



Board of Aldermen Shelton, Connecticut *FINANCE COMMITTEE – JANUARY 23, 2007*

Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Alderman Stanley Kudej, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:45 p.m., immediately following the Public Hearing on Ordinances.

Roll Call - Finance Committee

Alderman Stanley Kudej, Chairman, present
Aldermanic President John F. Anglace, Jr. - present
Alderman Christopher Panek – present

Public Session

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

Audit Report Presentation – Finance Director Louis Marusic

Mr. Marusic stated, at a former meeting we were talking about time frames for audit reports. I happen to have an audit report from 1976 in my hand here – I want you to take a look at it later. I have the audit reports for the fiscal year ended 2006 – 30 years later – this is what it looks like now. There are three audit reports in here – local, federal and state. The reporting requirements are so substantial now that it makes the audit report of 30 years ago look pale by comparison. The audit report of 30 years ago was a \$12 million budget, and now it's pushing a billion dollars – there is no comparison.

The State Statutes take into consideration the effects of Financial Accounting Standard Board pronouncements such as GASB34 and now GASB45. Believe me, it takes a lot of preparation. We are not a corporate environment – we have so much paperwork and red tape, through Statutes, applied to us that it just takes the time to do it. We do it in a very fine fashion as our audit report for 2006 from the

auditors would testify. I'm really not going to spend a lot of time unless you have questions – maybe we can do that later in a workshop – or whatever.

We have three audit reports – the audit report on federal awards – the City administered \$2.2 million of federal awards. Our City auditors issued a very excellent audit report which indicated that there were no material audit findings or question costs being reported related to federal awards. That resulted in the issuance of their unqualified auditor's report. This is one of the highest reports that you could possibly get. On that basis, the staffs of both the City and the Board of Education are commended for their good performance related to the administration of federal awards. I believe you all have the response to their audit report. Management letters, so they call them.

The second one is the audit report on State Financial Assisted Programs. The City administered \$6.1 million of expenditures for State Financial Assisted programs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, which does not include the total of exempt programs of approximately \$13.9 million for the Board of Education, which was in addition. No material audit findings or question costs are reported by the auditors relating to State Financial Assistance programs, which has resulted in their issuance of the unqualified auditors report, again, the highest type of a report that can be given. Staffs of both the City and the Board of Education are commended for their good performance related to the administration of State Financial Assisted programs.

Thirdly, we have the audit management letter, suggestions for recommendations of improvement on the General Fund and the Scully and Wolf Audit Management Letter received on December 28, 2006 showed no instance of non-compliance – and I stress that - under government auditing standards, and no reportable material internal control weaknesses, and I also stress that. Several suggestions for consideration toward modifying or improving the accounting controls administrative practices were made. I won't go into the detail but our response followed on that.

Again, this report was unqualified – this is the highest form of report that a municipality would want to receive. So if you have any questions, you have all the details, I would entertain them. Perhaps if

you have specific questions, I would also entertain any specific question you might have either now or later on. I thank you.

Alderman Anglace asked, is this a joint report or is it only including education in some aspects?

Mr. Marusic replied, this is for every fund of the City including the Board of Ed. There was only one relative comment made for the Board of Education, and that was an improvement that has already been implemented before the comment ever was printed. We thank the Board of Education for following up real quickly on that.

Alderman Anglace stated, on the management of State Financial – that's where the Board of Education,

Mr. Marusic interjected, no, it's on funds that were being passed to us more quickly now from one of the special revenue funds on education to the General Fund. The auditors asked us to speed that up, and going from quarterly or whatever, and they're doing it on a monthly basis, and we thank them for that. It improves the cash flow, that's all.

Alderman Anglace stated, document 1 is the summary, document 2 is the report that you got the details on the federal and document 3 is the details on the state managed funds.

Mr. Marusic replied, yes.

Alderman Kudej thanked Mr. Marusic.

Add-Ons

Alderman Anglace MOVED to add as Item 11 – Animal Shelter Building Committee Start Up Funds; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. 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 regular Finance Committee meeting of November 28, 2006; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

2. January Statutory Refunds

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 **\$17,668.40** 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 Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO

Alderman Anglace MOVED to amend the agenda and move Item 3 – Electricity Rate Discussion to Item 5 in order to take up Items 4 and 5 first; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

3. Budget Increase for Police Private Duty

Assistant Finance Director Sharon Scanlon explained, this is strictly a budget increase on both sides – the expenditure and the revenue. There is an incredible amount of private duty is going on. We have gone through our whole year allotment – I had budgeted a half-million dollars – we’ve gone through all of that, as well as collected the revenue on the other side. This is just to get us through the rest of the year on private duty.

Alderman Anglace stated, this has happened before.

Alderman Anglace MOVED to move to recommend to the full Board to increase expenditure line item 001-6100-511.80-50 by \$500,000 for Police Private Duty and increase Revenue Line Item 001-0000-351.10-00 by \$500,000 for Police Private Duty; SECONDED by Alderman Panek.

Alderman Anglace stated, this is a wash account. The money comes in from the private sources, goes into the revenue side, and is paid out on the expenditure side. Just washes through our books, and that’s it. When we start the year we always guess how much they’re going to run. It’s run higher than we guessed.

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

4. *Extension of Agreement Between City of Shelton and Worker's Compensation*

Administrative Assistant Sandra Nesteriak explained, this is also another instance where the City and the Board of Education work very closely together. The City contracts with the vendor to provide third party administrator services for our workers comp program that we self insure. The process includes all of the members of the Board of Education as well. We have very close communications with the Human Resources at the Board in order to make this program work smoothly.

In your motion #5 on the agenda packet, there is a line in parentheses that says current agreement – expires March 1st, and provides for an extension. The part about it expiring March 1st is correct – there is no provision for an extension. However, I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of extending the program for another three years. The increase in cost is just about three percent and the cost remains steady each of the three years of the previous contract. So it's a modest increase.

Every year, we get a book like this which is a representative study of all the workers comp claims. Part of the material that we get is status reports on the outstanding claims, and they're very detailed. We meet quarterly, including the Board of Education, with the principals at the Connecticut Healthcare Trust to discuss procedures, policies, positions, next course of action, in order to bring about a successful resolution to our workers comp claims, to get our employees healthy and back to work and to clear up any problems that might be along the way.

We have daily access to our claims rep who is designated specifically for Shelton. The manager is available to us at a moment's notice. As I said, we have quarterly meetings with the principals. We are able to dictate who our counsel is, and this is not always the case. We are able to save a considerable amount of money on counsel on hearings and so forth because we use our own Corporation Counsel and we're not charged extra for legal fees, which is an enormous savings.

We get special monthly out of work reports so we can track for family medical leave and various sorts of programs that are in place, that nobody is falling through the cracks. We have seen such an improvement in the administration of the claims through this particular TPA than we've had in the past. I've been here for almost 16 years – this is the fourth TPA we've had and it is by far the best.

They provide us training opportunities free for those of us who care to go. I have a brochure they send out, and there's everything from OSHA Recordkeeping, Defensive Driving, and it goes on and on. They provide a risk management service. The thing that I think you'll find most important is they talked us into, some while ago, having a managed care proposal for the, [passing out a paper to the Aldermen]

This is an excerpt from the last report. They saved us more in our managed care costs than we paid them in the entire three years, and that's in one year. That will identify managed care proposal.

They are a professional service - we don't have to go to bid, we did bid them originally or went for a Request for Proposals originally, and at this point in time, I hope you adopt the proposed motion in front of you which would be to recommend to the full Board to extend the agreement. Any questions?

Alderman Panek asked, was this the end of this contract was their first three-year contract with the City?

Ms. Nesteriak replied, no, it's the second three-year contract.

Alderman Panek stated, okay, so they've had it for six years and our motion is to approve another.

Ms. Nesteriak stated, we are all wonderfully satisfied with them. I think the savings speak for themselves. This is one year saving, last year's saving – the 2005 to 2006 fiscal year saving. I don't have the current figures available yet. But the cost of the contract is \$43,500 for each of the next three years.

Alderman Anglace stated, the motion, and it says renewal at an annual cost of \$43,500 per year. How did you manage to get \$43,500 in each

year of a three-year contract? That's pretty good, because usually they look for an increase.

Ms. Nesteriak stated, they went up from about \$42,000 from the prior three years. I think it's a very modest increase and very fair, given the services they provide.

Alderman Anglace stated, I think you said that the Board of Education also shares.

Ms. Nesteriak stated, all the employees of the Board of Education that were injured are serviced by this third-party administrator, and our quarterly meetings include Sue Attard-Kollet, the Human Resources Manager for the Board of Education.

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board to extend the agreement between the City of Shelton and Workers Compensation Trust for three years for an annual cost of \$43,500 per year for the Third Party Administration of Worker's Compensation claims, and to authorize Mayor Mark A. Lauretti to sign any necessary documents to effectuate same; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

5. Electricity Rate Discussion

Alderman Anglace stated, we took the liberty of inviting Mr. Cameron here. He has had some discussion with UI and others on the subject of electricity rates and we asked if he would be willing to share it with us. This is an example of another successful joint venture with the Board of Education.

[Mr. Cameron distributed packets to the Board]

Al Cameron, 307 Meadow Ridge Road
Finance Director, Board of Education

I'd like to begin by thanking Alderman Anglace for inviting me to come. I hope that I can represent well the efforts that Lou Marusic and I have been making, and actually have made over the years, to work together. Always, the energy that we have purchased, whether it's electric, natural gas, fuel oil or diesel, we've always purchased

cooperatively. The City has always taken the lead and we've always done very well.

Historically, if you look at the seven-year rolling average which our consortium was doing, the price we paid at the New Haven Harbor is more effective than any of the lock-ins were for all of those years. So we've done well. But, our environment has changed. That is what this is all about.

This is a presentation – and I won't take you through all of it – that we participated in, but it was about electrical deregulation. Where we find ourselves is in a situation where we all know it from home – UI has had an increase for residential ratepayers from 38 percent to commercial ratepayers up to 78 percent in the generation portion of our electric bill. This is a presentation by a company called Enernoc, which offers solutions. I won't take you through the whole thing, I'll just suggest to you that it's a really good, sort of a primer, on what has happened and why it has happened.

Rather than go through it all, I'll just say Enernoc is one of many people that offers services to us now that have not been available before. In the electrical business, as UI ratepayers we have been guaranteed a very low price for generation. It's called the standard offer. Years ago when the deregulation took place, and it's in here, UI bought a long term contract to get fuel, get electricity, from non regulated sources. They bought four years worth at a very low price. That is the reason why we are all experiencing these incredible increases today, because they had a great price for four years. In the four years that have happened, we've seen Katrina, and other things, and so the spot price has changed incredibly. That's why the percentage increase is so big.

One of the things that happened in the deregulation is that you are able to go out and shop for electricity. We've been working with Lou and Bob Wilcox on, how are we going to do that.

We belong to a purchasing consortium. The purchasing consortium is 121 Boards of Education across the State. What we do mostly is we buy paper, pens, glue stick, crayons, all school supplies basically. But over the years it has grown to include – you can buy copiers, you can

buy fuel oil, they buy futures, and a few years ago, they put together a consortium to buy electricity.

When the State rates became deregulated, they aggregated a bunch of Boards of Education and said, 'do you want to go together, use our combined purchasing power and buy electricity.' They made a partnership with a company called Strategic Energy, and they did it. But when it went into effect, the price for the generation portion, which is the part you can buy, was still significantly higher than the price that we were already buying from UI. So the effect of it was, well, there are 121 Boards of Education in this thing – the only ones for whom this was a good deal were the people that were buying electricity from Connecticut Light & Power. All the UI people stayed with UI and stayed on the standard offer.

We've had meeting with UI as recently as November, and UI said, until then, they hadn't lost, as much as they wanted to, they hadn't lost a customer from their standard offer because there wasn't a better price. They say there was deregulation, but if all the prices are higher, why would anybody move?

That's kind of where we are today. The Board of Education is in a consortium and the City has access to the same consortium. Just so nobody gets concerned, this costs \$50 a year to belong to. This is sort of a low-profile – it's a school business managers' consortium. In any event, there is a consortium, membership is voluntary, we've given in our information, I've just got today an e-mail from Bob Wilcox with all of the City's information, so the City is in the position to participate when the time comes.

What the form of that takes, is you get a phone call or an e-mail that says the strike price is 'x'. Right now, it's 9.125 cents per kilowatt hour. Now, just as a frame of reference, the price that we had been paying on December 31st was 4.063 cents per kilowatt hour, so it has been more than 100 percent increase. But that's not the final price. Probably, the price won't settle out until about March. We've been advised that March – there are two times of the year if you're going to be buying electricity, there are two times of the year you want to be doing it – you want to be doing it in September in a non-Katrina year, and you want to do it in March. So we're still kind of waiting to pull the trigger and see where things fall out.

What we've learned is, our budget this year is \$1 million for electricity. When you see our budget for next year you're going to see \$1.5 million. That's because of the advice that UI gave us – that we were going to have a 50 percent increase. When you see huge numbers like that you really start to get interested in, gee, what can we do? And the first thing that we can do is shop for electricity at a better price. I don't think we can answer this tonight, but there are a couple of ways that we can do it. One is through the consortium, but that is not the only way. This company here will put together a bid specification for us. They will come in and they will gather the same information that I've gotten from Bob Wilcox, from UI, they'll put together a load profile, they'll put together a reliability requirement and they will offer to the 11 companies that have been approved by the State Department of Utility Regulating Commission, they will go to them and approach them as to how much they would bid to provide us as a wholesaler. That's an option that's out there.

There's a local energy consultant that approached me about a week ago, who offered that he would provide that service. These guys do it on a mill and a half per kilowatt hour basis, which for us would be about \$12,000. The other guy talks about doing it on a contingent fee basis which he's thinking 15 to 20 percent of the savings, compared with the existing rate. But that's only a piece of it. That is just buying.

The next this is managing the demand. The best dollar that you can save is one you never had to spend at all. When the prices go up so much, other options start to look attractive. There are people that are out there offering services that were never offered before. One of them is what they call a demand response approach. What that means is that you can get money for dropping your demand. You can either drop your demand voluntarily by going offline – they call you and in a half-hour you have to go offline – and you could get money to build what they call distributed generation facilities which – you go off line and you go onto your own local generator.

We've talked with these people about that, we've talked with the local aggregator, we've been talking with the State Department of Ed because as you guys know, we have the High School renovation project going on, we have the 5-6 going on, and we want to position ourselves to get the most amount of subsidy that we can for energy

efficiency in those buildings. We're trying to access any outside help that we can find that knows how to get grants for these alternative programs. The alternative programs are available to us and they're available to you. I don't think I could give you an exhaustive list, I can only tell you that there are different rate structures available depending on how reliable you want your power to be.

Now, if you want it to be the same old UI as it's always been and you don't want to think about it, they can put it on autopilot and we can pay a fixed price. Or, if we want to, we could take half of our load – our load is about 7.5 million kilowatt hours per year. They could take half of that load and they could put it at a fixed price, and the other half could be variable and follow the market price. Or we could do what we've done with the oil, and we could simply follow the market price. As I said, in comparison with the lock-in prices for our consortium for the last seven years, the City's practice that the City has always followed and made a conscious is that we're going to follow the market price. So there are alternatives out there for us.

I'm trying to come up with a plan for tonight. I couldn't offer one. I met with our Superintendent and I met with the Chairman of the Board of Education. They made a suggestion for me to offer to you. That is that we put together some sort of a subcommittee to study this because we're going to have to make informed decisions – and we're going to have to make them pretty quickly. One of the people that we've been talking with about accessing grants and shopping for electricity prices, and by the way, just a footnote to all of this, probably nobody is aware of, natural gas is deregulated too. And all the stuff that I just said about the electricity applies to natural gas.

One of the people that came and talked with us said, you know, the sooner we start on this the better, because March is the time you want to be in the market. So what we need to do is see if we can put together a group to work on this, kind of intensely, between now and March. And of course, from the Board of Education, I will be the volunteer.

Alderman Anglace asked, do you think you and Lou could come up with some recommendations of what you'd like to see in a subcommittee to do this?

Mr. Marusic stated, I think the two finance directors and the two purchasing departments have to be involved, and anyone else from the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education that wants to join us. It certainly would be a learning experience. We would form the subcommittee and we would advise how best to approach so there would be savings or mitigating cost increases. I'm highly in favor.

Alderman Anglace stated, That's fine.

Alderman Panek asked, is there a time to engage this Enernoc or another consultant, have a committee and work on this prior to the start of the next fiscal year to work on a potential saving for the next fiscal year? How long would something like this take?

Mr. Marusic stated, we anticipate going out to bid very rapidly. We would probably go out for qualifications for someone to prepare the specs so that they will be able to go out and attempt to purchase electricity competitively in four different areas as it's being stated here. Plus, I don't know if they can do anything for gas.

Mr. Cameron stated, two of the people mentioned that they could do something with gas and electricity, and we should do them concurrently.

Alderman Anglace stated, that was my concern when we spoke, is that I know this is a dynamic time for the electricity rates and I know there are a lot of things up in the air here and at the State Legislature. But I just felt that we needed somebody working on this locally. We are not really, when we get into the budget, we've got until May to set the budget. So that's really the target. You get the best deal you can get for us, and work on it, and that would be fine by me.

Mr. Marusic stated, we met with the UI people and they told us 50 percent increase in energy generation costs. That would be over a six month contract, January through June. They didn't comment on what was going to happen after that. We have a time horizon problem here. So we would want to see if it's six months for us, or is it 12 months, or whatever. People like Enernoc would help us be able to determine what we might seek to obtain competitively from other sources of energy. Yankeegas stipulated an eight percent increase. Not as drastic as the UI for electricity. There wasn't too much we

could do there. This is natural gas that's piped in from Canada and all types of places, and then it's stored underground. What has a big impact here is obviously the degree days that you're experiencing. Higher degree days, the lower gas consumption, the lower the price, the cost of price obtaining it from Canada and other places – so there's a plus there.

When we talked to the UI people, Enernoc states four areas where you can save money – fixed price, time of use, hybrids, and indexed. So we asked UI to take a look at time of use. Time of use is, customers pay different rates of off peak, low demand, than for on peak high demand periods. Flatter off peak loads tend to benefit from this type of product.

When we found out, we said, okay, you know all about us, and I believe Bob Wilcox asked them to go back about 30 months, and he's got that information, which they already had. On the basis of that, they were able to take a look and adjust our rates to save \$40,000, in shifting from high demand on peak to low demand off peak.

So I think primarily how they took a look and evaluated the water pollution control plant, which is a big consumer of electricity. To shift to the Board of Education for just a little bit, I can remember an instance where they gave us a situation where the Board of Education in another town, I won't mention the name, decided to try to test the lights on the football field for a particular event that was going to take place, and they put it on for three hours while they went through and did their thing to see how good the lighting was, and that basically threw them into this high demand situation where it went from off peak to on peak – so their electric bill went sky high for a 20 minute use of electricity over a period of months. So this takes a lot of evaluation and being very, very sensitive to how that electric meter is spinning and what time of day it spins.

Generators are another way to, when the electric company tells you, get off line, generators, if you could kick that in, that would be good, it would take you off peak.

And that's about it. There is no magic bullet. The question is, how much can we mitigate this big spike?

Alderman Anglace stated, so, our understanding of the subcommittee going forward, Electricity Subcommittee will be Al Cameron, Lou Marusic, plus selected members of their staff as they see fit.

Mr. Marusic stated, plus any members of the Board of Aldermen and/or the Board of Education that would have time and the interest to join us.

Alderman Anglace stated, well, we're welcome to attend but if you find something that you think is of interest to us, let us know, communicate with us.

Mr. Marusic stated, by all means.

Alderman Anglace stated, this is the benefit, and this is another example of how you can work together and save some money and take away all those boogey mans that are in the closet for years by opening things up and just trying to work together on issues like this, that's good, and have the two finance directors together, standing working together, my God, that's unheard of.

Mr. Marusic stated, John, no, behind the scenes we're always working together.

Mr. Cameron stated, the only thing I'd like to add to what Lou said is that we're going to have to communicate with you pretty regularly because this is going to take some quick decisions. It's not going to lend itself to the normal processes of, you know, we have to wait for a meeting at the end of the month. As I said earlier with the consortium, when we were in the consortium a couple of years ago, you have to make a resolution to accept a contract, so what will happen is we will get some templates of contracts that you'll get to look at, and Tommy will get to look at. He'll give you advice as to what we should do, and then once that is all acceptable, we'll have contracts that are ready to execute with the 11 vendors that are able to sell in the State of Connecticut. And then you get notification, You've got two hours window. You've got to decide or not decide. So we'll have to kind of stay in touch with you as this thing evolves so that you'll know when we get to the critical mass of, 'okay we're going to have to get together and give you some more updates and stuff.'

Alderman Anglace thanked Mr. Cameron and Mr. Marusic.

6. Swimming Pool Roof Problems, Shelton Community Center

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board to approve costs not to exceed \$7,000 for architect's fees to prepare bid specifications for roof repair, attend a pre-bid conference with the bidders, check submittals, applications for payment, change orders, and make as many on-site visits during construction as are necessary; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

7. Mayor's Salary Review

Alderman Anglace stated, I have some things to pass out. Let me share. This is Ordinance #758 and that's attached. It was established to provide an objective way to determine the salary and benefits of the City's chief elected official. This process has been in place now for some time and has worked well providing objectivity and transparency to the process. The ordinance provides that the City obtain a human resources consultant to evaluate existing criteria for positions of similar size and responsibility for the consultant to work with the Board of Aldermen Finance Committee ultimately resulting in the consultant's recommendation of the salary and benefits to be paid for the position of Mayor for the next two years following the next election. The human resources consultant is considered a professional service and is exempt from the bid process. The Board of Aldermen chooses the consultant and establishes the work to be done via Ordinance #758, agrees on a fee for the service, and then engages the service through the contract. The process to be following is outlined in Ordinance #758. Historically, the Human Resources consultant was chosen via the RFQ process. Ed Yulosis Associates of Cheshire did the first study after the ordinance was first passed. Upon his death, William White was chosen using the RFQ process. He is from Fall River, Mass. As the City HR Consultant and did the salary study that went into effect December 1, 2005. The current task, it is timely for the City to commence the Mayoral study for the next salary cycle effective December 1, 2007 and December 1, 2008. Mr. White has been contacted and is agreeable to perform the study again this year. His requested fee for the service would be \$3,000 plus out-of-pocket expenses. His prior experience with the City has proven that he'll

make himself available as required and has the demonstrated ability to perform in a timely manner.

Consequently, I would ask the Finance Committee to consider recommending the attached motion to the full Board for approval at our February 8, 2007 meeting so that the Finance Committee could proceed to contract with Mr. White and the study can then commence.

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the full Board to authorize the Finance Committee to engage the services of William White Associates Human Resources Consultant to conduct the Mayoral Salary Review in accordance with Ordinance #758 at a cost not to exceed \$4,000 with funds to come from the Contingency General Account; SECONDED by Alderman Panek.

Alderman Anglace stated, I put \$3,000 for the survey and then out of pocket expenses – it shouldn't exceed \$4,000. Out of pocket expenses in the past have been travel back and forth, and if he attends a meeting with us, he stays over, so he pays for his lodging. I've attached the ordinance and I gave you his qualifications. The fee is \$1,000 more than last time, and it's been two years since he did it. He does all of the legwork, brings it back to the Finance Committee and we make the recommendation to the full Board.

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

8. Implementation of Capital Improvement Program - Discussion

Alderman Panek stated, the Plan Update Advisory Committee had made this part of the 10-Year Plan for the Board of Aldermen to begin investigating and forming an ad hoc committee for implementation of a Capital Improvement Program, so I wanted to get it on our agenda for discussion and any comments from the Finance Committee or the Board of Aldermen for moving forward with that recommendation.

I think it's a great idea, something the City should look at implementing. The amount of work that was done in the 10-Year Plan and put into this - they list it as a priority one issue. Six months has already passed since the 10-Year Plan went into effect, so I think it's time to start looking at it.

The development of the Capital Improvement Program obviously won't be done for the upcoming fiscal year; it's something the committee will have to work on and will involve a lot of people in the City and will take a while to work on, but I think it can be done in unison during the budget process and during the course of this year to work on implementing it for the start of the next fiscal year. Does anybody else have any comments on it?

Alderman Anglace asked, do you know, that in the town that they're recommending we tailor it after, they had to have a one time assessment – they taxed their people - to get their program started. They had a special assessment to get their Capital Improvement Program started. Have you looked at the details of it?

Alderman Panek replied, I've read through the entire 10-Year Plan Update and that's something a committee is going to have to look into before saying whether or not the City should engage in a real Capital Improvement Program. I think right now I see a lot of issues, street paving for instance, maintenance on buildings, things that are kind of done spur of the moment. We wait until its an emergency situation to pave a road. Maintenance issues as well. If you have a Capital Improvement Program that the Board of Aldermen approves and the initial year in effect is set in stone by law that these items are going to get done, I think it's going to benefit the whole community. From my experiences and my speaking with members of the public, I think you'd get public support for this type of program. All options have to be investigated.

Alderman Anglace stated, I don't think you're going to get public support for a tax increase.

Alderman Panek stated, well I think right now I hear a lot of public non support for a lot of maintenance issues in town. A lot of people are not happy – let's take School Street for instance. They just, finally, repaved that. The Fire Department last year told us they couldn't drive the trucks down the road because there was such a mess. That's an item that probably could have been taken care of years ago.

Alderman Anglace stated, but then they turn back money, huh?

Alderman York asked, who, the Street Department? For road repairs? Maybe in light of discussion maybe you could give us some background information on why a Capital Improvement Plan immediately costs taxpayers money, and why to start one up they had to immediately assess the taxpayers. I'd like to see some background information on that.

I'm not ready, personally, to turn over a Capital Improvement Program in the City, potentially the largest expenditure in the City, to an ad hoc committee. That's going to take a heck of a lot of talking before I'd do that. In the 15 years that I've been sitting here I've seen a lot of things happen in this town. I've seen every school in the City either renovated, and two new schools built, major roads reconstructed - Long Hill Avenue, Ripton Road, Nells Rock Road, Soundview, Commerce, Perry Hill. I've seen the Board of Aldermen - ball fields, don't let me forget about Capewell Park, Shelton High School, two fields, Shelton Intermediate School, two additional fields, Waste Water Treatment Plant, ongoing. These are capital items. You have large capital items, most of these are large capital items. Then you've got the smaller capital items, and we've addressed all of them. This Board of Aldermen knows better than anybody else - \$1.8 million a year we spend on capital improvements. How much do you want to spend? This community can only handle so much without impacting the taxes.

Alderman Finn stated, if you go back and you look at the two ball fields at the Intermediate School and you look at the track and you look at the football field at the High School and the track and I'm not sure what else is at the High School, the tennis courts, that was all voter approved by a referendum question underneath the Board of Education's plans for the new Shelton Intermediate School as well as the High School building plan, and if you look at the sewage treatment plant, that was also voter approved.

I believe the 10-Year Plan is looking at other issues and it was communicated that it should be a joint venture between the Board of Apportionment and Taxation ...

TAPE TWO

... capital improvement items and it's put off year after year and just change the year on the capital improvement requests.

Such as this year, for example, Highways & Bridges Department went from three trucks down to one truck, from two sweepers down to one sweeper. We were supposed to get a 10-wheeler dump truck for Highways & Bridges – we got a beautiful pay loader to use around the City for projects, but we have no way of transporting it. We don't have a trailer and we don't have a truck to pull it. Those are things we are looking at. Ball fields? I can remember and I'm sure Mr. Kudej can remember the issue at East Village park with the lights, and people were standing there telling us there's not enough ball fields for everybody to utilize. We've been purchasing property. Some of the property we indicated at that time when we were purchasing it we were going to put ball fields on it, which we haven't done.

Alderman Anglace stated, what you are suggesting is that we implement the Capital Improvement Program suggestion that was included in the Comprehensive Plan of Development. I'm telling you right now, I am not ready to do that based on the information that I have and based on what I've done so far. And I'm not ready to share that. If you have something specific that you want to run by us or to propose, we'll be glad to discuss it and look at it. But if you're looking for ideas from me, I'm not ready to give them at this point.

Alderman Panek stated, I can only follow up on what's in this very important document that some very dedicated members of our community, regardless of any politics involved, this thing, people put a lot of effort into this document. The Planning and Zoning Commission approved this plan. About 12 pages of this plan are dedicated to the Capital Improvement Program as a priority one issue. If there is no support by the majority on the Board of Aldermen, obviously, I can't make this issue move forward, but at least I get it on the table that I am in support of what the Plan Update Advisory Committee recommended, and I would like to see this part of the plan start to move forward. If the majority on the Board of Aldermen and if you as President of the Board of Aldermen are not in favor of it, I can't force you to be in favor of it, I can only put it on the table as an issue that I think is important and which obviously this committee thought was important and put a lot of effort into and made a strong recommendation in here that the Board of Aldermen consider this and start a committee. That's as far as I can move forward with it.

Alderman Anglace stated, that's pretty fair. Now, let me say, some dedicated people from the community spent 18 months working on a Charter Revision only to have it shot down. All blown apart. Didn't go anyplace. This document over here, this did not go in front of the people. You are raising this to the same level of importance as the Charter, because that's what they're recommending – an action that would normally be set out in the Charter. And that went down the tubes. So I'm not ready to take my responsibility and turn it over to people, they're suggesting, non-elected. You see, there are a lot of things to talk about. I've asked for a meeting with some of these people to get their thinking before we do any talking. Because once you start talking about these things, everybody wants, do this, do that by such, and you've got to think this thing through.

The Town of Granby went out to reach that five percent that is required by the Standard & Poors and the rating agencies. In order for them to reach that five percent, they had to go out and tax everybody right off the bat – right into the taxpayers' pockets. We don't have to do that, because the way we've managed things, the way we run our Capital Improvement Program, we've done it year by year and accumulated the money. When June 30th showed up this year, you see in the audit the \$5 million surplus that the credit agencies require was there. Now, we didn't have to do that. What kind of position were they in financially? What was their program? We don't know that. These people haven't shared that with us. We've got to go to Granby to get that. I'm not ready and I won't be ready quickly to implement what they suggested, because they haven't given us enough data or information to do that. This should be a very carefully thought out judgmental decision, and I think that as elected officials, we are the ones that should stand ready to take the heat if it's not the right decision. We don't give that away. They are suggesting giving that away to people that are not elected.

I appreciate what you're saying, and I don't want you to think that I'm not in favor of looking at it. I have looked at it carefully. I have found out things and I'm going to find out more. But I'm not ready to share them.

Alderman Panek stated, I put this item on the agenda for discussion. If I was looking to jam this down everybody's throats I would have put a motion on there to form an ad hoc committee and you would have

voted against it. I put it on for discussion and I think we have had good discussion. I think everybody understands your position and where you are, I respect that position and your opinion on what was offered in there. If this spurs more discussion on the Finance Committee – I know this isn't going to happen overnight, I know it's not going to happen in the upcoming fiscal year. I want to work together on it.

Alderman Anglace stated, that's fair; I'll keep you informed.

Alderman Kudej stated, there are a lot of things in there that people would want, but what's the final cost to us. Are people in favor of it or just our wish?

Alderman Panek stated, that is one of the things the committee will have to investigate. I'm not saying let's implement this and tell the taxpayers they're going to have a five percent tax increase for the next fiscal year. An ad hoc committee will work on that and call the department heads to get wish lists of different things they want to get done. They will evaluate those projects, evaluate the costs, and ultimately the committee is going to come to a final resolution. The committee as recommended is going to be made up of all the department heads, members of the different boards, finance, purchasing, a compilation of a lot of people to get it to work, not just one person throwing a motion out there to get a Capital Improvement Program, and that wasn't my intent of putting it on the agenda.

Alderman Finn stated, even that subcommittee, Alderman Anglace, it says it's responsibility under the 10-Year Plan of Development - gives them the responsibility to come up with a source of funding as well for the Capital Improvement projects that would be recommended for funding.

Alderman Anglace stated, they're talking about 10-Year Capital Improvement.

Alderman Finn stated, no, six years.

Alderman Anglace stated, they're saying, in their plan here, the Comprehensive Plan of Development, they're saying that our Six Year Capital Improvement Plan that we asked to be submitted with the

budget is not a Capital Improvement Program, it's a plan, and the first year of that plan becomes our Capital Improvement budget. What they're further saying, is that they want it to go out to 10 years. We have two things that we're doing. Every request we've got, and you can see it from the Board of Education side, look at all the schools we've done. All those major items went out with our support to the public for a referendum and they approved it. The Board of Aldermen on our recognizance, we can spend up to \$1.8 million. We have spent the \$1.8 million – our target is to spend this for intermediate cost items, items that do not exceed the threshold where you have to go to referendum. We've done that based on a combination of things. Planned things and unplanned things. Things that break down. When you need them, you have to go get them. Planned things like the four fire engines – the plan is to standardize our fire engines. You can't do everything. You can only spend so much money. We're spending \$1.8 million a year, and I don't remember the number from the budget, but that service number from the budget, with that \$1.8 million – what does it come to?

[reply from the audience] Over \$7 million of debt service that is a piece of the overall.

Alderman Anglace stated, if you take the debt service number and divide it by five, that is the amount of money we're spending for the short-term intermediate items. It's not that we're without a plan. We haven't discussed among ourselves our own plan and what we've done and how we've managed to get through 15 years of Capital spending. We've done a number of things – there's no question about things getting done.

Alderman York stated, I'd just like to say something. I've sat on the Street Committee for a year, and two meetings ago I found myself literally having to blast the Street Committee because I really feel like its getting to the point, personally, where I'm embarrassed to sit on it. It's embarrassing because people come before us, and they've been through every other department, they've been to the Public Health & Safety Committee meetings, they hit dead end streets and they finally have no place else to go, they get shuffled around and they wind up in front of the Street Committee, and are pouring their guts out to us because they have a problem that they can't get handled, and we literally sit there, I think, powerless, without knowledge, no insight, no

plans, no information, no reports, no idea of what is going on in the City, where it's going on, who's going to do it, when they're going to do it, literally without any plans to be able to speak intelligently to these people and give them some kind of direction. It's been a year.

I have seen, except for the last month which came after my letter to the Street Committee, that I thought the whole thing was a sham, all of a sudden things started happening, a little bit. I was never informed of anything, I was never given any reports about situations being taken care of. When I think of what Chris is talking about, I'm thinking along the lines of what you just said, plans. Where are the plans of what is going on in this City, whether they're big projects, medium-sized projects, small projects like getting a road paved or a road repaired? It seems like it's at the whim of somebody, and if you happen to have that person's ear, you are one of the lucky ones in town. If you don't have that person's ear, you are out of the loop and whether you sit on a committee or not makes no difference because you don't get the information. What I found out it's because most of the time the information doesn't exist, it's in somebody's mind. Everything is in somebody's mind. Everything seems to be at the whim of somebody who is going to decide that day what's going to get done and what's not going to get done. So I think that instead of immediately getting your back up over this whole thing, I think maybe we'd better settle down a little bit and realize this City is just too darn big to be dealing with these things at one or two individuals' whim of who is going to get taken care of today and who's not. You've got members of your Board sitting in front of members of the public embarrassed. That needs to be dealt with. And I know I'm not the first person to say that.

Alderman Anglace asked, what is your plan? If you've got a plan, then bring it forth. You will never have a plan that will satisfy you because you can't,

Alderman York interjected, we're not talking about perfection. We're not talking about trying to have the perfect cure for everything. Don't take it so far to the other extreme that you're making it automatically impossible and you're defeating it before it even starts. We need to start somewhere and we need to start talking about this. When I asked you to please bring to the table what the problems you had with it, what you think are the obstacles, you said you're not ready to share

that with us yet. Do you know how many times we hear that around here?

Alderman Anglace stated, I am not ready to share what they recommended in that plan, I am not ready to share what my thoughts are. There is nothing wrong with that. You can share your thoughts if you're ready, fine. But you're not going to force me to share my thoughts before I'm ready to share them.

Alderman York asked, well how about sharing your thoughts about what your objections are?

Alderman Anglace stated, am I the only one who has thoughts? There are eight members of this Board. I'm not the only one.

Alderman York stated, you've got two new members of the Board who need to be brought in to how things have been done for the last 15 years, who need to be brought into the loop of things and you're saying you're not willing to share.

Alderman Anglace stated, when I bring you in and tell you what we've done, and cite the specifics, boom boom, you want more. How much do you want to spend? Look what we've spent.

Alderman York stated, well first of all we need to sit down and have a meeting and find out, when you say how much do you want to spend, what are you talking about - we're not talking about spending anything yet. We're not anywhere near that. It's in relation to this discussion right now. What do you want me to do? Drop my 10-Year Capital Improvement Plan on the table and give it to you right now and say 'here's my idea of a 10-Year Capital Improvement Plan? No. The issue that was brought to the table was, let's discuss the possibility - not come up with one.

Alderman Anglace stated, the issue that came to the table was the issue contained in the Comprehensive Plan of Development. And I addressed that issue. I shared my thoughts with my colleagues and I think he accepted them. Now, I'm not ready to go any farther than that. If you want to come up with a Comprehensive Plan that you want to propose, be my guest. Then we'll see what you're talking about in terms of money. I think we've done an awful lot over the

past 15 years, I think we've managed the debt service in a way that hasn't adversely impacted the tax rate to the taxpayers.

Alderman York stated, well, Alderman Anglace, I would like to personally invite you to attend the Street Committee meetings.

Alderman Anglace stated, I've been to Street Committee meetings.

Alderman York stated, and I'm sure when you did, things got done.

Alderman Panek stated, I really want to read the last sentence on Page 7-11 of the plan: "The implementation of a Capital Improvement Program is viewed as a critical element of this plan." Again, I can only stand up here and tell my constituents that I listened to the makers of this document and that I tried to get this on the table. I can't get it on the table. The Board of Aldermen as a whole needs to embrace the things in this plan. The Planning and Zoning Commission right now is embracing several items in this plan and they're working on items in this plan. The Board of Aldermen is clearly identified in here as the one that needs to form the ad hoc committee. If there's not support, I would like my constituents to know that I supported what was in this plan with the Capital Improvement Program, just to form a committee and start seriously looking at it. Just to start looking at it. Again, as Alderman York said, nobody is talking about tax increases and spending money yet. We're talking about forming a committee to start investigating this. It's going to be a long process, and that's clearly noted in here. It's not something that's going to happen in two months. All the departments are going to give us their wish list and we're going to say okay, we're doing everything, and here's the tax increase. That's not what's stipulated in here. But again, if there's not support on the Board it's not going to move forward. This is probably as far as it's going to go tonight.

Alderman Anglace stated, I think you hit the nail on the head when you said 'tonight.' It may go farther in due course of time. But if you're looking for the majority to make it move forward, it's not going to move forward, because there are a lot of things that have to be understood. I've talked to Planning and Zoning people about this. I've talked to members of the Comprehensive Plan and I've told them of some of my concerns and I want to discuss them. I want to know

where they were coming from when they suggested this. I don't agree that it is the priority that they place on it.

9. *Discussion Regarding the City's Policy for Personal Use of City Vehicles by City Employees*

Alderman Panek stated, I'll try to make this debate a little quicker. The intent of putting this on was that I started looking, I had actually asked Administrative Assistant Sandra Nesteriak for the mileage log books for City employees that take their vehicles home. I believe I noted in my letter, this isn't meant to target any specific individuals. She provided me a list of City employees – a lot of them were emergency officials who take their vehicles home. As I understand it the Mayor's vehicle is covered under a resolution that the Board of Aldermen enacted several years back. It seems to be working fine, there is no issue with that specific vehicle. But I do think that maybe we should look into a written policy for the other vehicles. The Administrative Assistant told me that the other City vehicles are all covered under a verbal policy that was enacted in 1991 when the Mayor took office. I wanted to get a discussion, and possibly get a consensus to move forward with possibly putting something in writing whether it's a resolution, just to protect the City on the costs involved with fuel, liability, for use of the City vehicles, and just to keep everybody honest. How do we know where the vehicles are being driven? Are the vehicles being used for personal use? I'm sure for the most part they are. People who take them home use them for official City business, but when you have vehicles going home every night and going home on the weekends, what is a permissible use? If I see a City vehicle at WalMart on a Sunday, is that a permissible use? If I see a City vehicle out of town, when is it permissible and when is it not? Are they reporting this on a regular basis?

Alderman Finn was kind enough to get me a copy from the Fire Department and their policy which covers their vehicles, which require mileage logs for the Fire vehicles. As noted, and I attached Sandra Nesteriak's memo to me that there are no mileage logs and there is no written policy currently for these 16 vehicles. I'll open it up for discussion or thoughts about if we need a written policy or what they think about the way things are working right now.

Alderman Kudej stated, some of these people, I think, need to have their car 24 hours a day, seven days a week. You never know when there's going to be an emergency. They can't turn around and go home and pick up the car because they were in their personal car. I think you've got to allow them the right to use it. Keeping a log on how much gas they use, I think that's a reasonable request, but yes, they're going to be using a lot of mileage on personal use because they have got to be with that vehicle. They just can't go and get it at a moment's notice. That's my feeling.

Alderman Panek stated, I'm not looking to take the vehicles away, and I'm not looking to target any specific,

Alderman Anglace interjected. I think you have to start with who has the cars, why were they assigned the cars, what is the purpose that they have it, how do they use it. Like you said, you have something there from the Fire Department, maybe that would apply in other cases, maybe it wouldn't.

Alderman Finn stated, if you look at the 16 individuals that have them to be able to take home, five of those cars that Mrs. Nesteriak says they are not required for log books, but yet the Fire Department says they are required. So you have Mrs. Nesteriak saying one thing, and the Fire Department saying the other thing. Out of the 16 vehicles, five of those belong to the Fire Department.

Alderman Anglace stated, there are IRS regulations as well. I don't know what those are.

Alderman Finn stated, for example, I was at the Big E several years ago. The Fire Chief's car was there and parked in the parking lot. He and his family went up in the car. That's fine. Personal use. He has a log book and he's putting it down for Internal Revenue purposes that he took the car for personal use of the vehicle. No problem.

Alderman Panek stated, the one thing that kind of spurred this too is if we have a resolution for the Mayor's vehicle, why don't we have anything in writing for the others?

Alderman Anglace stated, the Mayor, we had to make a resolution for the Mayor because we are his boss. All eight of us, we're his boss. He

can't make it for himself. So he makes the resolution, administratively for the rest of his people, the people that work for him. We don't do that. But if you want to examine this thing, I think it's a question of where you start, who has them, and why. You can get them in here and talk to them. Who gave them to them?

Alderman Finn stated, as long as they have the log book and it makes reference so there's a separation between personal use and City use for IRS reporting. It shouldn't be a problem.

Alderman Kudej stated, I'm referring to the gas mileage. You take the Police Chief. A crime is committed and he's gone to a restaurant to eat or something on personal business and the thing is called in. He's got to run out there and he's going to stop and take mileage and mark it down just before he starts going? He's going to get there as fast as he can. Or the Fire Chief. Or whatever. And you're not going to be trying to keep a log book and respond to an emergency. It's ridiculous. I think it's asking too much.

Alderman Panek (talking mid-stream) any of ours, and a salesman in my company, you've got to keep a log book. If you take the vehicle home and you're driving around wherever you're going on the weekend you've got to write your starting mileage and your ending mileage. What Alderman Kudej is referring to, the intent of this isn't to say the Police Chief or the Captain or whoever else on there can't take their vehicle – I mean, if they're out to dinner on a Saturday night and there's an auto accident and the Chief or the Captain needs to get there, obviously, they need to have the vehicle with them. But, if they're driving around every weekend on personal use, at what point, and what priority on these vehicles – how many of these people aren't emergency officials on here? Not all of them are emergency officials. You have the Building Official, the Sewer Administrator, the Water Pollution Control Superintendent, Superintendent of Highways & Bridges, I mean, how many emergencies have they responded to over the past 10 years where they needed to have their vehicle with them on a weekend out somewhere?

Alderman Anglace stated, so really, are you questioning the fact that they have an automobile to begin with, or the use of it?

Alderman Panek replied, just the use of it – if they're using it for personal use, what policy besides a verbal policy do we have in place?

Alderman Anglace stated, so what you'd like to see is, if they're using it for personal use that they declare,

Alderman Panek interjected, I mean, are they allowed to drive, are people that are non-emergency officials on here allowed to drive vehicles on the weekends when they have it at their house? What if they're involved in an accident on a Saturday night with their wife and kids in the car? Are the employees aware who are driving these vehicles what is and what is not a permissible use? I think having something in writing that is distributed to these people that take the vehicles so they know.

Alderman Anglace stated, a lot of these positions have had cars going way back. Same situation. Now, apparently there has never been a written policy – a detailed administrative policy. From what I've heard and what was told to you, the Mayor verbally gave it to them. So what you're saying is you'd like to see something compiled, administratively, and distributed. We'll have to work on what that should be.

Alderman Panek stated, that's it. And not that we're going to take vehicles away from anybody or target anybody individually on that list, or say that anybody was doing anything wrong on that list, it's just, do we need something,

Alderman Anglace interjected, how do you anticipate that we put that together?

Alderman Panek replied, well, if it was the Mayor's original, verbal policy, if he wants to give his input, and if Sandy wants to give her input as to what a policy could be,

Alderman Anglace interjected, okay, why don't we, between now and our next meeting, why don't we think of things that we think would be good to be in that policy and we'll suggest it as a Finance Committee as an administrative policy that should be given to those people that take City cars home and have responsibility for them. The policy should address things such as, minimize the liabilities and account for

the recordkeeping and personal usage. I don't know the IRS regulations, but I'll try to get them.

Alderman Panek stated, you can also investigate what other municipalities are doing. It's the Mayor's option to enact a policy or come back with a verbal policy – I'd like to hear from him as well.

Alderman Kudej stated, I understand the State Police policy – all they do is keep track of gas mileage. The officer can take his wife and kids in the car and they can go anywhere they want, because you never know when they're going to be called. They have a gas card that indicates how much gas they use. There is no breakdown between personal and business. If it's good enough for the State Police, why isn't it good enough for us?

Alderman York asked, do they reimburse for their personal? So it's a benefit – they have a car, all maintenance, all gas, for all their personal use at their disposal as part of their job?

Alderman Kudej stated, they're on call 24 hours a day. Their regular work shift might be from 7 to 3 but they're still on call when they're off duty, so they've got to be able to respond.

Alderman York asked, are some of these vehicles actually emergency trucks, or are these all cars?

Alderman Anglace replied, we're going to have to contact the people that cover our insurance, they might have some thoughts on it.

Alderman Panek stated, this isn't something that needs to be enacted next week, we can work on it, exchange ideas, put it on an upcoming agenda for further discussion.

Alderman Anglace stated, let's gather the facts, let's gather all our thoughts and ideas, let's consolidate it and submit it to them and let them work on it. We'll give them the same chance – to go back and talk to people and come up with something. Whatever they come up will strengthen the program. You're not suggesting by any means an examination, who has the cars, why they have them, but if that has something to do with how they use them, we would like to know. For instance, if the Chief of Police, an unmarked car, in fact you know the

Chief of Police is now driving the Mayor's car because the Chief of Police car was wiped out in New Haven. So if the Chief of Police has – he has 24/7 – who knows why. Supposing you've got a guy that's undercover. He's got a car. We don't even know that. Maybe we don't want to know that. Know what I mean? He's going to be exposed to a lot more liability.

Alderman Kudej stated, we will all work on it.

10. Yutaka Trail Discussion

Alderman Panek stated, this is another item that I put on there, I don't know if there's any more discussion on the item. I spoke with Alderman Anglace last night. I tried to contact the Mayor today and I was unable to get him. The reason that I want, and I'll put this on our next full board agenda again for further discussion is, I'm trying to attempt to find out what the cost was for the paving of this road. As you recall in December the full Board approved a bid waiver for this project. I've heard from people on the street the project was completed in mid-December. However, I've talked to Lou Marusic, I've talked to Sharon, I've talked to Bob Wilcox in Purchasing, Finance, nobody has a cost, no purchase order has been issued, to their knowledge, as of today. I'm looking for a follow-up as to who completed the work, and what the total cost of the project was.

Because it involved a bid waiver, I think that the Board of Aldermen deserves a follow up from either the department head who asked for this, or from the Mayor if he is the one who was working on this project, in terms of what the total cost was.

Alderman Anglace stated, this is no different than any other project, they bid it by the linear feet, just like we told you. They bid by the linear feet. Now this project wasn't, the one successful bidder, as he explained to us, he gave us an approximate cost at the waiver meeting. I don't remember what it was. But he said that we do the preparation, they do the paving, and then they bill us by the linear foot. When we get the bill, we issue the purchase order, and it gets paid. He hasn't billed us, and I confirmed that today. He hasn't billed us since December.

And I know who it was who did the work. Brennan did the work. Cocchiola was the successful bidder and Cocchiola couldn't get the job finished because he had so much other work. So they got Brennan to come in on one day notice and do the job.

Alderman Panek stated, I think this all goes back to the bid waiver process, and I know in recent months we've had a lot of debate on the bid waiver process, and the Mayor has stated at numerous meetings when we approve bid waivers that he is going to follow up with the Board of Aldermen on these projects. That's all I'm looking for and this is a follow up. I'd like an explanation, or, a copy of the contract, the purchase order, what the total price was, how many linear feet it was.

Alderman Anglace stated, there's no contract, it's just by the linear foot.

Alderman Finn asked, when he submits the bill, does he indicate where he got the asphalt from?

Alderman Anglace asked, the guy who did the job? Brennan? He hasn't submitted a bill.

Alderman Finn asked, when he does submit a bill will he submit the bill indicating where he got the asphalt from?

Alderman Anglace stated, I don't know. I don't think that's pertinent to the bill.

Alderman Kudej stated, there are only three areas, Bridgeport, Waterbury or Southbury.

Alderman Finn stated, or a portable asphalt company.

Alderman Panek stated, well, if you do come to find out that it has been billed, or that the City has received the bill, you can let me know. Thank you.

11. Animal Shelter Building Committee

Alderman Anglace stated, you'll remember we appointed an Animal Shelter Building Committee, and they need some start-up money. They sent a letter asking for \$16,000 as start up money. Here's what the letter says: *"the newly-created Animal Shelter Building Committee at its regular meeting of January 11 made a motion to request seed or start up money for a clerk and for consulting and feasibility studies in the amount of \$16,000. This amount was derived from preliminary scope of work consultation with an architectural firm specializing in the field of animal care facilities."*

Alderman Anglace MOVED to recommend to the Full Board to appropriate \$6,000 to the Animal Shelter Building Committee for costs associated with clerical services, engineering/architectural services and miscellaneous costs with the \$6,000 to be transferred from Unappropriated General account to a new account to be set up by the Finance Director; SECONDED by Alderman Panek.

Alderman Anglace explained, this motion allows them to use the \$6,000 for any of those purposes, so we don't make a target for the consultant to say, we've got 'x' amount.

Alderman Panek stated, if they spend the \$6,000 they can come back to us next month or the month after?

Alderman Anglace stated, once they get their RFQs or RFPs, once they negotiate a price, they can come back to us for the whole price. Just don't give it to them up front – like any building committee – and the bidders notice.

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

Adjournment

At approximately 9:20 p.m., Alderman Anglace MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Panek. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 3-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Bruder
Clerk, Board of Aldermen