



Board of Aldermen  
Shelton, Connecticut  
FINANCE COMMITTEE –APRIL 22, 2004

---

Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Alderman Stanley Kudej, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.  
All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call - Finance Committee

Alderman Stanley Kudej, Chairman, present  
Aldermanic President John F. Anglace, Jr. - present  
Alderman Nancy Minotti, present

Alderman John Finn – present

Public Session

Alderman Kudej asked if any member of the public wished to address the Finance Committee.

---

Irving N. Steiner, Co-Founder, We R 1

I'd like to first ask if the subject will be the high speed approval of land use. Is that a subject of discussion tonight? I understand the town wants to get faster approval on large pieces of property when dealing with sale or purchase, and it was my understanding that might have been part of this portion of the meeting.

Alderman Anglace stated, the procedure for selling of City property is on our agenda. That is what you're referring to, right?

Mr. Steiner replied yes, that is what I'm referring to. Do we have a quorum? As you know, I represent We R 1 and I would like to give my comments on this high speed track that has been mentioned. I don't look forward to the City having faster speed at acquiring or disposing of property. Most of it is from past history. I could cite several examples to show that the City has had trouble in the past, even at their present pace, to handle acquisition and sale of property, both private and public. One of the cases I'd like to bring up is the Hurd property that is located north of Perry Hill Intermediate School. I've studied the history of that property. Mr. Hurd passed away, the property was put up for sale with the first dibs given to the City of Shelton and for some

reason, the property was turned down, I think it was selling for somewhere around \$300,000 and I think the confusion that appeared to generate at the time was that the powers that be thought that the property was south of the Perry Hill Intermediate School – now empty – when in fact it was not. There was property north, just adjacent to the Perry Hill. But in not picking up on the right of first refusal, the property was purchased by a local developer.

I don't know what went on in Executive Session, but somewhere down the line the City realized the mistake and went back to the person that has purchased it and bought the property back. The developer charged the City almost twice as much for the repurchase of the property. Part of that property is still a rental that the City is playing landlord with.

The second item, which again shows a weakness in the administration in handling these types of purchases and acquisitions, is the Mayor's purchase on 110, which was through Black & Decker, a publicly owned business, with stockholders. The Mayor himself faulted his own administration's land use departments for failure to take first dibs. That is the reason that I don't feel we should go on fast track at this time. I thank you.

---

Judson W. Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue

I, too, would like to go on record as stating I am against the procedures that are going to be discussed this evening for the selling of City property. First off, I don't think you even need to even waste your time discussing this. You have the ordinances that are in place, set in the Charter, it goes before the Conservation Commission, back to here, if it is supposed to be done, you have to request an 8-24 referral, and the different sections are solely spelled out, step by step, it's already set in motion for you. I am totally against it.

Number two. What you might be discussing this evening, the resolution establishing procedure for the purchasing at auctions. That one there I am totally against. I'll set the record straight. I am against that motion. You are putting too much responsibility into the hands of one person. If you wish to cite different items, the one thing that stands in my mind is what you did, when the City purchased the ladder truck from the City of New York. We're having problems. Any time we go out and you're going to buy something second hand, you're buying someone else's problems.

Third. I don't think you even need to even discuss this. It is solely set up in the Charter. To find it, you would look under Section 7.14.3. Everything is covered there under the section of Waiver of Bids.

I won't take the time to read this; I'm sure you each have a copy of the Charter.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the April taxes are correct. Thank you.

Alderman Anglace asked Alderman Kudej, could you ask the last speaker if he would give us a reference to which ordinance he was referring to?

Alderman Kudej asked Mr. Crawford to answer the question.

Mr. Crawford stated, did I use the terminology, "ordinance"? Well, I must back track and say there is not a City Ordinance for that. But you do have certain procedures spelled out going from the Conservation Commission, if then from the Planning and Zoning requesting an 8-24 Referral, if that does come back favorably and you wish to go out for sale, then that has to be listed and that comes before, then, us, the Board of A & T, we would open the bids and present to you people, the Board of Aldermen then, what the highest bidder would be.

Alderman Anglace stated, what you're referring to is the 8-24 – Section 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statutes, which require that any purchase or sale of any City property has to have an 8-24 Referral from the Planning and Zoning Commission, upon which time if they report favorably, to proceed with the recommended purchase and sale, then the Board of Aldermen just has to prove it by majority, but if they recommend against selling or purchasing whatever is recommended, then the Board of Aldermen needs to proceed only with a 2/3 vote of the entire body. That we understand and have done for years.

With respect to opposing a procedure to sell, putting a procedure in place to sell, that's incorporated in the recommendation, or at least what we've got to discuss tonight. We haven't omitted any reference to the 8-24.

Mr. Crawford stated, I'm just saying I don't feel you even need to go into any discussion this evening. You have everything set in black and white. Thank you.

---

Chris Panek, 19 Meghan Lane

I also would like to go on record against any resolution that is going to allow a Shelton employee or City official to go to public auction to purchase a vehicle or equipment on behalf of the City. As Mr. Crawford alluded to, I think there's too much potential risk involved in terms of one person making a

decision to purchase a used piece of equipment, not only in terms of the equipment possibly being defective or the City taking on the responsibility of previous problems with a piece of equipment, you're just putting too much authority sending, say, a Public Works official to an auction, and also you really need to define what an auction is. Is an auction somebody – a business has five pieces of equipment for sale and we want to go there and offer a price for it, or is an auction an actual public auction where there are other bidders involved for the equipment? I think the liability is way too big and the responsibility is too much to give one person a blank check to go out and buy a piece of equipment on behalf of the City. Thanks.

---

Tom LaTulipe, 91 Toas Street

Mr. Chairman, I've seen many cases where people buy used vehicles and they're very satisfied with them. The reason for that is, they have time to take into consideration the care that vehicle has had. When we go to buy, like Mr. Jud said, the fire truck, we had many, many problem with and still have problems I understand, the used vehicles we bought for the DPW down there. Talk to the employees, I understand one of them didn't have a radiator, and all of them had to be painted and refurbished, and there's no warranty on these vehicles. You can't go to the manufacturer and complain. I bought a 1987 Suburban. I had problems with it. From the dealer that I bought it from. Not with the dealer. With the vehicle itself. The paint peeling off. The only thing I got satisfaction from was going back to the manufacturer, and they rectified that problem. If we buy a used vehicle, there's no warranty on these vehicles. They have auctions all the time. The state has auctions on equipment they have up there, I believe it's up in Wethersfield. But you're taking pot luck when you buy these vehicles, and it's impossible. I know I was in the mechanical trade for 25 years with my son. And it's impossible almost. People come in and they say, "I want to buy this car, I want to take and have it inspected and see how good it is." You don't have X-ray eyes, you can't look inside of a transmission or inside of a motor and see what's going on in there. So I really think we ought to think strongly about the situation before we buy any used vehicles. I thank you very much for your time.

Alderman Kudej asked three times if any member of the public wished to address the Finance Committee. Being none, he declared the Public Session closed.

#### Add-Ons

Alderman Anglace MOVED TO ADD THE FOLLOWING to the agenda:

Item #6 – Fire Truck #40 Pine Rock Park; SECONDED by Alderman Minotti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

1. Approval of Minutes

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board to waive the reading and approve the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting of March 25, 2004; SECONDED by Alderman Minotti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

2. Refund of Taxes

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of \$44,158.77 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 Tax Refunds account #001-6100-412-80.42; SECONDED by Alderman Minotti.

Alderman Anglace stated, it should be noted that the full Board approved the overexpenditure of this account to the end of the fiscal year.

A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

3. Procedure for Selling City Property

Alderman Anglace stated, this item is for discussion.

Alderman Finn stated, I'm not a member of this committee, but I'd like to make some comments, even though I'm not a member of the committee. The definition for selling the City property basically asks, the City may ask or may decide to sell property it owns. This property may be a small fraction of land or a building lot or parcel consisting of several acres. It may also be property containing buildings. This procedure pertains only to property of significant size, a building lot or larger, with or without buildings on it.

If you recall, back in the Hope days, when Mayor Hope was in office, Mayor Hope was doing something very similar. There has to be procedures in place how he did it. He sold small parcels of land that the City received in lieu of taxes. He went through the same procedures as Mr. Crawford spoke about earlier as it did go out to bid and the bids were open, and from there the property was sold. So procedures already have to be in place. There also when the Hope administration they sold two schools downtown so, including, I'm not sure if they're going to sell this one but they're trying to sell the Shelton Community Center at that time which is Huntington School.

Something there already has to be in place. I think the Board of Aldermen have to be careful what we're doing. When you're looking at anything over a building lot, I believe the Board should hold public hearings so the public is aware of exactly what acreage are we referring to and where this property is located. If we're looking at something that is larger than that, I think it should go out to referendum and the voters should decide within the City of Shelton as to whether or not we're going to sell a building such as I'm going to use for an example such as the Intermediate School. The old Intermediate School. Also for the Mas property. We, the aldermen, should not make the decision on that. The voters should be the ones making the decision.

Alderman Anglace stated, first of all, let's begin at the beginning. We received a letter from George Sender to buy two lots on Tuxedo Avenue. He owns one lot and he wanted to buy the lots on either side. This triggered the thought of, go search and see what is in place. How do you go about doing this? How do you – we received other requests from people to buy lots that adjoin their property, especially down in Pine Rock Park. We've received requests from other people to purchase City-owned land, and each time we get a request, we don't have , and I'm not talking about these little slivers that we've had to deal with that are just obvious – they make sense that we can't use them for anything and we put it back on the tax rolls, that makes sense – and you give it to the adjoining property owner. That's not of material size. But the issue became one of, how do we do this to protect the City's interest, and how do we do this to make sure that it isn't just given to somebody who is a buddy of mine or a buddy of yours or some other friend, or somebody – the first person that spoke up about it. There has got to be a procedure in place to handle the way we go forward with it. I totally agree with you that we have to be careful in how we craft this, because you'll notice that this is on the Finance Committee agenda. It was passed out to all of the Aldermen, but it's on the Finance Committee agenda for discussion only. That is the purpose of it, so we go forward on it very carefully. We're in agreement on that.

I put this together with respect to how we go forward with it. Now, it may be that something as large as 66 acres, we have to take a look at it. When I heard reference to that, larger sized properties, larger sized buildings, you've got to weigh that against, do we authorize a \$26,000 referendum to determine whether we sell something or not, or do we wait until the next election comes up to put it on the ballot. You've got to weigh that against what it is that you're doing.

Alderman Anglace continued, look at the other side of it. The Charter gives the Board of Aldermen certain powers to do certain things, to spend certain monies, because we are the elected representatives of the people. That authority to do those things should be considered when we're weighing this. It's a balance. What is in front of us tonight, and the reason that we've got it here and the reason that we put it point by point is to look at each point, to see what value each point has, and what it will do in formulating a procedure.

Alderman Finn stated, that's why I brought up the fact that underneath the Hope administration there had to be a procedure in place, because they were selling parcels left and right in the City of Shelton, and there were parcels that they gained through in lieu of taxes or they had liens on them. The only other parcels that they sold besides that were Commodore Hull School and Ferry School downtown here in Shelton. Again, what I'm saying is something like Commodore Hull School or Ferry School, if that was today, I would prefer that it go out to referendum, or like you said, in the November ballot. Because I don't think we should make the decision to sell City property of that size. That should be left up to the voters.

Alderman Anglace stated, Jack, I'm not agreeing or disagreeing with you, I'm saying that's why we're talking about it tonight – to go through the issue to see what is here. You have made reference twice to something, procedure back in the Hope days. That should be researched. We should see if we could find that and see what it said, because procedures, we have started, in recent years, a Board of Aldermen's Procedures Book that when we develop a procedure, that goes into the book that is kept with the Board of Aldermen Clerk, so that procedures for water – how you go about getting water – how you go about getting sewers – all of that has been put down in procedure form, a format that can be followed. That is what I think we're talking about here, doing the same thing here.

If you look at the first one, a request received to sell City-owned property of significant size, we needed to put the words "significant size" in there so that when you get these slivers of land that the state has given to the City in certain areas, they don't need them for road construction so they give them to us, we take them, but that's not what we're talking about. Those generally are more than not can go to the adjacent property owner because nobody is going to use them under hardly any conditions.

The requests come in from a number of sources. We would send it to Conservation, because Conservation does a couple of things for us that I think are very important. One of the things they do in making their recommendation for us, is to research the deed on the property to see if the

property is deed restricted – if it can be sold. Some properties cannot be sold. They're given to the City as open space properties in perpetuity. You can't sell them. It's very important for us to know what the deed says and what the deed restrictions might be.

We look to Open Space for an opinion from them also. Does this fit into our Open Space Plans, if it does, they'll come back to us, Conservation, Open Space will come back to us and tell us what value the City has to the property, what the deed restrictions are, and give us a recommendation.

If they say there are no problems, we recommend you sell it, then the next step would be to go to Planning and Zoning for an 8-24 Referral. 8-24 Referrals are required by State law.

Alderman Finn stated, one of the things that I found out is when some of the Planning and Zoning members receive these 8-24 Referrals from us, they don't receive any backup. They don't receive backup pertaining to our request. There is a lot of discussion on one parcel on Buddington Road. That was openly discussed at Planning and Zoning. We had questions pertaining to backup information and there was none available. They were going by hearsay and comments made by various members of staff to Planning and Zoning. I believe that in the future, if we send anything to Planning and Zoning, we should also provide them with all the backup information they need to make a decision.

Alderman Anglace stated, good point. Whatever we have available to us, certainly at that point we can send it to them. Now, if they come back with a favorable 8-24 and say, go ahead and sell it, proceed with it, then if it's favorable we proceed. If it's not favorable, then the only way you can proceed is if the Board of Aldermen override the unfavorable by a 2/3 vote.

If the 8-24 is favorable, or if the not favorable is overridden, and the Board of Aldermen proceeds, the next step would be to have the land appraised. See what its appraised value is. Upon receiving the appraisal, the City would advertise it's accepting bids, no lower than the appraised price, or, another price higher than that if the Board of Aldermen determine that it should be put on the market for the lowest bid being higher than that – whatever price they determine. Then you also set a cutoff date to received sealed bids. Then you require all of the bids to be accompanied with a cashier's check in the amount equal to 10 percent of the purchase price, so that you know that you're getting bids from responsible people.

Alderman Finn stated, on the appraisals, how are you going to word that in the bid spec. Really, when you go out to bid, you don't want to tell anybody exactly what the dollar figure is you're looking for.

Alderman Anglace stated, if we're selling a piece of property, we need to know what the appraised value of it is.

Alderman Finn stated, we do, but you won't put that in the bid.

Alderman Anglace stated, what we would put in the bid, we would use that to determine the starting point. In other words, let's say we have a piece of property we want to sell and the appraised price is \$200,000. The Aldermen would then consider that. They could say, we'll sell it but we won't accept anything less than \$200,000. So that's the starting bid. We put it out to bid. Anybody can bid on it, the lowest bid to start is \$200,000. Then the Finance Committee of the Board of Apportionment and Taxation would open the bids with the Purchasing Agent, and determine who is the highest, the same as they do now, determine who is the highest responsible bidder.

Then the Board of Aldermen would approve the bid and authorize the sale. Beyond that, Counsel would come up with a contract to sell and the Aldermen would authorize the Mayor to sign it. The proceeds from the sale would go into the General Fund, unless the Aldermen designated another use.

Alderman Finn stated, if we're going to be selling property, building lots, 50 x 50 or 50 x 100, that is basically what you call green space in downtown Shelton. We decide to sell property in downtown Shelton. I believe that money probably should go to the Conservation Commission or the Open Space Account, but maybe designate it to help purchase property in the future in the downtown area.

Alderman Anglace stated, it's all in here, that the second step is for Conservation and Open Space to give us an opinion. We would consider their opinion. We're not making any hard and fast decisions to sell anything. All we're doing is putting in place a procedure to be followed so that we could ensure that all the things that should be done are going to be done if you get to this point.

This guy came and said, "sell me two lots." Now I can write him back a letter tomorrow and say, "no, we won't." That may be the opinion of the Board.

But if somebody sends us a letter then ultimately that letter has got to come to the Board to decide, yes or no. All I'm saying is before we get this, we should do all of these things, which I think are prudent things to do, before we make a decision.

Alderman Finn stated, I agree with you on that, but again, the flag is raised because they're talking about buildings, large parcels of property. That is altogether different than what we're discussing right now.

Alderman Anglace stated, look, this is the first discussion on this thing. Obviously, there are probably some darned good points that are going to come out of it. They will come out of it from us, from the public. I think we should absolutely take no action beyond discussing this tonight, and then get back, let people feed us back information. I don't think anybody would disagree that it's prudent to put in place a procedure to be followed if somebody asks us the question, "sell me this property." If you want, we could put a procedure in that we won't sell any property. But I wouldn't say that – if you put in a procedure we won't sell any property, we may. We may want to. Look at what we did with the two lots up at Sara-Nor Drive. We swapped those two lots that were unusable for the property that is going to become Constitution Park that was – it's a plus. Whether we sell or we swap or trade, this procedure should still be followed in whole or in part. I listened tonight, and I made some notes, and we'll have the benefit of the thinking that we received tonight and we'll bring it up again and talk about it next month and see if we can refine it further.

Alderman Minotti asked, is there no procedure in place now? Is that what you're saying?

Alderman Anglace replied, no it's not – we're not going to take any action, we're simply looking to put one together. We're just discussing it tonight.

Alderman Finn stated, we're not sure if there is or not. In the Hope administration there had to be some sort of procedure in place because they were selling property. There had to be guidelines for him to follow.

Alderman Anglace stated, we'll go forward from there.

Alderman Kudej stated, most of this is pretty well spelled out, going through all the commissions and boards to see if we need the property or we don't need the property and has it any value for us. But right there on the first side, it says "significant size." If we've got anything of significant size, I think we should maintain. And if we have to get rid of some big parcel of land, maybe we should have to go to the public to see if it's well worth selling.

Alderman Anglace stated, look at the order this is in. First the request is received to sell. You can get requests from people all the time that want to buy.

Alderman Kudej stated, I think we have to redefine "significant size." Small parcels of land, up to an acre or so that nobody wants, maybe.

Alderman Anglace stated, we'll work on that. We're probably going to encounter a number of different types of examples that we have to think about. Quickly, off the top of my head, I can think of Pine Rock Park where we've had any number of requests from homeowners where City owned property to the rear of them would allow them to park their cars that they couldn't do now. It's extremely difficult terrain. The other thing is, if you recall from some of those homeowners in Pine Rock Park, they have said we'd even be willing to deed restrict – you can sell it to us and we would deed restrict that we would not build anything on it. So all of this can be added – it can all come in.

Alderman Kudej stated, it needs to be refined a little bit.

Alderman Anglace stated, this is the first go-around, we'll put it on the agenda again for next month.

5. Resolution Establishing a Procedure to Purchase at Auction

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board that the following resolution be adopted.

Be it Resolved that the Board of Aldermen hereby establishes a procedure for bidding at public auctions, provided the following steps are followed:

1. That the specifications for desired equipment are determined in advance.
2. That the book value of the desired equipment is determined in advance of the auction.
3. That the Board of Aldermen authorizes a "bid not to exceed" price in advance of the auction.
4. That the Board of Aldermen waives bidding and authorizes auction bidding on the specific type of equipment sought.

5. That the Board of Aldermen designates persons who have authority to act on behalf of the City as our "agent."
6. That the designated "agent" makes a pre-auction inspection of the equipment.
7. That the "agent" is bonded.
8. Auctions usually require a "cashier's check" or a "certified check." The "agent" should investigate the pre-approval bidding process and utilize it if it applies.
9. That the "agent" is limited to bid only on pre-approved type equipment with a maximum bid price established by consensus of the Board of Aldermen.

SECONDED by Alderman Kudej.

Alderman Anglace stated, if we're going to go to auction and bid on some equipment, we can't publicly let everybody know what the bid price is going to be, because then you won't be bidding. We would have to do that by consensus – establish a price by consensus. I think that is something that has to be checked out by Counsel. He looked this over, but I would specifically ask that he look to see that establishing a consensus to bid is an appropriate executive session item.

Alderman Kudej stated, I would like to see a person that is more or less an expert on that particular item we're bidding on in this proposal - not just anybody.

If we're going to go out and bid on a motor vehicle, we want somebody that is mechanically inclined and knows what to look for, and spot problems – not just somebody that we authorize to have a check in his hand.

Alderman Anglace stated, that is why it's worded to say that the Board of Aldermen designates "persons" who have authority to act on behalf of the City as our "agent." We would not authorize anybody unless they were an expert in this area.

Alderman Finn stated, I'm not a member of the committee, but I have reservations about this since the beginning. I thank Alderman Anglace for putting some of my thoughts into it, especially when it comes to agent and bonding. Again, I agree with the speakers here tonight who pointed out the

fact of Ladder 33 at the Huntington Fire Station. Then we bought three sanitation trucks from the New York Department of Sanitation. One of the trucks actually had to be brought up here on a flatbed to the City of Shelton because it didn't have a radiator. Honestly, I've never seen those three trucks on the street since we purchased them. Maybe they have been out, but I haven't seen them. You have to be cautious as the Aldermen have stated. You need somebody that will have to have knowledge and knowing exactly what to look for, because when you go to these auctions, you might be able to tell about the engine from the oil, but what else can you tell about the machine where the other problems are that just aren't visible. That's the concern of mine. I just can't see spending \$50,000 or higher for a piece of equipment that might become a burden to the City of Shelton. I caution you on this. In fact, I really think Counsel should look at this to find out if we are moving in the right direction, even before this goes to the Board of Aldermen, if he has the chance to review it. You have to remember that resolutions are non-binding. We can pass all the resolutions we want to, but they're really non-binding.

Alderman Anglace stated, they're not binding on the next Board of Aldermen.

Alderman Finn stated, that's correct.

Alderman Anglace stated, let's go back to the fire truck. I heard it mentioned a couple of times. That wasn't purchased at auction. That was purchased on the recommendation of the Board of Fire Commissioners and we authorized it. It wasn't purchased at auction. When you talk about the fire truck and use it as an example – it's a poor example because any ladder truck - all the ladder trucks we have, have the same problems meeting OSHA requirements. The specs are so tight. Even the ones that we bought brand new have trouble doing that.

The one thing you said that I would buy into, first of all, I don't see this as something that is absolutely a must. I'll be glad to table this to allow more time to think about it, to receive more suggestions; more ideas. I'll be glad to do that. The way this was presented to me was that it's an opportunity to save money. That's all it is. You've got people – it doesn't say it in here – but first of all the Purchasing Agent should be one of those agents that we're talking about. The second person should be the department head that is going to use the equipment, and third should be somebody that understands the equipment and can look at it pre-auction.

If we go forward it's ...

TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO

...table it and take more time to think about it and receive more ideas. But the way they suggested it to me, if you take a \$200,000 piece of equipment and you can buy it at auction for \$70,000, and they feel comfortable, whoever the people are that understand these things, that it's a good piece of equipment, that it's renovated, it's in good shape, they understand and we should understand that any piece of equipment is going to require maintenance. I have a 1989 Lincoln that requires maintenance. But the maintenance is far less than buying a brand-new Lincoln.

Alderman Finn stated, when you want to buy a brand-new Lincoln, you also get a warranty with it for a number of years. It covers a majority of the items on that vehicle. When you buy something at an auction, there is no coverage for maintenance. That burden now becomes the burden of the City of Shelton and we can have a major problem with an item in six months or nine months. It could end up becoming costly to us instead of saving money.

Alderman Anglace stated, what they also tell me is that, before this equipment goes on the block for auction sale, that it is renovated, or

Alderman Kudej interjected, most auctions they have an inspection period prior to the bid. The people that are designated to go out and bid, they inspect the item to the best of their ability and then they make their – on that inspection.

Alderman Anglace stated, I don't think this is intended, and we can put this restriction in, we're not talking about buying police cars at auction. We're talking about heavy equipment; specialized equipment that you don't use every day, and that you don't need throughout the whole year. The people in Public Works feel that you can save money by buying it at auction.

Alderman Finn stated, I'm not a member of your committee, but if you'd prefer to table it I think I'd look favorably upon it.

Alderman Anglace MOVED to TABLE; SECONDED by Alderman Minotti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

6. Fire Truck #40 – Pine Rock Park

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board to transfer \$4,722.23 from Contingency General account to Fire Vehicle Fund account for the purpose of paying expenses incurred in conjunction with the make ready of Truck #40 Pine Rock Park; SECONDED by Alderman Minotti.

Alderman Anglace stated, this is the new truck that came into Pine Rock Park – the one that CRRRA gave us. But it didn't have the equipment on the back. So to make it a useful brush and small fire truck, they had to put the equipment on the back, and that equipment came to \$4,722.23.

Alderman Finn stated, that money would be well spent – I loved the work that Commissioner Sabatino has done to that truck – the truck responded to Sikorsky Aircraft when we had a false alarm two weeks ago, and it looks real nice and again, Commissioner Sabatino put a lot of work into that truck and the \$4,000 will be well spent.

Adjournment

At approximately 6:55 p.m., Alderman Anglace MOVED to adjourn;  
SECONDED by Alderman Minotti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION  
PASSED 3-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Regan  
Clerk, Board of Aldermen