system as hereinbefore defined who has not complied
with the provisions of section 7-282b, of the Connecticut General Statutes shall provide the information required by the following section of this article within thirty (30) days after notification to do so.

(b) Any person or persons, firm or corporation installing an alarm system within the City of Shelton shall register, with the Shelton Police Department, at least five (5) working days prior to installation of any alarm. No alarm device may be installed before obtaining such permit. The chief of police and the fire marshal are allowed the prerogative to authorize installation sooner if they so choose.

Any such person, corporation or commercial enterprise shall designate a permittee responsible for fines authorized under this section and provide proof of financial responsibility before such permit is issued.

(1) For monitored systems the name, address and telephone number of the central station operating company.

(2) For systems not monitored by a central station monitoring company, the name, street number (apartment number, suite number or floor, as may apply) and home and work telephone number of the premises to be protected. The names, addresses, home and work telephone numbers of at least two (2) persons other than the alarm owner/user who can be contacted twenty-four (24) hours a day, who are authorized by the alarm owner/user to respond to the premises upon request of the police or fire officer in charge and who have access to the premises and the authorization to silence or reset an alarm system.

(c) Every alarm owner/user shall be responsible for updating the information herein required to be provided to the Shelton Police Department or Shelton Fire Department. If the information changes, the alarm owner/user shall notify the Shelton Police Department or Shelton Fire Department within five (5) working days of the change.

(d) No alarm system shall be installed by other than a licensed person, owner or other person meeting the requirements set forth in the building and electrical codes of the State of Connecticut and the Connecticut Fire Safety Code. No alarm system shall be installed unless an electrical permit to install has been obtained from the town building official or his designated representative, as is required by the building and electrical codes of the State of Connecticut.

(e) No person, firm, business or corporation shall install an automatic telephone dialing device which will transmit an alarm message within the City of Shelton terminating at the Shelton Police or Fire Departments.

(f) All alarm systems, as defined in this section, which sound an audible signal, which may be heard outside of the protected premises, shall be equipped with a device that will limit the duration of such audible signal to not more than ten (10) minutes in accordance with section 22a-69-5.1 of the Administrative Regulations of the Department of Environmental Protection of the State of Connecticut.

(g) Any person, corporation, business or commercial enterprise that controls, owns or operates an alarm system from which system there are two (2) false alarms from a particular residence, business, firm or corporation within the prescribed annual twelve month period, the chief of police may cause to be issued, a written warning for the first two (2) false alarms and if there is a third false alarm within the same twelve month period, the chief of police
may thereafter issue a citation in accordance and a fine of one hundred dollars ($100.00) for each false alarm which occurs during the remainder of the 12 month time period.

(h) Any person, firm or corporation who violates any provision of this article may be fined a sum not to exceed one hundred dollars ($100.00) for each violation thereof. Each violation shall be considered a separate offense.

In the event of five (5) false alarms from any particular residence, business, firm or corporation within the designated annual time period, the Chief of Police may summon the designated permittee together with the permittee’s alarm company responsible representative to a meeting with the Chief of Police and/or Fire Marshall in order to identify and correct the source of the false alarms. Alarm companies shall be subject to the penalties as described in this ordinance.

Failure to respond to efforts to correct defective alarm systems or to provide the information required herein may result in additional sanctions including an order to immediately disconnect said alarm.

Upon the issuance of the citation, the provisions of section 7-152c of the Connecticut General Statutes as implemented by an ordinance entitled "Ordinance Relative to Hearing Procedure for Municipal Ordinance Citations" shall apply.

(j) Pursuant to any penalty provided, the chief of police or the fire marshal are authorized to seek an injunction or take such other legal action as may be applicable to the particular situation.

(k) The provision of this article shall be deemed to be severable, and if any of its provisions shall be held unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the decision of such court shall not affect or impair any of the remaining, provisions.

(l) City properties and buildings shall be exempt from the provisions of this article.

(m) This article shall become effective after publication as provided in the City Charter.

7.1.B Ordinance Exempting Certain Motor Vehicles Adapted for Disabled

Alderman Papa MOVED to adopt as proposed the Ordinance Exempting Certain Motor Vehicles Adapted For Disabled as presented at the March 28, 2006 Public Hearing on Ordinances; SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

PROPOSED
ORDINANCE EXEMPTING CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES ADAPTED FOR DISABLED.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Shelton, CT:

1. Purpose: Pursuant to the authority granted to municipalities by Sec. 12-81c of the Connecticut General Statutes, the City of Shelton herein enacts an ordinance to exempt from personal property taxation any specially
equipped motor vehicle (as herein defined) owned by a person with disabilities or owned by the parent or guardian of a person with disabilities.

2. **Definitions:**

   a. **PERSON WITH DISABILITIES** means any person who has a physical impairment which requires the special adaptive equipment referenced in the definition of Specially Equipped Motor Vehicle in order to adapt the use of such vehicle to the physical impairment of that person. Persons with physical impairments of a limited duration shall not be considered as Persons With Disabilities.

   b. **SPECIALY EQUIPPED MOTOR VEHICLE** means a motor vehicle which has undergone a permanent and significant modification to its frame or other structural member by the bolting or welding of special equipment for the purpose of adapting its use to the physical impairment of a Person With Disabilities. Such equipment shall include raised roofs with roll-bar systems, raised doors, special control stations, dropped floors, kneeling systems, wheelchair lift, ramp, hand controls, cart lift and any other device or mechanism necessary to permit the vehicle’s operation.

   c. **MOTOR VEHICLE** means a vehicle as defined by Sec. 14-1(47) of the CT General Statutes.

3. **Exemption:** Any Specially Equipped Motor Vehicle shall be exempt from personal property taxation upon compliance with the terms of this Ordinance. Any such exemption shall expire when the vehicle is sold or ceases to be used for transportation of the disabled person.

4. **Medical Documentation and Expiration of Exemption:** The Assessor shall require written and signed documentation verifying that the installation of the special equipment is directly related to the physical impairment of the Person With Disabilities in order to adapt the operation or the accommodation of the Specially Equipped Motor Vehicle to such Person With Disabilities. A physician licensed to practice medicine in the State of CT shall provide such documentation. Any such exemption shall expire when the vehicle is sold or ceases to be used for transportation of the disabled person.

5. **Applications:** Applications to establish eligibility for the exemption permitted by this ordinance shall be filed annually with the office of the Assessor not later than October 1st. For motor vehicles purchased on or after October 1st in any assessment year, said application shall be filed not later than the following September 30th.

6. **Assessment Year:** This ordinance shall be first applicable to the assessment year commencing October 1, 2006.

7. **Effective Date and Manner of Publication:** This ordinance shall take effect 15 days after publication of a summary of this ordinance in a newspaper having a general circulation in the City of Shelton as provided by CT General Statutes Sec. 7-157(b).
7.1.C Request for Water Main Extension – Broc Terrace

PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON MARCH 28, 2006.

Alderman Papa MOVED to adopt the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING $172,000 FOR THE BROC TERRACE WATER MAIN EXTENSION AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF $172,000 BONDS OF THE CITY TO MEET SAID APPROPRIATION AND PENDING THE ISSUANCE THEREOF THE MAKING OF TEMPORARY BORROWINGS FOR SUCH PURPOSE

SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

NOTE:

The results of this Public Hearing showed a clear majority in favor of proceeding with installation of City Water on Broc Terrace. Of the eligible 17 homeowners, the vote was as follows:

- 11 households voted YES (65% IN FAVOR)
- 3 households voted NO (18% AGAINST)
- 3 households did not show (18% NO SHOW)

With a clear 65% in favor and a maximum of 35% who could be opposed, it was clear that no written ballot was necessary.

Of particular note was the fact that #27 and #32 Broc Terrace are currently up for sale. Carey & Guarrera Real Estate signs (925-0058) are on both properties. The Board would like to send written notice of this pending Water Main project approval to the Real Estate Broker thereby putting them on notice and asking them to so inform prospective property buyers. If notice can otherwise be put on the property records we would support that also.

RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING $172,000 FOR THE BROC TERRACE WATER MAIN EXTENSION AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF $172,000 BONDS OF THE CITY TO MEET SAID APPROPRIATION AND PENDING THE ISSUANCE THEREOF THE MAKING OF TEMPORARY BORROWINGS FOR SUCH PURPOSE

RESOLVED:

Section 1. The sum of $172,000 is appropriated for the water main extension on BROC Terrace, including, but not limited to, excavation and restoration of roadway, installation of water service connections and Aquarion Water Company service connection charges, and for administrative, printing, financing and legal costs related thereto.

Section 2. To meet said appropriation $172,000 bonds of the City may be issued, maturing in substantially equal annual installments not later than the fifth year after their date. Said bonds may be issued in one or more series as determined by the Treasurer and the Director of Finance and the amount of
bonds of each series to be issued shall be fixed by the Treasurer and the Director of Finance, provided that the total amount of bonds to be issued shall not be less than an amount which will provide funds sufficient with other funds available for such purpose to pay the principal of and the interest on all temporary borrowings in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds of said bonds outstanding at the time of the issuance thereof, and to pay for the administrative, printing, financing and legal costs of issuing the bonds. The bonds shall be in the denomination of $1,000 or a whole multiple thereof, be issued in fully registered form, be executed in the name and on behalf of the City by the facsimile or manual signatures of the Treasurer and the Director of Finance, bear the City seal or a facsimile thereof, be certified by a bank or trust company, which bank or trust company may be designated the registrar and transfer agent, be payable at a bank or trust company, and be approved as to their legality by Robinson & Cole LLP, Attorneys-at-Law, of Hartford. The bonds shall be general obligations of the City and each of the bonds shall recite that every requirement of law relating to its issue has been duly complied with, that such bond is within every debt and other limit prescribed by law, and that the full faith and credit of the City are pledged to the payment of the principal thereof and interest thereon. The aggregate principal amount of the bonds of each series to be issued, the annual installments of principal, redemption provisions, if any, the certifying, registrar and transfer agent, and the paying agent, the date, time of issue and sale and other terms, details and particulars of such bonds, including the approval of the rate or rates of interest, shall be determined by the Treasurer and Director of Finance in accordance with the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended.

Section 3. Said bonds shall be sold by the Treasurer in a competitive offering or by negotiation, in the Treasurer’s discretion. If sold in a competitive offering, the bonds shall be sold upon sealed proposals at not less than par and accrued interest on the basis of the lowest net or true interest cost to the City. A notice of sale or a summary thereof describing the bonds and setting forth the terms and conditions of the sale shall be published at least five days in advance of the sale in a recognized publication carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news and the subject of state and municipal bonds. If the bonds are sold by negotiation, provisions of the purchase agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Mayor, Treasurer and Director of Finance.

Section 4. The Treasurer and Director of Finance are authorized to make temporary borrowings in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds of any series of said bonds. Notes evidencing such borrowings shall be signed by the Treasurer and the Director of Finance, have the seal of the City affixed, be certified and payable at a bank or trust company designated by the Treasurer, be approved as to their legality by Robinson & Cole LLP, Attorneys-at-Law, of Hartford. They shall be issued with maturity dates which comply with the provisions of the General Statutes of Connecticut governing the issuance of such notes, as the same may be amended from time to time. The notes shall be general obligations of the City and each of the notes shall recite that every requirement of law relating to its issue has been duly complied with, that such note is within every debt and other limit prescribed by law, and that the full faith and credit of the City are pledged to the payment of the principal thereof and the interest thereon. The net interest cost on such notes, including renewals thereof, and the expense of preparing, issuing and marketing them, to the extent paid from the proceeds of such renewals or said bonds, shall be included as a cost of the Project. Upon the sale of said bonds the proceeds thereof, to the extent required, shall be applied forthwith to the payment of the principal of and the interest on any such notes then outstanding or shall be deposited with a bank or trust company in trust for such purpose.
Section 5. The City hereby expresses its official intent pursuant to §1.150-2 of the Federal Income Tax Regulations, Title 26 (the "Regulations"), to reimburse expenditures paid sixty days prior to and anytime after the date of passage of this Resolution in the maximum amount of and for the capital projects defined in Section 1 with the proceeds of bonds, notes, or other obligations ("Bonds") authorized to be issued by the City. The Bonds shall be issued to reimburse such expenditures not later than 18 months after the later of the date of the expenditure or the substantial completion of the Project, or such later date the Regulations may authorize. The City hereby certifies that the intention to reimburse as expressed herein is based upon its reasonable expectations as of this date. The Director of Finance or his designee is authorized to pay Project expenses in accordance herewith pending the issuance of Bonds, and to amend this declaration.

Section 6. The Mayor, the Treasurer and the Director of Finance, or any two of them, are hereby authorized, on behalf of the City, to enter into agreements or otherwise covenant for the benefit of bondholders to provide information on an annual or other periodic basis to nationally recognized municipal securities information repositories or state based information repositories (the "Repositories") and to provide notices to the Repositories of material events as enumerated in Securities Exchange Act Rule 15c2-12, as amended, as may be necessary, appropriate or desirable to effect the sale of the bonds and notes authorized by this resolution. Any agreements or representations to provide information to Repositories made prior hereto are hereby confirmed, ratified and approved.

Section 7. This Resolution is adopted pursuant to the provisions of Section 7.16 of the City Charter and is within the limitations set forth therein for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006.

Enacted by the Board of Aldermen: ________________________________

Approved by the Mayor: ________________________________ Date ______

Attest:

_________________________________

City Clerk

Date ____________________________

7.2 101 Mohegan Road

Corporation Counsel Welch gave the Aldermen information dating back to the summer of 2004 and a copy of the most recent map that has been prepared by the owner of the gas station. Back in 2004 there was a motion by the Board of Aldermen to convey the excess right of way to adjacent property owners, and then modify – not to convey but to abandon – it was a paper street. There was some dispute or disagreement as to whether the City was the owner of the property or whether it was just a paper street. When you abandon a street, it automatically goes to the neighboring property owner – so you abandon it, it would become the owner of Mohegan Road. What had happened, as you can see from Bob Kulacz memorandum of August 25, 2004, the City, in 1987, shifted the road to the left for safety reasons, thereby leaving a strip of land approximately 20 feet wide along the front of the three properties on that corner where the gas station is – it’s basically still City-owned property. It was taken up as if it was not City owned, but
just excess right of way so to speak, that could be abandoned and go to the property owners. Mr. Kulacz investigated it and said that it was his belief that the City actually owned it, and therefore you have to convey it. This is a painful history for the property owner, because we were ready to give it to him. We took that action to abandon the road which would have it go not only to the gas station but to the property to the right and the left, which is currently being used as the property owners as their lawns. The property owner has gotten, at our request, a title search done of the property of this 20 foot strip. It is determined, it says going back to colonial times – he couldn’t find a deed to the City but since it’s a City road he determined that the City is the fee owner of this 20 x 100 foot strip. The thought was in speaking to the President of the Board of Aldermen, that it has a nominal value. We contacted Mr. Rak as to the value – we didn’t want to spend the money on an appraisal if it has no value. Mr. Rak, in my conversation with him, thought it had value and it would not be just nominal. What we’ve done in the past, knowing we had attempted to abandon the property, which would have given it to the property owners on both sides, it was determined that the City owns it and therefore, for all intents and purposes, you have to convey it. It has to be fair market value price determined by the Board. In discussion since it’s not nominal, I think your practice has been, as Mr. Kulacz has indicated – get the appraisal and convey the property. I know Mr. Stanziali, the owner of the gas station, has gotten Planning and Zoning approval for what he’s attempting to do, subject to your conveyance. I do think it’s necessary, based upon Mr. Rak’s comments, to get that – so we are not for all intents and purposes giving something away - abandoning it and then giving it away saying we have no interest in it. In this case it’s something that you own. It’s a 20 x 100 foot piece.

Alderman Papa MOVED to authorize the conveyance and obtaining an appraisal of property located at 101 Mohegan Road as identified on a map entitled “Release Map Property Survey of Property Located at 101 Mohegan Road, Shelton, Connecticut, Prepared by Lewis Associates” with a cost not to exceed $350 with funds to come from the Professional Services account; and further,

MOVED to request an 8-24 from the Planning and Zoning Commission. SECONDED by Alderman Finn.

Corporation Counsel Welch noted that Planning and Zoning gave an 8-24 back in July of 2004 and they also approved the plan subject to the Board of Aldermen granting it.

Alderman Papa asked, the three potential owners would have to pay the City money for that particular portion?

Corporation Counsel Welch stated, the only one that has responded to our letter of September 2004 is the property owner of the gas station.

TAPE TWO

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

Corporation Counsel Welch stated that Mr. Stanziale and his attorney are here to answer any questions.
Attorney Jean Marie Riccio

I represent Mr. Stanziale, one of the principals of D & D Stan. Mr. Welch very succinctly summarized this arduous task we're trying to do here. I have copies of the maps and title search if you would like to see them.

Corporation Counsel Welch stated, they have the map.

Attorney Riccio gave a copy of the title search to the Clerk. She continued, according to this title search, it is owned by the City of Shelton and as Mr. Welch stated back in 2004, it was approved, based on Mr. Welch's motion here. We would ask in order to conserve time, that your approval could be made subject to this appraisal and an agreement in regard to the price that's to be set for the conveyance. It has been going on for a year and a half at least, and there is considerable cost involved. The title searcher suggests that we also search the abutting property owners. Mr. Stanziale has paid for this, he has had a survey, and now he's going to have to do further title search to,

Alderman Anglace stated, I don't think we can grant that request. The reason why is because if we were to approve this subject to an 8-24 approval from Planning & Zoning, we would be usurping their authorities under State law.

Corporation Counsel Welch stated, I believe there was an 8-24 in July of 2004 as to the conveyance, and I think there was also – they just approved it subject to your agreeing to the conveyance, two months ago. We're not going to get that appraisal for two weeks and I'm sure you'll have a special at the end of the month.

Attorney Riccio stated, we were here on March 21st before Planning and Zoning and as Mr. Welch said, they did approve it, subject to you folks' approval. We're just trying to conserve time.

Alderman Finn stated, State statutes says we cannot sell any property without an 8-24 referral from Planning and Zoning.

Attorney Riccio stated, we're not trying to circumvent that process. As I believe you did in other minutes, you can always amend it and rescind your decision at a later time. Mr. Welch won't give us the deed and there won't be an actual conveyance. We're just trying to expedite this. If it could be subject to submission and recording of the 8-24, and of course the conveyance.

Alderman Anglace stated, my personal feeling is that whenever we try to expedite something – we have people that are awfully good at expediting. They come to us every month, the day of our meeting, and want to add things to our agenda. It confuses the heck out of us. It's best to follow the procedures in order and do it that way. Then we don't have to go back and re-do something. It should be done by the end of the month. If Planning and Zoning has approved it subject to our approval, and we approved it tonight, why do we need to do any more? If they approved it subject to our approval,
Corporation Counsel Welch interjected, we’d get from them the 8-24 because if they’ve done that, at their meeting, as a conveyance, we’ll just get the letter. We usually have the letter in front of us that says, here’s our 8-24.

Alderman Anglace stated, you’re saying that Planning and Zoning has already approved this subject to our approval?

Attorney Riccio stated, the notice has already been recorded.

Alderman Panek stated, your initial comment was that there might be more value to the property than just the nominal fee. I thought that was the reason that Tom was recommending to hold off, because what if the appraiser comes in and says,

Alderman Anglace interjected, if they’re willing to agree that whatever our appraisal says, and whatever we decide the value is they’ll pay, then we’ll approve it.

Attorney Riccio stated, that’s all we’re asking. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Stanziale stated, now that we have to do an appraisal on it, I thought it was going to go, the minutes of the meeting, the title search, now it’s changed, now we have to get it appraised. So whatever. It’s another step that wasn’t in the original approval back in 2004. Now this is all of a sudden being changed. I really don’t have a choice. We’re shut down now.

Alderman Papa stated, at least you could expedite it.

Corporation Counsel Welch stated, I would suggest that with passing the motion that was on the table, you can schedule this at the end of the month at a special meeting of the Finance Committee. I don’t think it’s appropriate to agree to the sale of a piece of property at a value that is not known.

Attorney Riccio asked, the motion Mr. Welch made was to approve the conveyance and to get an appraisal. Has that been done? So the conveyance will be done subject to the appraisal. Thank you very much.

8 FINANCIAL BUSINESS OLD

8.1 Heating Fuel Oil Account – Request for Over-Expenditure

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the over-expenditure of the heating fuel oil account 001-4800-716.40-16 through the end of Fiscal Year 2005-2006; SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

9 FINANCIAL BUSINESS NEW

9.1 Senior Center Doors

[was moved to the beginning of the agenda]
9.2 Historic Documents Preservation Grant Application

Alderman Papa MOVE to authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign the attached agreement for a historical document preservation grant application; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

9.3 White Hills Civic Center Roof – Additional Funding

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve an additional $855 for plywood roof decking with funds to come from LOCIP; and further, MOVED to add this item to the Capital Improvements Account; SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

9.4 Engineering Services – Rotundo Engineering LLC – Walnut Tree Hill Road Design

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the proposal for engineering services as provided by Rotundo Engineering, LLC for the reconstruction of Walnut Tree Hill Road with funding of $7,000 to come from LOCIP; and further, MOVED to add this item to the Capital Improvements Account; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi.

Alderman Finn asked for background information on the firm as he has never heard of this firm before.

Alderman Papa stated, they’re on Canal Street. They went out to RFP for it.

Alderman Finn stated, I have no problem with the motion, there’s just no backup on it.

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

9.5 Engineering Services – Rotundo Engineering LLC – Huntington Street Sidewalks

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the proposal for engineering services as provided by Rotundo Engineering, LLC for the installation of sidewalks on Huntington Street with funding of $10,200 to come from LOCIP; and further, MOVED to add this item to the Capital Improvements Account; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

9.6 EMS Building Re-Roofing

Alderman Papa MOVED to add the installation of a new roof on the EMS Building located at 100 Meadow Street to the Capital Improvement Plan with funding not to exceed $5,200 for materials to come from LOCIP.

City maintenance will perform the work.
SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

10. - LEGISLATIVE - NEW

10.1 Appointment – WPCA Commission

Alderman Papa MOVED to appoint Steve Morse (R), 8 Willard Road, Shelton, to the Water Pollution Control Authority with a term expiration of December 6, 2009.

NOTE: Steve Morse replaces Tom Minotti (R)

SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi.

Alderman York questioned Mr. Morse’s qualifications to be a WPCA appointee. Mr. Morse was in the audience and introduced himself.

Alderman Papa added, you know, most of these people are volunteers so it’s kind of hard to get somebody that is an expert in water pollution control. If you know of anybody that you want to recommend, I’m sure you could recommend it to the Mayor. He is replacing Tom Minotti, who was an educator.

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

10.2 UI Energy Blueprint Incentive Application

Alderman Papa MOVED per the recommendation of the Energy Management Committee to authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign the UI Energy Blueprint Incentive applications. SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

10.3 Reaffirmation of Fair Housing Policy

Alderman Papa MOVED to reaffirm the Fair and Equal Housing Policy for the City of Shelton, which, by reference, is hereby made part of the minutes of the meeting; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi.

Alderman Finn asked, why aren’t we working with the Greater Bridgeport RPO or the Greater Bridgeport Board of Realtors, since everybody wants to consider us Fairfield County, even though we are Valley.

Alderman Anglace stated, the only thing I can think of off the top of my head is that this is a recurring Fair Housing Policy that was set up years ago and we reaffirm it year after year.

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.
10.4 Resolution – Memorandum of Understanding – Homeland Security

Alderman Papa MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

Resolved, that the Mayor of the City of Shelton, Mark A. Lauretti, be and hereby is authorized to act on behalf of the City of Shelton and its Board of Aldermen in executing a Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Connecticut, Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, for participation in the FY 2004 State Homeland Security Grant Program.

SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

11.0 Executive Session

At approximately 8:55 p.m. Alderman Finn MOVED to enter into Executive Session to discuss the following items:

11.1 City of Shelton v. Sosnoff
11.2 Workers Compensation – John Casertano
11.3 Contract Approval - WPCA

and invite Corporation Counsel to remain in the Auditorium; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

Return to Regular Session

At approximately 9:20 p.m., Alderman Papa MOVED to return to Regular Session; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

Alderman Anglace noted that there were no votes taken in Executive Session.

11.1 – City of Shelton v. Sosnoff

No action.

11.2 - Workers Compensation – John Casertano

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the supplemental finding and award for the Workers Compensation matter of John Casertano, File # 400056116 dated April 29, 2005; SECONDED by Alderman York. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

11.3 – Contract Approval – WPCA

Alderman Papa MOVED to approve the contract between Kovacs Construction Corporation and the City of Shelton for a total sum of $2,958,765 for pump station modifications per public bid #25-26; and further,
MOVED to authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign all necessary documents; SECONDED by Alderman Lanzi. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

**Adjournment**

Alderman Olin MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman York. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 8-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Bruder, Clerk
Board of Aldermen

Date Submitted: ______________

DATE APPROVED: ______________BY: ______________
Mark A. Lauretti
Mayor, City of Shelton