



BOARD OF ALDERMEN  
SHELTON, CONNECTICUT  
***PUBLIC HEARING ON THE BUDGET***  
***APRIL 28, 2009***

---

**Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance**

Aldermanic President John Anglace called the public hearing on the budget to order at 7 p.m. All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

**Attendees**

**Board of Aldermen**

John Anglace, President  
Lynne Farrell  
John "Jack" Finn  
Stanley Kudej  
Eric McPherson  
Kenneth Olin - absent  
John Papa  
Anthony Simonetti

**Board of Apportionment and Taxation**

Mark Holden, Chairman  
Judson Crawford  
Nancy Dickal  
Greg Kodz

**1. FISCAL YEAR BUDGET 2009-2010**

CITY OF SHELTON

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.6 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHELTON, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN WILL CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010 ON

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009 AT 7:00 PM IN THE AUDITORIUM AT SHELTON CITY HALL, 54 HILL STREET, SHELTON, CT 06484.

ALL PERSONS WHO HAVE AN INTEREST THEREIN MAY APPEAR AND BE HEARD IN RELATION THERETO. COPIES OF THE PROPOSED BUDGET ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE.

WRITTEN COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS MAY ALSO BE SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN AND MUST BE RECEIVED PRIOR TO THE PUBLIC HEARING.

**ANTICIPATED REVENUES**

Government Grants	7,601,512
Local Taxes	95,076,600
Other Local Revenue	3,925,911
General Fund Surplus	3,295,734

**TOTAL ANTICIPATED REVENUES** **\$109,899,757**

**PROPOSED EXPENDITURES**

Administrative Office	416,854
Employees Resources	5,088,117
Legislative	133,580
Board of Ethics	1,500
Elections	133,355
Inlands/Wetlands	84,643
Economic Development Commission	37,201
Economic Development - SEDC	90,000
Planning & Zoning	321,029
Recreation	1,450,916
Probate Court	11,300
Elected/Appointed Officials	18,450
Conservation Commission	46,852
City/Town Clerk	432,868
Public Employees Appeals Board	200
Senior Center	288,158
Drug & Alcohol Commission	2,500
Zoning Appeals Board	19,860
Corporation Counsel	171,160
Public Safety	48,236
EMS Commission	157,696
Fire Marshal	295,183
Animal Control	109,069
Fire Department	730,326
Police Department	6,028,768
Municipal Parking Authority	5,000
Youth Service	203,171
Public Health	220,858

Building Department	225,792
Highways & Bridges	2,681,931
Road Repairs	125,000
Public Works Director	13,700
Engineering	257,612
Tree Warden	85,000
Recycling Program	378,409
Sanitation	2,450,850
Library	1,043,054
Debt Service	14,193,714
Utilities	2,758,800
Building Maintenance	845,347
Management Information Services	306,082
Assessor	436,793
Tax Collector	319,378
Purchasing	360,968
Public Risk Management	1,877,950
Accounting	495,518
Community Development	64,172
Miscellaneous	980,375
Outside Agency Contributions	297,825
Contingency	150,000
<b><u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES - CITY DEPARTMENTS</u></b>	<b><u>\$46,895,120</u></b>
<b><u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES - BOARD OF EDUCATION</u></b>	<b><u>\$63,004,637</u></b>
<b><u>TOTAL PROPOSED EXPENDITURES</u></b>	<b><u>\$109,899,757</u></b>

Alderman Anglace asked if any member of the public wished to speak in regard to the proposed 2009-2010 Fiscal Year Budget.

*Win Oppel, 34 Soundview Avenue*  
*Chairman, Board of Education*

When the Board was developing its budget this past fall, our goal was to bring to the City a request that was as close to no increase as possible, in light of the ever weakening economic climate. We directed the Superintendent and her staff to prepare as lean a proposal as possible, while still moving the educational advancements that we have made over the past several years forward.

Our foundation budget was projected to grow by more than \$1 million. And the projection increase in our health insurance costs was set at \$1.4 million. The Superintendent, in concert with the Board, reduced

this projected growth to just over \$1.4 million, the amount of the projected premium increase in our health insurance. Our plan includes staff reductions based on enrollments and retirements, deferring the hiring of an HVAC technician and selected cost reductions in various accounts.

At the time of the adoption, the board recommended that our Finance Director begin the process to bid rather than renew our health insurance. Working in concert with the City, the coverage was bid, and I have been advised that there has been a substantial reduction in the amount of the premium for next year. Mr. Cameron, our Finance Director, has told me that we should expect our premium to increase by approximately \$400,000. This is a savings of approximately \$1 million next year. While we as the Board have not met to approve any alterations to our budget request, I am certain that should the Board of Aldermen fund our health insurance increase, we would be very satisfied.

Our Board has made substantial progress in the past year in reducing operating expenses in the area of busing, moving the buses to a lot to eliminate the rental fees, and energy usage. Our grant to offset the cost of re-lamping the Shelton High School has resulted in a reduction in our monthly electric bill. We will continue to look for ways to allow us to make the most use of our taxpayer dollars.

The Board looks forward to working with you, the Board of Aldermen, during the upcoming year. Thank you.

*Denise Deeds, 65 Walnut Tree Hill Road*

I'm here to speak to you this evening, very briefly, in support of three issues related to the budget. While there are many important budget issues including the Fire Department and Police Department, I'm most concerned about these three.

The first is the Education budget. It is imperative that we adequately fund the Board of Education to ensure quality education for our children. I believe the Board of Education has been responsible in limiting their requests during these difficult times, and the City needs to do our part to limit the loss of programs and teachers, and to retain the quality programs that we have to date.

The second thing I'd like to mention is the Library. I am a member of the Friends of the Library, I'm a user of the Library, and a real believer in quality and wonderful programs that our Library offers to our community. These are needed more than ever in these difficult economic times for families to be able to go and have interesting programs to attend, to be able to check out DVDs for entertainment purposes and so forth. To cut the funds for the Library at this time seems to me to be wrong and also short-sighted. So I hope you will consider returning at least a portion of the programming funds to the Library. It's such a small amount of money, but it can make a big difference in the life of Shelton residents.

The last thing I'd like to mention is our roads. Our roads are in terrible repair. I drive around town all the time and I know that you do too. It really is a shame to see the terrible shape these roads are in. It seems like, you know, it's difficult economic times and it makes sense to cut that budget. But on the other hand, I'd like to point out in these difficult economic times that contractors may be looking for work. We may be able to get more for our money by spending the resources that we have on these repairs today than we would at other times. I would certainly like to see that at least we spend the money that is budgeted each year for the road repairs rather than returning it to the budget.

I thank you for listening to me. Thank you very much.

*Robin Willink, Superintendent of Schools*

As this will be the last time that I address the Aldermen in this setting, I wanted to thank the Board for the collaboration and the cooperation that we have really enjoyed during my tenure. Mr. Anglace has set the tone for cooperation and he has emphasized at numerous public meetings throughout the years, as have Chairman Oppel and Chairman Tim Walsh before Win.

The Board and the City, as you know, have strived to cut costs in every area. We have reduced the hours that the schools are open and we've worked in conjunction with the City and Parks & Rec. We have all reduced staff; we have all used technology to make things work better and to make things work more efficiently. We have shared staff. Not only have we shared staff informally but more than that we have shared

their expertise. If we have someone that has the knowledge that you need, you have used them, and vice versa. We've certainly benefitted from that collaboration and that sharing. We have developed the bus lot, we've gone out to bid for our healthcare and are still working on that. Our electric costs, and everything that we have done, we have done a better job working together. The City and the schools have both implemented savings independently, but working together we have made the most significant impact.

In the last few months, the time and the dedication and the effort required to recover from the fire at the High School has cemented that bond that clearly exists between the City and the School System, and I'm so proud to have been a part of that team.

When we met in March, I described the budget-making process that Win has alluded to. We all recognized the difficult economic climate and therefore, we presented a budget that was over \$1 million less than our budget for last year. We compensated for the rising contract costs and also fixed costs by reducing staff based on enrollments and retirements, differing new hires, and making selective cuts in other accounts. We presented a budget with no increase other than our healthcare. At that time I said to you all that we would not be able to continue with what we have without help in funding the healthcare costs. We just can't cut another, more than \$1 million plus that we've already cut. So tonight I'm asking that this Board please cover the cost of the School System's healthcare. As you know we are still working on this, but the additional monies which we believe to be approximately \$400,000 this time, will ensure that our schools can maintain excellent instructional programs, top-notch facilities, increased technology and a vibrant athletic program.

Working together we can offer first-class education to all of our students, prepare them for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and most importantly, continue to raise the bar to meet the expectations and the vision of both the City and the Board of Education. Thank you.

*Dave Gioiello, 65 Walnut Tree Hill Road*

The Board of Education, based on what Mr. Oppel has just said, is asking for an increase of less than one percent. The proposed budget that the Mayor submitted for the City side is almost a three percent

increase. I think we need to be fair here if we're going to ask the Board of Education to hold their line and give them just what they had last year, or a minimal increase. The City should do the same, and hold their line to what they had last year and not go with the three percent increase.

I would also speak in support of returning the money to the Library. The money that was cut from the Library is small - \$2,000 from the programs; \$30,000 from books. Come on folks, people use the Library, and now is the time their using it more as they look for jobs, they use the computer system, and this town needs to support it. Thank you.

*Richard Widomski, 49 Christine Drive*

I'm missing Alderman Olin here tonight – my Alderman – he doesn't miss too many meetings.

Alderman Anglace replied, he's sick tonight.

I don't know where to start with this, I came in a little late; I heard the Superintendent talk to the idea of increasing the budget by \$1 million. I could concur in many cases, however when I look back at some time ago when this Board was looking for \$55,000 to build a railroad, and I mentioned this at the Board of Education meeting, in fact Win Oppel took issue with it. I see them giving \$55,000 to the City out of the Lafayette School roof fund, when they should have kept the dollars for the schools. I believe Mrs. Willink, and when I spoke to the Board of Apportionment and Taxation and we're proud that they cut the budget as they did. I concur with that. We also said that they failed to ask the PTOs for the things that they would like to have in order to cut the budget. I don't concur with that at all, especially when the Board of Aldermen goes ahead and takes \$55,000 from money that was slated, perhaps not for the direct education, but for dollars for the Lafayette School roof. \$55,000 that could have easily gone to our children's and grandchildren's education.

Then I look at the bonding. I looked at Debt Service Expenditure from \$14 million. I spoke to a member of the Board of A & T and the answer I got was, "we're not quite sure what's in that budget." So I went, notified, or called, e-mailed Lou Marusic Sunday and told him I

would meet with him yesterday. Of course, I went yesterday, City Hall is closed. Of course, you know, I could understand a four-day work week, however when we're in the midst of a budget process, you go ahead and close City Hall. I said, "Okay. My fault. I wasn't paying attention, should have known better." So I went today. Well, Mr. Marusic is not available. So I talked to a person about the Debt Reduction, \$14 million. And no one is quite sure where this \$14 million is going, or where it's coming from. Is it bond issue? We've got a \$14 million loan. Not a grant. \$14 million loan. You don't have to write it down, John, it's right in the Connecticut Office of State Comptroller bond allocation, I think it goes back to 2004, for the sewage treatment plant. Then there's another \$5 million for the sewage treatment plant. That \$14 million, not counting the dollars for the Board of Education, amounts to something like 30 percent, off the top, whatever, it's pretty significant. I don't know whether that Debt Reduction or whatever it is is a slush fund for the City to pull dollars out. I don't know. I don't know whether the Board of Education had a separate bonding item or whether this is included in the item. If the Board of Education has their own bonding cost or debt reduction, this \$14 million is pretty significant, because I think the City budget, not counting the Board of Education, is something like \$40-something-thousand dollars. I don't know off the top of my head. Where, what is this figure? What is this \$14 million debt reduction? I haven't a clue. I don't know, the Board of Apportionment and Taxation, I can't get an answer from them. Then we looked at Canal Street. \$55,000, it doesn't sound significant. However I'd like to see the look on the PTO's faces of that one school that gets \$55,000 that you gave to build a railroad. I think if you took the \$55,000 and spread it along the whole school system they'd be able to get some extra things that the Superintendent and the Chairman of the Board of Education did not ask for because of trying to keep a tight budget.

We're selling property. Why are we selling property? Why are we selling the property on Perry Hill Road when in fact someone else bought it, we bought half back, and now we're selling part of it? Does the Board of Education need that property? It's right next to the school. We're selling property on Soundview Avenue. Repeat performance of Perry Hill Road. We're looking to sell property at the Crabtree site. We hear the condominium owners at Summerfield Gardens asking why, asking why there's a thought of putting buses on open space. The paper this week says, Board of Education has no

knowledge of that. At the Board of Aldermen meeting the Mayor said it came from the Board of Education. And, there's a piece of property sitting on Bridgeport Avenue, vacant, zoned for buses, and you could put them right there instead of selling that property. It would cost zero. That's where some of the waste might be going. My fear is that you're selling this property and dumping it into Canal Street project when it should be going to fix the roads in the City of Shelton, and to educate our children and grandchildren.

Take a ride on Nells Rock Road. Take a ride on Mohegan Road. Take a ride on Lucille Drive. Pick a street. Theodore Drive. Christine Drive. Pick a street. They're a mess. And you're looking for \$2 or \$3 million to put on Canal Street? The Huntington Herald some months ago said that the property is going to be sold to Avalon Bay. Are we funding them so they can flip the property? Is that where the money is going? Before you set the budget, start thinking about what you're doing with this money. We talk about transparency, John, you and I had talked about it at some of the meetings. All talk, no action. Let's get the transparency going. Let's find out where the money's going. Give it to the children. Give it to the roads. Give it back to the taxpayer. Thank you.

Tom Harbinson, 15 Soundcrest Drive

Greetings Aldermen, I want to first thank the Board of Aldermen for the financial support they have given Conservation efforts over the years. You have been there when we needed prompt approvals for modest expenditures related to grant applications. You have given positive 8-24 referrals when review was requested of our Open Space Plan document. You have prepared process of bonding, commenced with negotiation to acquire, and authorized referendum questions that all furthered preservation of open space. However, one can never rest on past achievements – there is more work to be done. It is why I am here at the public hearing on the budget tonight.

I was dismayed by comments made at the Board of Aldermen meeting of April 16 that seem to indicate the Conservation Commission is in favor of not directly following the Open Space Ordinance. This is not accurate.

The Open Space Trust Account is sourced from 1) fees paid in the course of subdivision application, in lieu of land set-aside in accord with subdivision regulations, and 2) budget amounts as outlined in the Open Space Ordinance.

As we are all aware, subdivision applications and the land's appraised value upon which any fee in lieu of payment is calculated have both dropped significantly. This funding component is not meant to, and cannot on its own contribute adequately for the Open Space Trust Account's intent – the financial preparation for purchase of lands.

Due to sloppy bookkeeping from the Finance Department and poor administration from the Planning and Zoning Department, the Conservation Commission has discovered that there has been fee in lieu of payment due from subdivision, which was not paid by the developer. The Conservation Commission is charged with reporting to the Board of Aldermen annually on the Open Space Trust Account status and use. The Conservation Commission has requested reports from the Finance Department, but to date nothing has been received for many months and the Conservation Commission cannot make a formal report.

The last significant expenditure which the Open Space Trust Account allowed us preparation for was for the purchase of property on Buddington Road from United Illuminating, over the objections of a developer who wanted use of the property for development. The property of 10.86 acres was purchased for the meager amount of \$108,001 and was closed on 2007, January 16th.

The last time a budgeted amount, \$250,000, was appropriated into the Open Space Trust Account was also in 2007.

Expenditures since then for items such as 279 Soundview Avenue partial purchase payments, and court-ordered supplement payments to achieve court-approved value for the Wiacek Farm on Meadow Street, were simply washes of money into the Open Space Trust Account and out to the sellers, functioning to launder the activity as meeting the "intent" of the ordinance.

The purchase of property at 279 Soundview Avenue has laid witness to the public sector's lack of prompt ability to act financially compared to

the private sector when no ready sources have the backstop of a fund balance. We pay dearly for the outcome we all sought in the first place - preservation and conservation of certain lands.

At a Board of Aldermen meeting on 2006, September 14<sup>th</sup>, I stated "the importance of having an Open Space Trust Account for when we apply for grants is to illustrate that there is an ongoing commitment from the community and you as the fiscal authority pledge toward open space an annual amount that can grow and be utilized from an account. Things like a referendum – that's the public furthering their comments that that is the right direction to head. Having an Open Space Trust Account is important for us when we apply for grants, and as you know we have been pretty successful with that." Since then we have not been awarded any "grants" toward land acquisition.

Let me be clear. The Conservation Commission, Mayor and Board of Aldermen have been very successful in the past conserving the quality of life in our community via purchase of land to be retained as public open space, and the purchase of development rights on agricultural lands to preserve the heritage and character of our community. These have, however, been somewhat like easy pickings of low hanging fruit. Property owners who approached the City to preserve the land rather than seek out development of their property, substantial grants from the DEP, USDA, and even gifting of land or monetary gifts both result in the sales prices reduced below market value – all effecting reduction in the City's share of the cost.

Let me offer another quote from the same 2006, September 14<sup>th</sup> Board of Aldermen meeting mentioned earlier. "I have no problem with the ordinance starting in 2007-08, in fact the motion that I had offered is a resolution that would just keep everything in place. And knowing that we're going to spend every bit of \$200,000 this year, and that we would just make the appropriation next year. What's the issue? What's the big deal? I don't think it's so hard to live with." That was Mayor Lauretti on page 48 of your minutes.

Flip the diary forward 2 ½ years to the present. What's the big deal? I don't think it's so hard to live with.

I ask that you think strongly and independently regarding the funding of the Open Space Trust Account as part of your budget process, and

consider making it in accord with the City Ordinance that 6 of the 8 current Alderman approved on that same date, 2006, September 14<sup>th</sup>.

Thank you very much.

Arlene Liscinsky, 54 Country Ridge Drive

Good evening everyone. I'm here as I have been over the last 15 to 20 years since I've lived here and have been a huge public advocate for public education. I was a Board of Education member for the last 10 years. I certainly feel it's my obligation to advocate for, obviously, the Education budget. But before I do that, I just want to make a couple of comments based on some previous comments.

Mr. Widomski, for instance, did come before the Board of Education and talk to us about the \$55,000, and for the record, he has to understand, and I think that Mr. Oppel did try to explain this to him, is the Board of Education does not have the power to spend the bonding money. That is appointed by the Board of Aldermen and that's your obligation and your responsibility. We relegate that responsibility to you. We have no say on how it's spent. We can request it through Capital Expenditure which we do every year. We always present a Capital Expenditure budget. One of my big beefs over the last several years has always been that we don't fund it as a City. I have actually seen in this year's budget, we're not putting any dollars into municipal capital expenditures or vehicle replacement, and my question will be later on, will we go out later on and bond some more?

On the second point that he talked about, on the debt, he's right. The debt has gone up. I did a little quick review. 2003-2004 our debt, the percentage of the budget was 5.29. 2007-2008 was 8.65. 2008-2009 was 10.6. This year it's 12.9 percent of the budget. Now, my problem with that is, there are many items that we have requested that could have been a budgetary thing. We could have paid for it as we go along, and we chose not to. We chose to bond it. I know money is cheap and it's probably getting cheaper to some degree with interest rates. At some point in time, I think it's just a matter of good budgeting – bad budgeting. I've never understood the way the budget is done here in terms of the rationale. I understand the budget process, but I don't understand the rationale behind some of the budgeting, as to why departments get more or why departments get

less. Library was cut drastically. Fire Department was cut drastically. Police Department was increased, and yet they turned back a sizable amount of money over the last several years. I don't have an issue with that, and to quote Mr. Papa, there's nothing wrong with that – that says that they're doing good budgeting. I have to differ philosophically with him. I've been in business for 40 years. Years ago I was State treasurer for a national organization. I've managed a half-million dollar budget, not anything near what we're dealing with here, but you had to budget very close to what you thought you were going to spend. The Board of Education three years ago in the budget process spent five or six meetings literally on zero-based budgeting. We went through five years of expenditures, we spent a tremendous amount of time and looked at every single expenditure to see that we were putting forward a realistic budget. I look at some of the budget numbers on the City side, and I just don't understand the rationale. I'm not saying it's wrong; I'm not saying it's right. I don't think it's been really clarified in the Board of Apportionment and Taxation. I don't think they've asked the hard questions. I honestly don't think that's the case. The \$14,193,714 that's in this year's budget is, what we're doing is robbing Peter to pay Paul. So we're taking money away from the Board of Education, we're taking money from the Library, we're taking money away from the Fire Department, we're taking money away from Property Maintenance, we're taking money away from Management Information Systems, which if anything we should be at least at a status quo if not, we should be promoting our information systems. I sit on the Technology Committee with Mr. Anglace and if anybody knows, you certainly know the power of what the technology will do for us and the labor and the efficiency that it can certainly bring to us all. Capital Expenditures and Vehicle Purchase we put zero, zero, zero, zero in the budget. If we have to bond any more, you know, it's just like your own financial home. I own a business. I've actually had two start-up businesses. They're very successful. I've sold one. I'm in another one. We've gone along and it's a cash-based business where we have to really watch our dollars. I have to buy 90 days out and I have to pay for it in 30 days. I have to make sure I always – I'm checking my checking account like three times a day to make sure that I have enough cash to purchase what I'm going to be purchasing for the next month's sales and so on and so forth. I just want to clarify the point that Mr. Widomski had made. The other issue is the Capital Expenditures.

I know the Board has worked with the Board of Aldermen and we have done a tremendous amount of things with boilers and roofs and what have you. I'm just saying that we should maybe perhaps take a different approach. The Mayor said in his budget address that perhaps this would be the year of the taxpayer. I don't think it's fair to take from some departments and to be able to balance the budget on the other side. I know you're up against some hard restraints but you also have to have the political fortitude. I know we're going into an election year and certainly it's decisions that you're going to have to make are very hard decisions. Our Board of Education has made our past hard decisions. We're still standing. I really believe that you have to, if you're going to take and not increase, we've done everything we possibly can. I know at our Board of Apportionment and Taxation meeting we sat with them and Mr. Simons gave a whole proposal on what we have actually done to save the taxpayers dollars and cents. We've asked the Superintendent to put that on the website because we think the general public needs to know that. They don't really understand or know the millions of dollars the Board has saved. Hundreds of millions of dollars. We went out two years ago for health care. We're saving \$11,000 a month at the High School because we changed all the ballasts and bulbs and so on. We went out to energy generation to buy cheaper kilowatt hours. We partnered with the City or at least got the City to come in along with that. We're doing our part, we really are. I don't think we should be penalized for that. If you see not to be able to give us the money that we need to cover the healthcare, we have to go back and we have to make hard decisions. Programs, people, and students will suffer. If you really want this to be the year of the taxpayer, then if you don't have the fortitude to give the Board and go against the Mayor's wishes the money we need, then I would also suggest that you go zero percent on the City side and really make this the taxpayers' year and give them perhaps that \$1.3 million that you've been saving. That's exactly what it would be, it's \$1.303849. That would probably result in a tax decrease. I would hope that you would see it our way. I do thank, and I was very happy to hear Mr. Anglace say that "if you don't have an education, you're nowhere in this country." I actually applaud you for saying that. You finally are coming to see our way. I thank you for your time and effort.

*Ron Pavlucik, 287 Eagles Landing*

Good evening. I support the Mayor's budget as it was released a number of months ago. I support the efforts of your organization, your Board and the Apportionment and Taxation to hold the line on any significant changes, especially any increases. This needs to be the year of the taxpayer for obvious reasons, and we see other towns trying to do the same thing – Stratford, Fairfield, Monroe, Trumbull, but in the latest reading of the newspaper articles it seems like most of those towns are not going to be able to hold the line on a tax freeze. I would like to see Shelton definitely be a city that does that.

I want to see a big article in the paper in the next couple of weeks when you finalize the numbers – “No mill rate increase in Shelton.” I trust your judgment to move the numbers around. You are the most informed on that information from attending all the budget workshops. I want the bottom line, even if it includes a slight increase in the budget due to, that can be accommodated by the increase in the Grand List, I want to see, and I'm asking you to hold the line so that we might be the only community in the whole region that has no increase in the mill rate. Not only is that a very selfish reason on my part to have happen, but I think it's something that would be a line in the sand; something that would be another bright star and award and good reputation for Shelton which has already got a great reputation and image in the area because of the low taxes we've had for so long under Mayor Lauretti and your efforts and others.

I think that's something that I would like to see – all those real estate agents in the next 12 months be able to say to all those people that are going to be coming into Shelton, looking for a house, looking for a condo, that this is one of the few, maybe the only community that was able to hold the line on tax increase and not change the mill rate. Please do your best to see if you could do that and thank you for your many hours of volunteer service to Shelton in the past year.

**Adjournment**

Alderman Anglace asked three times if any member of the public wished to speak. Being none, at approximately 7:38 p.m. Alderman Papa MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Bruder  
Clerk, Board of Aldermen