



BOARD OF ALDERMEN
SHELTON, CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCES
TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2013

Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Aldermanic President John Anglace called the Public Hearing on Ordinances of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7 p.m. All those present stood and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President – present
Alderman Lynne Farrell - present
Alderman John “Jack” Finn – present
Alderman Stanley Kudej – present
Alderman Noreen McGorty – present
Alderman John P. Papa – absent
Alderman Eric McPherson - present
Alderman Anthony Simonetti – present

1. AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE 11-37 – “NON-RESIDENT USAGE; FEES”
RELATIVE TO BOATS AND BOATING (BOAT LAUNCH ORDINANCE)

Sec. 11-37. Nonresident usage; fees.

- (a) Nonresident boaters will be permitted the use of the boat launching ramp and picnic area after having secured a permit from the city/town clerk for which an annual fee of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) will be charged.
- (b) The fee rates established in subsection (a) of this section and section 11-36 are minimum amounts which cannot be decreased except by revision of this article.
- (c) Increases in the fee rates may be recommended by the parks and recreation commission and by revision of this article.
- (d) Annual shall be defined as a period between April 1 and November 30th of each year.

Alderman Kudej explained, we want to make it 12 months a year; no increase in the fee. The rules will apply from April 1 to March 31. Everything else stays the same.

Being no speakers on this item, Alderman Simonetti MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman McPherson. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

2. RESCIND SEC. 4.3 (a) (b) FIRE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT FUND

Sec. 4-3. Fire vehicle replacement fund.

- (a) There is hereby established a fire vehicle replacement fund. This fund shall be used for the replacement and/or refurbishment of fire department vehicles. This fund shall receive an initial appropriation of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00) on July 1, 1984 and annually thereafter one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00) shall be added to this fund from the annual budget.
- (b) This fund shall remain separate and apart from the operating budget of the city and shall be cumulative. The final determination of any expenditure from this fund shall be by the Board of Aldermen upon the written recommendation of the Board of Fire Commissioners.
(Ord. No. 450, 12-8-83)

Alderman Anglace explained, the thinking here is that we have gone a different route over many years. I think this was initiated back in 1984 and we've gone a different route with financing our Fire Department vehicles. The latest route we've gone to referendum and getting public to approve, develop specs, go out to bid and purchase the vehicles.

The Board of Fire Commissioners sent me a number of letters, three or four, and I went through the ordinance book and saw we had a number of ordinances that were no longer... the Charter had changed and superceded them.

Bruce Kosowsky, 29 Martinka Drive

As I came down here tonight I was trying to figure out why this vehicle fund has not been funded over the years. I had the unfortunate experience to be part of the Board for a number of years and also I did work with a refurbishment program we did many years ago. That turned out to be a very good program where we saved the taxpayers a lot of money, we were able to continue the use of our fire apparatus and I'm happy to report that I know one of the fire trucks that we refurbished is still in service – it's no longer located in Connecticut but it's still in service, which proves that refurbishing does work. The Fire Department, I don't think based on what I see with our government and our state and not even our local, that we should keep on pushing our funding out to other people to pay for, which is the bonding process we seem to be going into now. I recall many years ago there was a lot of criticism over that, over how much the other people bonded. I don't know what we bond today, what our bonding debt is in the City of Shelton today, but I figure it's a lot more money than it was back in 1990 or 1991. I don't see why we can't fund something

that made a lot of good sense. A lot of people put a lot of good work into that program – that ordinance – it worked very well for us in refurbishing vehicles. We were able to pick up on areas where trucks needed body repair. We ended up saving a lot of money and now because of lack of funding there wasn't the board's decision not to have this funded because I went to many budget requests, always asking why it was not funded, when I was on the Board of Fire Commissioners for a number of years. I don't quite understand why we don't want to fund this program, especially when the Fire Department [inaudible], they can extend the life of them, which helps the taxpayers. It doesn't put us to this point where we're buying four trucks at a clip. Then you'll have four trucks that are going to be going out of service and another four trucks out of service. Who's going to pay that? Are we going to bond another four trucks and another four trucks, is this going to go on and on and on? Whereas if you look at the way the ordinance was written, it has to come before the Board of Aldermen anyway; it's not like the Board of Fire Commissioners can spend the money. You have to come here, explain what you're going to do, how you're going to fix something, how the money is going to be spent, go through the bidding process, and it worked very, very well. I can think of three Hons and a Mack fire truck and the one that got into an accident – that was a problem – but that truck ended up getting refurbished also. We did a lot of good work with that. You might want to think this out. As a present Board of Fire Commissioners based on what you said about the Charter change, have they encouraged this, have they gave you pros and cons on this? I don't remember anybody talking about this. That's my only opinion.

Alderman Finn stated, Commissioner Kosowsky said you would know if this administration had funded this ordinance from 1991 to 2013 there would have been \$2,200,000 in that account for that purpose plus interest.

Alderman Anglace stated, or put another way, this ordinance funds \$100,000 per year. You're not going to buy any new equipment with \$100,000 a year. Talking about refurbishment? Yes. We're refurbishing a different way. How many vehicles have we had to refurbish, Chief? Where did you get the money? How did you get the money? We didn't take it out of this fund.

Chief Jones replied, we're taking it out of our current Vehicle Maintenance account, and if there's a major expense we come to the Board of Aldermen for special appropriations under your discretionary fund for bonding. So when the tanker had its unfortunate accident, we had to come before the Board for funding.

Alderman Anglace stated, and what we've done, it's consistent with this, and the same thing as far as Conservation is concerned and Open space. The ordinance for Conservation and Open Space calls for \$250,000 to be put away every year and used to buy property. We are spending far more than that on property that we're acquiring. So we're not going to take and spend these large amounts. What we do, historically what we have done, intermediate sized properties especially, is to take these properties and make a deal with the person who wants to sell them to the City

to pay for them over two, three, as many years as we can, and it's a good deal for them because they don't get the money all at once and then from our point of view we can either allocate the money in the budget or bond it from Board of Aldermen bonding in that particular year. We're authorized to do up to 2 percent of the Grand List. That worked well for us. The principle of taking money and putting it off into a side account whether it's Fire Department or Conservation or anything, we just don't think that's the way to go. Why take money and put it over there and let it sit? Doesn't make sense. When we need to do it, we fund it.

Alderman Finn stated, may I point out that the \$2,200,000 would have collected interest in the bank so it would have been far more than that. When we go out for bonding we're also paying interest on the money that we're bonding for to a bank. This would be money, cash on hand. If we're not in the business any longer to fund certain things, will we be doing away with the Pine Rock Park fund then?

Being no further speakers on this item, Alderman McPherson MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

3. RESCIND SECTION 4-34 FIRE CHIEF, FIRE MARSHAL, AUTOMOBILE ALLOWANCE

Sec. 4-34. Fire Chief, Fire Marshal Automobile Allowance.

The fire chief and the fire marshal of the city receive five hundred fifty dollars (\$550.00) per year, each, for use of their automobiles in the performance of their duties, retroactive to July 1, 1974.

(Ord. No. 234, 1-13-75)

Alderman Anglace explained, it's obvious that we provide the Fire Chief and Fire Marshal with a car now, so they don't need this ordinance saying that they use their vehicle in the performance of their duties and that they'll be reimbursed for it. It no longer applies. We have Section 2-96 of the ordinance book that says that should their vehicle break down, they just use that procedure to get reimbursed for their personal automobile. There's no reason to keep this on the books – it's a clean up item and that's what we're doing.

Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue

You haven't voted this evening yet but my question that I'm presenting to you is, if you go and approve this, has the Fire Department already proposed in their upcoming budget that you have there the amount for the Fire Marshal's and the Fire Chief's car?

Alderman Anglace stated, that question, with all due respect, is not pertinent to the issue under consideration. The issue under consideration is eliminating the ordinance which reads, it's a one-sentence ordinance, "the Fire Chief and the Fire Marshal of the City receive \$550 per year each for use of their automobiles in the performance of their duties." With the City supplying them with a car, and with the City, if their car breaks down we will pay them out of Section 2-96. We're not going to give them \$550.

Mr. Crawford stated, Alderman Anglace, I'm just stating, the way it is reading, rescind Section 4.34 Fire Chief Fire Marshal automobile allowance. Now, as I stated, the budget has already been drawn up by all the departments. You have not made a decision this evening as to yes, or no. But I still say that they would have had to have added this into their proposed budget.

Alderman Anglace stated, maybe I'm misunderstanding you. You want to know if the Mayor has included that \$550 in the proposed budget?

Mr. Crawford stated, that is correct.

Alderman Anglace stated, okay. We'll check that. I don't know the answer.

Chief Jones stated, for clarification, I could probably address Mr. Crawford's question. Although it's an ordinance, just like the Fire Truck Replacement Ordinance, since I've been Chief the last five years that has not been an expenditure that has been provided in either the Fire Department budget or any other areas. Chances are it's not in the budget. I have not received an automobile allowance. It was the understanding that we are provided a City-supplied vehicle. I can't speak for the Fire Marshal's office but as the Chief, over the last five years I haven't received those monies allocated by ordinance. I don't believe they have been in the Fire Department budget over the last five years, nor would I seek them because I am provided a City vehicle. Hopefully that clarifies Mr. Crawford's question.

Being no further speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

4. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4-35 OFFICER'S SALARIES

Sec. 4-35. Officers' salaries.

The salaries of officers of the fire department shall be as follows per annum:

Fire chief stipend salary	\$20,000.00
Deputy fire chief stipend salary	\$10,000.00

Assistant chiefs chief's stipend salary, each	\$7,500.00
Custodians (4) stipend salary, each	\$4,000.00
Quartermaster stipend salary	\$5,000.00
Recruitment officer stipend salary	\$5,000.00
Director of training stipend salary	\$5,000.00
Training assistants (4) stipend salary	\$1,000.00

(Ord. No. 226, 8-12-74; Ord. No. 378, 7-25-79; Ord. No. 492, 12-12-85; Ord. No. 530, 7-9-87; Ord. No. 581, 7-12-90; Ord. No. 723, 5-14-98; Ord. No. 826, 5-10-07; Ord. No. 844, 7-9-09.)

Alderman Anglace explained, this proposal seeks to address the issue of the Fire Chief's stipend salary, raising it from \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year.

Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue

Again, the amendment to the section Officers' Salaries. You have not made a decision to either approve this or rescind this. It's the same question. Has the salary for Fire Chief been put into this year's proposed budget at last year's figures or what you are planning to propose? Thank you.

Alderman Anglace stated, the salary of the Fire Chief is at \$15,000 in this year's budget, the proposed budget for next year. The Board of Aldermen, the earliest we can vote on this is at our April meeting and if it's approved by the Board of Aldermen at the April meeting, we'll have plenty of time to put it into this year's budget before we adopt the budget. I believe it's the end of May that we'll adopt it this year.

Alderman Finn stated, if you recall when we formed the Office of Emergency Management I was vocal in the fact that the Director of the Office of Emergency Management was receiving \$15,000 for only having two people underneath him. Our Chief of Fire Service at that time had 232-250 people underneath him and I thought that was an injustice to the Chief that the salary would be the same. I do support a salary for the Chief but it probably should have come from the Board of Fire Commissioners.

Bruce Kosowsky, 29 Martinka Drive

That's a good question. I mean, didn't we just go through a whole Charter change? Wasn't it continually pushed by this administration to keep changing the Charter? So we changed the Charter, you got a Board of Fire Commissioners that has a budgetary process in their scope of duties. There are a couple things in the scope of duties there. Here we are, we just voted on this thing, we're in a new year and we're already skipping the process. I don't understand it. I would think that if the raises for

all the officer, Fire Chief, Assistant Chief, Deputy Chiefs, are they all on that or just one person?

Alderman Anglace replied, we're only recommending one person.

Mr. Kosowsky continued, only one person. And it didn't come from the Board of Fire Commissioners. There's no communications this year from the Board of Fire Commissioners requesting it, only one person gets a raise. We never did it that way. We always would give everyone consideration. It's interesting. We just went through a whole Charter, told the people, so it looks like we have that wedge still exists. Very interesting.

Being no further speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

4. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4-36 BENEFIT OF SURVIVING SPOUSE OF FIRE PERSONNEL

Sec. 4-36. Benefit for surviving spouses of fire personnel.

Up to ~~four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00)~~ Five Thousand and No/100 (\$5,000.00) Dollars annually in real estate taxes of property owned by the surviving spouse of a Shelton fireman killed in the line of duty for the City of Shelton shall be abated during the period that the surviving spouse remains unmarried. Benefit will apply to current surviving spouses who otherwise qualify but the benefit will not be retroactive. This benefit does not apply to a Shelton resident whom another municipality employs and who subsequently loses their life in the line of duty.
(Ord. No. 779, 6-10-04; Ord. No. 783, 9-9-04)

Alderman Anglace explained, essentially, it's currently that the City abates up to \$4,000 in taxes for the spouse of a firefighter who dies in the line of duty working for the City of Shelton. The proposal is to increase that to \$5,000 with the thinking being that it more adequately represents the average taxes in the City. There is one clarification that was brought to my attention that I'd like to explain. It says, "this benefit does not apply to a Shelton resident who another municipality employs and who subsequently loses a life in the line of duty." That could be a little bit ambiguous. I think we should clarify it. An example would be – there was a person who worked as a policeman in another town and who was unfortunately electrocuted and killed. This did not apply to that individual but for a Shelton individual who works in the Fire Department as a volunteer – this covers spouses of Fire personnel – so I don't care where you work, your full time job, if you are serving the City of Shelton as a volunteer firefighter and you're killed in the line of duty, this applies to you regardless of where you work full time. Your spouse will be covered with the \$5,000 abatement of annual taxes. Of course you probably won't

remember Danny Wannagot. His spouse was covered, of course Worker's Compensation kicked in, but this tax abatement applied to her until her passing.

Justin Sabatino, 193 River Road

I applaud you Chairman for raising the ordinance to \$5,000 but I think it's a little short. We all had this discussion when the ordinance was first proposed years ago, but I don't think there should be a cap on this ordinance. Basically discriminates, if a fireman's spouse lives in a certain section of town where the taxes are higher, they might not be able to afford to live there. There are a lot of towns in the state that have this same ordinance or these rules, and to my knowledge through the Connecticut Fire Academy, we're the only one with a cap at this time. If we died in the line of service we don't want our spouses to have any burden on them and be able to have the same quality of life to live in Shelton. But if they live in an area where the houses are worth a lot of money and yes, worker's compensation kicks in, about \$60,000 from the City, some other benefits here and there, and if we do have supplemental insurance, it might cover their mortgage. But that spouse might have trouble paying her taxes and you would never want somebody who died in the line of service to have their wife or husband evicted from their house for not paying their taxes, because their family member died in the line of service in that town. This ordinance should be looked at very closely and I would go to taking it all the way and cover it completely, like the other towns do. Thank you.

Alderman Finn stated, I'm a Vietnam Vet and I receive over \$3,000 in tax abatement on my house or car. It comes down to \$63 or \$67 for my six years of service. Where do you come up with the figure of \$5,000? That \$5,000 figure comes down to roughly just below \$100.

Alderman Anglace stated, I said earlier, the \$5,000 comes from being approximately the average tax for the average home in the City.

Alderman Finn stated, I have to agree with Commissioner Sabatino that there should be more research into this to see what other communities are doing for the spouses of survivors of volunteer firemen and policemen.

Alderman Anglace stated, I just want to let you know that other big spending communities are also raising their taxes. What we are trying to do here is to provide a benefit that is uniform across the board to all our firefighters. Everybody will get the same amount of a benefit. If you go on and do not accept the cap, then what you create is a situation where one firefighter gets \$10,000 and another only gets \$2,000 because that's their tax bill. So the one with \$2,000 is going to come and say, "Wait a minute I'm getting screwed. She's getting \$10,000, I've got to get another \$8,000 so pay me in lieu of." You create all kinds of inequities.

Alderman Finn stated, that's why I said you have to go back and look at what other communities are doing. If not for our volunteer firemen our taxes would probably be up and they save the City of Shelton close to \$6 million or \$7 million.

Jack Brandt, Fireman, Woonsocket

I'm listening to this discussion. I've been 35 years in the company. Several of my fellow firemen have gone down for various reasons over the years. You're setting a price on what my life is worth to my family. You're putting a top on this town saying, this is what we think you're worth if you go down at a fire scene. You want to do something for my wife if I went down? Don't make her pay taxes, period. Worry about if the next guy's taxes are higher than hers? She won't care. She won't start a bit. If she doesn't have to pay them, and someone else goes down, and that woman doesn't have to pay them, whether ours is \$6,000 a year and theirs is \$100,000 a year, you've eliminated it. Period. They don't have to worry about it. You can throw the pennies out and say, oh, look what we did, sounds good. But if you're going to do it worthwhile, quit arguing over it. It's pennies. If my wife doesn't pay taxes in this town, it's not going to cause the taxes of this town to go up. It's not like we're losing 1,000 firemen a year. In relationship to the goals of tax collecting in this town. That's all I've got. There's no sense in doing the arguments over pennies.

Alan Ovesny, 1005 Howe Avenue

I don't understand why we're worried about they're saying us keeping the taxes down. We haven't lost nobody lately, hopefully we don't. And if we lose one person and the family is taken care of, I don't think it matters if they live in a fancy house or if they live... they're doing the same job. To put burden on families that are letting their loved ones donate a lot of time to this department, and then just look to the side, I think it's wrong. I put 26 years into this department and that's a lot of us doing that is the reason why you have cheap taxes. Pretty much that's it.

Alderman Simonetti stated, the firemen have a very valid point. Obviously most of our firemen are men. Some women have served. From my being at the firehouses I find that the spouses are part of the fire department, some way, some how. They do participate and maybe we should consider either going from \$5,000 up or looking at what other communities do. Thank you.

Alderman Finn stated, I believe the comment was made by the gentleman from Woonsocket and also Captain Ovesny. We should probably look at freezing the taxes for anybody who dies in the line of duty.

Justin Sabatino

You heard from the other firemen. I heard your comments, Aldermen. The biggest thing is, none of us want to die; we don't want to have to fight for this, but it seems like we're going to have to fight for this ordinance. Most of us will go back to our

companies and tell them what happened tonight. I had the unfortunate opportunity to be there when Danny died, as a young member, not knowing, and then when this all came about with the ordinance for Nancy and all that, it seemed really good. But it didn't sit well when that happened, and I was on the Board of Fire Commissioners and I didn't speak up. I've been to a few firemen funerals, and a lot of times most politicians and most people will say, "anything I can do," to the spouse. Well, we're saying it now in front of our spouse so we don't have to get there. Do something for them. Do it across the board. We don't ask for much, we never got a tax abatement for the firemen, we have a little incentive, a little pension plan which is, not many members make because they don't make the calls to make it. But if somebody dies we want to do as much as we can for them. We had a police officer that died in the line of duty and everybody here, even the firemen, stepped up to help out. I know that most of you aldermen would do the same. Thank you.

Alderman Anglace stated, everybody should understand that this ordinance went into effect at \$4,000 in 2004. Since that time there have been no proposals from anyone. This ordinance tonight asks that we change it from \$4,000 to \$5,000. When the Board finally acts on it, we are not going to act on the suggestion to take it beyond that, we can't do that. We are going to act on yes or no, \$4,000 to \$5,000. That is the limit, that's what's proposed, that's what we have to act on. I just want you to understand that so you're not disappointed.

Alderman Finn stated, we can always amend the ordinance by the time it goes to back to the full Board of Aldermen. We don't have to put \$4,000 to \$5,000 in there, we can indicate that the volunteer firemen or police officers in the City of Shelton, their spouses taxes will be frozen. Period.

Alderman Anglace stated, yes, the Board could, if they wish, amend it. Yes. That's a possibility. But what we're going to act on as it stands right now is \$4,000 to \$5,000.

Jack Brandt, Woonsocket

Okay, you gave me the date when this thing was in and you said, "oh, nobody's come up forward with anything else until now." Does that say something about your fire people, your volunteers, that fight your fires? We don't get out there and start hollering for this or for that. We did make it to this meeting to talk about this issue. Just remember that. I don't care when the thing got into the system. We were thankful when you did it. It was something. It was new. You can come up and tell me all about how four years ago, eight years ago, and in eight years nothing's been said. Well, it's being said now. The fact that somebody up there turns around and says, "Well, we could do it," you sit up there and try to say, "oh, we can only stick with what it is," says that there's a big problem up there.

Alderman Anglace stated, what he suggested was that what I said was that the ordinance was submitted from \$4,000 to \$5,000 and we're going to vote on that.

Jack said it could be amended by the Board of Aldermen to another number. That is correct.

Mr. Brandt stated, when you said it though, it was almost as if that was final, and that's the way it's going to be.

Alderman Anglace stated, I didn't say that's the way it's going to be, I said that is what was proposed, and that's what it is. That's what we're going to act on. Now he said a member of the Board could, not "a member" but "the Board" could amend that to a different number. And the Board could if the majority wishes to do that, they could amend it and it could be acted on at a higher number.

Mr. Brandt stated, well I stepped up because I heard you say, "These are the two numbers, this is what was proposed, and don't be disappointed if we don't act on something that's been suggested tonight. That's all. And he said that it could be acted on by an amendment.

Being no further speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this matter; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

6. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2-44 (c) CLERK'S PAY

Sec. 2-44. Clerk's pay.

(a) For any clerk hired after July 1, 2000, who performs the duties of taking and transcribing the minutes of the meetings of the various boards and commissions shall be paid at the rate of eighteen dollars (\$18.00) per hour. If said clerk is the regular clerk of the board or commission and is employed by the City of Shelton in another capacity, the hours employed in both positions shall be added together to provide that said clerk be paid one and one-half (1 ½) the weighted average hourly rate earned during the week for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours in any week. "Regular clerk" is defined as a clerk who attends and takes minutes at meetings of a board or commission on a regular basis. A clerk who attends and takes minutes of meetings on only an occasional or sporadic basis shall not be considered the regular clerk and shall not be entitled to overtime compensation as described above. "Weighted average" shall be determined in accordance with 29 C.F.R. Section 778.11.

(b) The hourly rate of eighteen dollars (\$18.00) described in subsection (a) shall not apply to any clerk hired on or before July 1, 2000. All other provisions of said subsection (a) shall apply to all clerks regardless of the date of hire. The rate of pay for any clerk hired ~~prior~~ to July 1, 2000, shall continue to be paid at the rate in effect as of said date provided that if said clerk was being paid less than eighteen dollars (\$18.00) per hour, said clerk's pay shall be increased to eighteen dollars (\$18.00) per hour.

c) Any clerk who attends a properly scheduled meeting which is canceled ~~due to the lack of quorum for any reason~~ shall be paid a sum equal to ~~one (1) hour's~~ two (2) hour wage.

d) This section is effective May 1, 2005. (Ord. No 741, 6-8-00; Ord. No. 748, 5-10-01; Ord. No. 788, 4-14-05)

Alderman Anglace explained, the Clerk of the Board of Aldermen or any other Clerk that's employed by the City currently gets, if they show up for a meeting, they get \$18 an hour when they're working. If they show up for a meeting, they get paid one hour's pay. So we're going to increase it to two hours pay if they show up for a meeting and it's canceled.

Being no speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this matter. SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

7. RESCIND SECTION 2-96 APPOINTMENT

Sec. 2-96. Appointment.

The Mayor, within thirty (30) days after assuming the duties of his office shall appoint from the Board of Aldermen a finance committee.
(Ord. No. 275, 4-12-76)

Alderman Anglace explained, this has to do with the Charter. The Charter came along and superceded this ordinance. The ordinance says that the Mayor within 30 days after assuming duties of office shall appoint from the Board of Aldermen a Finance Committee. Well, the Charter has superceded that ordinance and sets forth that the appointment is made by the President of the Board of Aldermen various committees, and the Chairman, etc., it says how it will be done. We no longer need this; it's a clean up action.

Being no speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this item, SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

8. RESCIND SECTION 2-97 COMPOSITION; REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

Sec. 2-97. Composition; removal of members.

The finance committee shall consist of three (3) aldermen, one (1) of whom shall be designated by the mayor as chairman. Members of the finance committee shall hold

office until removed there-from by the mayor. The mayor is hereby vested with the same power of removal as provided in section 3.3.3 of the Charter.
(Ord. No. 275, 4-12-76)

Alderman Anglace explained, this is very similar to the one I just talked about, the Charter is superceding the ordinance. It has to do with the composition of the Finance Committee of the Board of Aldermen, and it no longer applies. So we're cleaning it up.

Being no speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

9. AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2-115.3 APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

Sec. 2-115.3. Appropriation of funds.

Commencing with fiscal year ~~2007-2008~~2012-2013 and each fiscal year thereafter, the board of aldermen shall allocate ~~two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250, a sum of money which is the lesser of the monies expended from the open space trust account in the previous fiscal year or Fifty Thousand and No/100 (\$50,000.00) Dollars~~ from the annual budget to the open space trust account which sum should be appropriated within forty-five (45) days of the commencement of the fiscal year. ~~The board of aldermen shall allocate fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000.00) from the annual budget to the open space trust account for the fiscal year 2006-2007.~~
(Ord. No. 802, 3, 9-14-06)

Alderman Anglace explained, this has to do with what I mentioned earlier, the Open Space Trust Account. Currently the ordinance requires \$250,000 to be put into the budget, and then within 45 days transferred from the budget to the Open Space Trust Account where the money is spent, not spent, whichever, from the recommendation of the Conservation Commission and approved by the Board of Aldermen. In discussions with the Chairman of the Conservation Commission, over the years we have purchased more property than we've had to put money into this fund. So we've outspent the ordinance limits and the Chairman suggested that the way to do it, since we are bonding, or short-term bonding under Board of Aldermen bonding, which is five-year bonding, or long-term bonding, which we haven't done with any of our property purchases, we felt that all we have to do to really put enough money in that trust account so that there'd be enough money there to explore the purchase of new properties via appraisals, any situations where you'd need expert opinion, attorneys fees, closing costs and stuff like that. We could take that money out of the Open Space Trust Account. So we agreed it looks pretty much like \$50,000 would replace what they spent the previous year out of the fund up to \$50,000. Thereby keep the fund in enough money to do what has to be done. Historically we did some research and we have not spent beyond this amount, so

we feel pretty comfortable that it would be enough for the purposes that it was intended.

Being no speakers on this item, Alderman Finn MOVED to close the hearing on this item; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman Simonetti MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Finn. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Bruder, Clerk
Board of Aldermen

Date Submitted: _____

DATE APPROVED: _____ BY: _____

Mark A. Lauretti
Mayor, City of Shelton