



SPECIAL VIRTUAL MEETING
BOARD OF ALDERMEN
CITY OF SHELTON, CT
THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2021
Shelton City Hall, 54 Hill Street
Live-Streamed at www.cityofshelton.org
MINUTES

Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Mark A. Lauretti called the Special Virtual Meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at 5:00 p.m. in the auditorium at Shelton City Hall. All those present stood and pledged allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President- Present
Alderman Eric McPherson, Vice President- Present
Alderman Cris Balamaci- Present
Alderman Joanna Carloni - Present
Alderman David Gidwani- Present via Phone
Alderman Noreen McGorty- Not Present
Alderman Anthony Simonetti- Present
Alderman Bernie Simons- Present via Phone

Administration

Mayor Mark A. Lauretti - Present
Fran Teodosio, Corporation Counsel – Present

Others Present:

Joe DeLong, CCM, Executive Director and CEO
Kevin Maloney, CCM, Director of Communications & Member Relations
Donna Hamzy Carroccia, CCM, Advocacy Manager

Public Portion

Mayor Lauretti asked if anyone from the public wished to address the board. There being none, he closed the public portion.

PRESENTATION:

Joe DeLong, Executive Director of Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM)

- Zoning Reform in CT to Force Suburban and Rural Communities to Allow Multi-Family Housing as a Matter of Right
- CCM Relationship with Desegregate Connecticut and Open Communities Alliance
- Questions, Concerns and Comments

Joe DeLong: I want to thank the Board of Aldermen for having me here this evening. First, I want to introduce one of my Advocacy Managers, Donna Hamzy Carroccia, who has been on the front lines of this issue for the past couple of years. As we get into technical questions, I am going to ask Donna to help answer those because Donna is the one who has been doing a great deal of work with all parties involved in this issue. Let me first talk to you briefly about the history of this issue and how CCM has developed this position. Dating back to last spring, at least on these particular bills, we received a phone call from Sara Bronin, who is the head of Desegregate CT. Sara Bronin asked if we would be willing to work with them and join their coalition to discuss these issues. My comment to Sara was, 'absolutely.' As an organization, we are willing to join any coalition to discuss any issue, it doesn't mean we will be supportive of it but we absolutely want the opportunity to come to the table and work with various groups on issues that impact our communities. We held a meeting with CCM's Executive Committee and Board of Directors and invited Sara to that where she talked about what she was working on and some of her proposals. They had a lot of questions. There were things in the proposals that at that time the Executive Committee was not supportive of. They made that clear but did indicate at that time that yes, CCM would certainly be willing to be a partner in working together on these issues and appreciated the opportunity to work with them instead of having to just respond to legislation that is many times well intended but very poorly written and thought out. That puts us in precarious positions with the General Assembly. For the last several months, CCM has had a working group of our members that have been working regularly going through the proposal. To give you an idea of the members in that working group I am just going to read them off: Barkhamstead, Bethany, Bolton, Bridgeport, Clinton, Columbia, Darien, East Windsor, Greenwich, Guilford, Hamden, Hartford, Killingly, Mansfield, New Haven, Newington, Redding, Stamford, Stratford, Thomaston, Union, Warren and Westport. That working group went through each individual proposal. There were meetings that they had where they spent two hours on a meeting talking about one segment of the Desegregate CT proposal. They made their modifications that they thought were appropriate and talked about how it would impact their individual communities. Ultimately, the individual segments of the Desegregate CT proposal were voted on over the course of the meetings one segment at a time. Through that working group, there was not a single dissenting vote that was cast on any one of these individual proposals after they had modified them or made the recommendation of how they thought it should be done. Following the working group getting through all of those individual proposals, in a way in which they could be supportive of them, the working group product went to CCM's Board of Directors which currently has representatives on it from 30 communities. It was presented to the Board of Directors as a

package with the understanding that this package had been worked on for months with the working group of CCM's members and the Board of Directors was asked to take a position on it. Again, there were no dissenting votes from the Board of Directors as they looked through the package as recommended. There were two members of the Board of Directors that abstained from casting a vote. It was pretty heavily vetted by the membership. One of the challenges that we find with these types of positions are that there are many bills that are out there that often create a lot of confusion. There are bills that we don't support because we haven't been part of being able to work with the organizations that develop them and vet them. Ultimately, you have a bill that is going to be up on Monday which is Senate Bill #1024; said bill is essentially the modified version of the original Desegregate CT agenda, as modified by the working members of the CCM membership and vetted by CCM's board. That's one of the proposals. There will be several other proposals that we will oppose. The other thing I want to point out is that we did a quick cursory look, knowing that we were going to be here tonight, on the proposed Senate Bill #1024 and Shelton is already doing all of them. I don't believe that there is anything in that specific proposal that if enacted will have any impact on your community at all because frankly you are pretty much ahead of the curve on this issue as it comes to your affordable housing and your local zoning laws. As of right now, it doesn't look like it would have any impact, at least currently the way you are conducting your zoning. I think that pretty much lets you know what the process is and I think that's important because I get asked the question a lot, not just on this bill, but a lot of bills, things like, 'why did CCM take this position?' I always give the same answer, 'it's because the members told us to.' We don't develop these positions. As staff, there is a process that's put in place and we go and carry out the will of the members as it's presented to us.

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: I just want to add on to what Joe said regarding the Desegregate CT Proposal and the CCM membership over the many months we have been working with them. This doesn't also stop here. This is just the bill that came out of those discussions, this is the first part of that legislative process, so there is an opportunity for us to all come together and really lend our voices and work in a collaborate way to make this work for everyone. Below are some consensus items I would like to discuss.

- The item relates to Commercial Corridors and Main Street Corridors: The original proposal that Desegregate CT put out had the reference to a Commercial Corridor. In many towns, particularly the smaller towns, there weren't any commercial corridors that stood out. It didn't apply to them. So, they thought it made more sense, and was more representative for communities across CT to use the term Main Street Corridor.
- The original draft had included a cap of \$250 on consulting fees. For instance, when a developer comes to you with a proposal and you want to go out and seek consultation on any part of his proposal, this would have capped it at \$250. There was generally a consensus around the table, not only with the small towns but mid-size cities as well, who may have the staff but not have the technical expertise to fully vet the proposal. We came forward and asked that those caps be removed. The compromise was adding the word 'necessary' which makes it narrow in the terms that it's 'whatever consulting fees are necessary for a particular project'. That gives each town some flexibility as to what is necessary. It's not fully defined by the bill.
- This item refers to the removal of the word character. This is something that people have been talking about. The word 'character' brings a lot of conversation. The

beginning of our conversation on that is that it's really just a word but for some people it really is a word that carries a lot of historically racially segregating context. Whether you agree with that or not, it was the will of the group and a consensus that folks do feel that way. How can we get to a place where towns can have the ability to maintain character so to speak but not say it in such a way? There was an agreement that the words Physical Sight Characteristics & Architectural Context would be used in its place. That allows you all to ensure that there is aesthetic conformity and you can preserve any characteristics but just doesn't use the word 'character' specifically as just the word.

- The next item refers to Traffic Standard Changes. Within the bill there was some conversation that Desegregate CT had about providing options to towns, traditionally the option is 'Level of Service,' that's how you decide what the traffic impact is going to be in a particular development. This proposal is offering the option of using the 'Vehicle Miles Traveled' or 'Vehicle Trips Generated' rational. The reason behind that is really that a lot of developments use of the Level of Traffic Service impacts by the development tend to create road expansion and sprawl. The hope was that in offering this option there might be towns that use Vehicle Miles Traveled to provide for mitigating options. Mitigating strategies involved things like adding bikeways or walkways or crosswalks, giving towns the ability to use that standard with the option to require the developer to provide options for crosswalks, bike walks, sidewalks and bus stops. That again, is not mandated by the bill, but it provides an option to towns if they want to use Level of Service, they can still use that. It couldn't be a mandate because DOT still uses the Level of Service standard.
- The next item refers to Minimum Parking Standards. This particular part of the bill, applies a minimum parking standard not to exceed. This part of the bill applies to all parking within the community and there is specific language in the bill that's related to just the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) section of the bill that requires as of right, the types of housing within a transit district within that particular portion of the bill, there are no parking requirements. To back up, relating to parking requirements, it was agreed that while the bill initially allowed for minimum parking standard, it was the will of the group is that we should also set a ceiling for that. They decided that there was a minimum standard with a maximum allowable parking or dwelling units and multifamily mixed-use developments that may not exceed parking in excess of one parking space for each studio or one bedroom dwelling unit and two parking spaces for each dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms. Again, related to the TOD portions of the bill, there is no parking requirement.
- The next item refers to Regulation of Signs. This particular piece of the bill, was not discussed in our working group but it is one that came out of our policy committee related to law and liability. Essentially, it just removed the word 'advertising' from the zoning statutes because there was a court decision that allowed Zoning commissions to regulate advertising signs with no other types of signs included. Towns really felt that they needed an option to regulate all signs not necessarily the content of the signs but regulating the signs in general. By removing the word 'advertising', municipal attorneys said that is a quick solution to allow for towns to be able to regulate all signs, again not the content of the signs, but without having to worry about just advertising signs being part of the statute.

- The bill also allows for an ‘aggrieved party’ to sue a municipality if the city is not following the zoning laws of the state. That particular part of the bill started off with the language, ‘any person’ and there was a lot of conversation around that not any person can bring suit because they don’t have a standing regarding that particular suit. By using the word ‘aggrieved party’, it was agreed that this actually provides the legalese that provides the point that they have standing within the court with that particular suit.
- The next item is Accessory Dwelling Units. The working group agreed that because it’s essentially what towns are now doing, to allow for as of right accessory dwelling units for at least one on each single-family lot.
- The next item is Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). This is what Joe was talking about in terms of Shelton and how you guys are doing in this area with TOD. It’s an important point to make because this is where some of the concerns arise. So, in the bill they are proposing that 50 percent of an area within a quarter mile of one main street, they are proposing that for two- to four-person unit housing with any housing being over ten percent of the units as affordable. Essentially what they are saying is that 50 percent of the lot area within a half mile of a fixed Transit District, so you all don’t have a fixed Transit District that is defined in this bill. So, this particular piece of it will not apply to you. The second portion relates to the same calculation off of the Main Street Corridor and Shelton already provides for multi-family housing within that space.
- The working group that was created was meant to develop model guidelines for buildings and context appropriate streets. It would require training for land and zoning boards and while the technical pieces of that have not been laid out, the concerns that were raised for this are really for the smaller towns who are already having trouble finding volunteers who sit on these commissions. By adding mandates to require training for these members and putting the onus on those commissioners who volunteer, the fear is that they won’t get volunteers for these commissions.

Mayor Lauretti: Who is paying for the training and who is doing the training?

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: That’s still one of those items that is sort of hanging out there. As CCM and other organizations, that are named in the bill, we already provide training such as CAZEO (CT Association of Zoning Enforcement Officials) or CCAPA (Connecticut Chapter of American Planning Association). they already provide this training and have this curriculum so there really isn’t a lot of work that has to go into putting that together. We have had conversations with member services internally to be able to provide that training to our membership and as an extension to your commissions, that’s still a work in progress. If the bill is to move through the process there will be a fiscal note for this reason and we are working behind the scenes to alleviate that.

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: Then the last piece of this is the Sewer and Water Infrastructure. In CT a lot of communities do not have Sewer Water Infrastructure to support development. That is really why some of these communities have not built out. Our hope, and has been for quite some time is, that the State recognizes that we want to use alternative waste treatment systems and also emboldening DPH in the statutes that already exist to create regulation around the use of these types of structures so that when developers come and they want to deal with each town based on a set of regulations that DPH just created, it’s

easier across town lines to understand what the requirements will be. We hope that DPH will at least be given some funding to create regulations that they were required to create.

Alex Rossetti, Shelton P&Z Administrator: I just have one comment and one question. As I am sure most of you in this room are aware that municipalities are required to have an Affordable Housing Plan by the end of this year. It seems that the state is jumping the gun by mandating all of these requirements without allowing towns to implement their own plans and to see the impact of those plans come to fruition. I agree, that many of these ideas could be beneficial but I am curious as to why this urgency for statewide mandates and all these different changes when municipalities haven't had the time to address many of them? I know Shelton as you mentioned is ahead of the curve in allowing Accessory Dwelling and Multifamily Development in some areas but I think a lot of municipalities outside Shelton would address these issues themselves without the state pushing this. Why is this happening without giving towns the time to address these issues themselves? The second issue I have is, and it seems like this is not the case, but of residents and people I have spoken with are worried about multifamily developments in typical one-acre zoning outside of transit hubs and outside of main street areas and I was hoping that you could clarify for the record that these bills are not intended to allow multi-family developments outside of these areas in the more suburban zoning areas intended for more downtown transit areas?

Joe DeLong: I do want to address the second question. The way it was phrased as 'these' bills. We are speaking specifically to 'a' bill. There are several bills out there, many of which we would have tremendous reservations about for a variety of reasons. There are probably bills introduced that would address that concern, but I will let Donna speak to the specific bill that Desegregate CT proposed and how they would apply. As to the first question as to the why? To be honest that's a question that we could ask over a whole lot of things that the General Assembly decides to do or advocates decide to tackle. Our position goes all the way back to six years ago when I was initially hired for this job. One of the things that I asked the board at that time is what is it that you want? What do you want in a successful executive director? They said that they really want to be partners in governing. We want to be at the table as opposed to being on the menu all the time. We have worked in that regard to say that anybody who wants to work with us, we will try to, it doesn't mean we will agree with what you say, we will try as an organization to represent our members with our members at the table to work collaboratively with you. We will come with an open mind and an open agenda to try and work through things. I will say a variety of these proposals have been around for years. I think that the national stage of highlighting equity has driven them to the forefront. I would argue, perhaps unsuccessfully, that CCM has done a lot of work in the area of equity. I would argue that these bills, none of them, have anything to do with equity. Some may, but at least the ones that we have been engaged with and working on in the housing area, they aren't as much about race equity than they are about economics. We don't always know why the General Assembly takes on what they take on and why they make certain things a priority. As long as they are a priority for some, we have to make sure we are at the table and working collaboratively and if something passes it has to pass with the best interest of our members.

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: Specifically related to the first question with the Affordable Housing Plan. I think folks see it as two different things. This particular bill the terms that are used such as mixed use and multi-family housing, they aren't really talking about affordability. The time when affordability is raised is when the units in a development need a certain percentage, etc. As to Joe's point, I don't know why but I think maybe in this case it's because we aren't talking about affordable houses but diversity of housing. As for your second question, for the record, this does not relate to multi-family or mix-used housing none of that is referred to anywhere else outside the TOD zone. Under the bill, requirements are specifically in that area of TOD.

Alderman Simonetti: Who is behind this bill, which Senators, which Representatives, do you know who it is?

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: Desegregate CT, they have done a lot of work behind the scenes to their credit really, there are a lot of different organizations. I would say there is not one particular legislator that's the champion. It's really just a collection of them but more so, a collection of organizations that have now signed on to the Desegregate CT organization.

Mayor Lauretti: It seems as if Hartford and New Haven are in on this.

Ms. Carroccia: They are definitely part of the conversation on this but they are not the only ones.

Mayor Lauretti: No, they aren't the only ones, but they are the aggressors.

Alderman Simonetti: This is Bill 1024, and you said that Shelton is ahead of the curve and you don't see any real problem with this for us. Which bill do you think may be a problem that was just brought up by our administrator that would affect one-acre zoning areas?

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: I don't have them in front of me so I am just thinking off the top of my head, but there are a number of bills but one you may have heard of is Bill 804, that particular bill is before the housing committee, Senator Anwar from South Windsor is the champion in that bill. What a lot of different advocates have done is take certain pieces of the Desegregate CT bill and inserted them into proposals that go farther. To the credit of Desegregate CT they have come to CCM to work with us whereas other organizations and legislators really haven't done that. Those proposals we do not agree with because there was no consensus from amongst our membership.

Alderman Simonetti: If I could now ask our Zoning Administrator and our Zoning Chair, do you agree with her that Bill 1024 is not a problem or are there problems with it?

Alex Rossetti: Based on what CCM has said and what I have had an opportunity to skim through, this does not seem to pose any challenges to our city. Most of the items that this bill proposes are things that we already have in our regulations and ordinances and things we do constantly. I think based off of what we heard tonight; I believe it's a bill we can feel safe with. The other bills mentioned I think we definitely should review.

Mayor Lauretti: The only caution that I would raise is that often times the legislature in their infinite wisdom attach values and numbers associated with these regulations that is very difficult, if not impossible, for many municipalities in Connecticut to meet. We may fall victim to that as well.

Alex Rossetti: I would like to make just one comment. I think many of us understand that there is a housing shortage in the state and we are losing our population year by year due to high housing costs and a plethora of issues. Some of these housing proposals may help change that and may help keep our youth and our educated population in the state. But to say that Desegregate CT is not related to affordable housing, I don't think that's quite right, I understand they have different intentions but I know Shelton is a different town than some of these other towns but my assumption would be somewhere like Redding or Easton, doesn't have as much commercial development, they might be inclined to come up with a downtown area or a commercial area that is going to allow for higher density development and with their affordable housing plan they are going to allow for these higher density developments, so again, going back to what I said earlier, these are just my comments, I don't want to speak for the rest of administration, but it just seems they are jumping the gun by mandating all these things for towns that haven't had the chance to potentially allow for themselves to come up with locations where they want to put these things and maybe they are outside of transit districts, maybe they want to relocate things, I know it doesn't apply for Shelton but just some food for thought. I would let municipalities be creative and work with their commissions and staff to figure out ways to address these issues, then the State doesn't have to get involved.

Virginia Harger, Chairperson for P&Z: I would like confirmation on who on CCM staff went through all the proposed bills that make an impact on zoning?

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: We didn't go through all of them, I just want to be clear on that.

Virginia Harger: I did testify in the Public Hearing for Bill 804 and I signed up to testify for Monday's hearing before Planning and Development. I will hold judgement on the impact of what some of these will be because while it seems at first glance it may not affect us but it can because there is always something that falls through the cracks. I wouldn't sign off on this personally myself or want the city to until we get a lot more information. I printed out six different proposed bills that had a lot of redundant language and my hope is that there isn't a thought process that if you can't get it passed in this bill then we get this language passed in another. Let's hope that's not the case. Those are my concerns. Then specifically you mentioned about the sewer and water infrastructure and have the local DPH been informed of this and have they had a chance to share their input?

Donna Hamzy Carroccia: I haven't heard from anyone but I can run it by the members. It's always been the thought process to increase their jurisdiction.

Alderman Anglace: After picking up the phone and calling you to come out here today, I am not sure that I am any farther along except that more people are involved, and we heard a

few things and we maybe understand a few things that we didn't, but the way this came to me is that I read the New York Times article, not very complimentary and we are working with Desegregate CT, who appears to be working with us but on the other hand they are going off on their own and they are picking on one of our members Woodbridge and they are taking an action against them and getting the Yale Law School involved and I just don't see that as a third party, sitting here as a member saying, 'Hey, I don't think they are working with us, I think they are using us.' I am not sure which is the case.

Joe DeLong: Can I respond to that quickly. I just want to be clear because I think it's a very valid point. That's actually not Desegregate CT going after Woodbridge. It's Open Communities Alliance. They are two totally separate organizations. We don't have that relationship with the Open Communities Alliance.

Alderman Anglace: I can see why. We need to be in the communications loop. One of the things that CCM has done very well is communicate. This issue was not communicated. It was just not communicated well. You might think that Shelton is doing fine and they may be head and shoulders above others when it comes to this but we have issues to communicate as well and things that should be put on the table when the powers to be in Hartford are changing laws, there are some things that our P&Z people will tell you that may open their eyes a little bit. I think the communications has got to get better if we are going to have an impact. Just to take a step back, you noted that there was a working group. I have no idea how that working group was formed. I don't believe we were contacted and asked if we had an interest in it.

Joe DeLong: I can't necessarily speak to that directly. As you said communication can always be better. What we did initially is send out to the membership saying that we were forming this community and asking anybody who would be interested in serving on it and then as time went by there were other communities that reached out and said that they heard this was going on and we have a concern and our response was come and join the group. I think your point is a good one. We need to take to heart that the communication can better and we will take that back and work on it.

Alderman Anglace: We have 169 towns and I am sitting here wondering how many of them are aware of what's really going on and how this is going to impact them? I think there will be a serious impact, not only to the town but to every individual who has invested his life savings in his property. The challenge coming from Hartford is that we are going to tell you how to legislate for the entire state, all 169 municipalities. That's just gross.

Joe DeLong: Let me say this. That's music to my ears, because the more member engagement we have, the easier our job is. We would certainly love to have greater engagement on these issues. I can send you a list of not just the Desegregate CT committee but all of the policy committees of the membership within CCM and if there are people from your boards or commissions who would like to join a particular interest in any of those areas, you have my word, we will make that happen. We would love to have you as a part of it.

Mayor Lauretti: Thank you all for coming.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Alderman Anglace MOVED to waive the reading and approve the following meeting minutes:

1.1 SPECIAL VIRTUAL MEETING – FEBRUARY 23, 2021

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Minutes can be viewed on the city website: www.cityofshelton.org.

5.1 FINANCE COMMITTEE

5.1.1 NO ITEMS

5.2 PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE

5.2.1 NO ITEMS

5.3 STREET COMMITTEE

5.3.1 NO ITEMS

REPORT OF THE MAYOR

I want to share with the Board some of my thoughts on a letter to the Editor by one of our very own, the Great Gidwani, from the first ward. He sent a letter to the editor of the Shelton Herald saying that the City deserves better than Lauretti. Over my thirty years, I have always appreciated my critics or not so much. Only because I know most of their dialogue and commentary are personal. It's very, very, rarely rooted in fact as the case may be here. Mr. Gidwani starts out and says that apparently the system is irrevocably broken. I thought to myself, how does he qualify this? Considering the fact that we didn't go through this last year. He references the fact that kids are not being picked up by the school buses because we aren't managing them properly. I thought to myself, 'okay, where was this commentary last year when the city took over the buses?' Virtually non-existent. If you look around the state, the country and the world in the last year, it's not hard to know that there are many things that have been disrupted in our lives from government, school, recreation, transportation at every level. No one is surprised by that except Mr. Gidwani who thinks it's singular here to Shelton. I did some research and got some numbers from the Board of Education. These are the total school runs needed and provided in the morning and the afternoon. This is for the month of February. There were 545 runs that we made. Ten of which we missed. Ten out of 545 runs for the month of February. If you go to March, there were 396 runs and eight of which were

missed. That means that the kids didn't get transported by the buses because there was a lack of availability for buses. It has nothing to do with the resources that we have to provide the service. It has everything to do with the fact that there is a pandemic and that people are sick, people are staying home and/or calling in sick. Last Monday, we had 17 drivers call in sick and we were unavailable to provide two runs that day. It started out as four but we scrambled and put together a private contractor and took some of our other bus personnel to fulfill runs and you know, if timing was an issue then so be it but it was not for a lack of effort. All of this week we have been down 12 to 13 drivers because as you know when you get Covid-19 you are required to quarantine for X number of days under CDC guidelines. That hampers things. As I said to you earlier, this is not an issue that is singular to Shelton. Last couple of months, the City of Waterbury had 30 drivers call in sick and had to cancel bus runs. Last November, the City of New Haven had to cancel school for a month and a half for lack of bus drivers because the drivers called in sick. The list goes on and on. We see this in Stratford, Trumbull and Monroe and other surrounding communities. Again, not singular to Shelton but in this political environment that we live in, people like to think that other people in the public are not smart, and that they will buy into all this rhetoric. Going a little bit further, I want to talk about the fact that last year, some time around November, school was shut down from November to January. No school at all. The reason being is that they couldn't staff the classrooms because teachers called in sick. They couldn't get substitutes to fill in. So, is this singular to the school bus issue in Shelton? I will let you decide what you think. The other thing that we have been expeditiously working on with respect to school transportation is the automated system that is the responsibility of the Board of Education called Versatrans. They have a system that does the routing and establishes all the routes with input from the BOE staff at central office. They give us the information where the kids live and establish the routes. That has not been updated in ten years. I am also told that there is probably anywhere from 800 to 1000 kids in the system that no longer exist. So, we are going to be working the next couple of weeks with Versatrans to update the automation on our buses for our drivers and re-establishing new routes. Some of you have heard me say in the last couple of months, our school enrollment is down 1,300 students since 2009. That's not insignificant. If you look at the capacity of an elementary school, that is the equivalent of three elementary schools. Not only do we have the same number of elementary schools that we did in 2009 as we do today, but we also have the same school bus footprint as we did fifteen years ago. That hasn't changed. I am going to tell you that it is going to change. It's going to shrink that footprint, it's going to make us more efficient, and for all those people out there that deny the fact that we saved \$1,000,000 a year by taking over the transportation for the school system, I would just call their attention to the court settlement and the fact that our guaranteed price of \$3,150,000 is \$1.2 million less than what Durham had quoted the school system two years ago and that they were all set to sign on to. That million dollars gets compounded for the next two years because we agreed to a three-year contract with no increase. It's important for the public, who still has an open mind, to understand the facts surrounding some of this negative commentary that is coming from people who are disenfranchised for whatever it is that drives them. As a sidebar, it was just Monday that CT-Transit in New Haven had 50 bus drivers call out and they had to cancel services. I am not sure if the City of Shelton is the only one being impacted by this worldwide pandemic.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

No Report.

6 – LEGAL REPORT

6.1 CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING

Alderman Anglace MOVED to authorized a total payment of \$2,537.50 to Corporation Counsel Teodosio Stanek, LLC, for services rendered per statements March 4, 2021, with funds to come from the following Legal Services Accounts:

Professional Services -	001-1900-411.30-01	\$
Legal Fees -	001-1900-411.30-03	\$2,537.50
Foreclosure Fees -	001-1900-411.50-01	\$
Court Costs -	001-1900-411.80.84	\$

SECONDED by Alderman McPherson.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Dave Gidwani left the meeting at 6:06 p.m.

6.2 ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL BILLING

No Invoice.

7– LEGISLATIVE – OLD

7.1 ITEMS FROM PUBLIC HEARING

7.1 A. NO ITEMS

8 – FINANCIAL BUSINESS – OLD

8.1 NO ITEMS

9 – FINANCIAL BUSINESS – NEW

9.1 MARCH STATUTORY REFUNDS

Alderman Anglace MOVED that the report of the Tax Collector relative to the refund of taxes for a total amount of \$73,038.03 be approved and that the Finance Director be directed to make payments in accordance with the certified list received from the Tax Collector with funds to come from the Statutory Refunds Account 001-0000-311.13.00.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

10 – LEGISLATIVE – NEW

10.1 ITEMS TO PUBLIC HEARING

10.1 A. NO ITEMS

11 - EXECUTIVE SESSION

11.1 A. REQUEST TO MOVE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Alderman Anglace MOVED to go into executive session and asked the Corporation Counsel and Assistant Corporation Counsel to be included.

SECONDED by Alderman McPherson.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Alderman Simonetti MOVED to reconvene and noted that there were no votes were taken in executive session.

SECONDED by Alderman Balamaci.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

11.1 FISHER VS. CITY OF SHELTON

Alderman Anglace MOVED that the 14 percent permanent partial disability impairment rating of the lumbar spine as assessed by Dr. Klauser be approved and that the claimant William Fisher receive a permanent partial disability award of \$12,538.64 to be paid in accordance with Workers Compensation Protocol.

SECONDED by Alderman Simonetti.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman McPherson MOVED to adjourn the Special Virtual Meeting.

SECONDED by Alderman Balamaci.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Theresa Adcox

Theresa Adcox
Board of Aldermen Clerk

DATE APPROVED _____ BY: _____
Mayor Mark A. Laretti

