



CITY OF ANSONIA BOARD OF ALDERMEN Special Meeting – August 20, 2013

Call to Order

Aldermanic President Gene Sharkey called the Special Meeting of the Ansonia Board of Aldermen to order at approximately 8 p.m. immediately following the Public Hearing on Charter Revision.

Roll Call

The following Aldermen were in attendance:

Edward Adamowski, D1- present
Peter Marcinko, D1 - present
Charles Stowe, R2 - present
Philip Tripp, R2 - present
Kevin Mott, D3- present
Joseph Jeanette, D3 - present
Jerome Fainer, D4 - absent

Anthony DeLucia, D4 - absent
Howard Madigosky, D5 - present
Joan Radin, R5 - present
Scott Nihill, D6 - present
John Marini, R7 - present
David Knapp, D7 - present
Gene Sharkey, D6 - present

President Sharkey declared a quorum of 12 present, 2 absent.

Discuss and act upon recommendations of the Charter Revision Commission

Alderman Nihill MOVED to accept the call of the meeting; SECONDED by Alderman Marini. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 12-0.

Alderman Tripp MOVED to accept the report of the Charter Revision Commission as a final report and all four items should be passed on to the ballot; SECONDED by Alderman Marini. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 12-0.

President Sharkey stated, we had accepted the Explanatory Text on Questions 1, 2 and 3 at our Regular Meeting. Can we also accept the Explanatory Text that goes along with Question 5.

Alderman Rading MOVED to accept the Explanatory Text that goes along with Question 5; SECONDED by Alderman Marini. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 12-0.

President Sharkey stated, we have recommendations before us that we've accepted.

Number one, that the Charter of the City of Ansonia be amended and revised to increase the solicitation of bids and proposals by duly advertising by publication from \$5,000 to \$25,000.

Alderman Knapp MOVED to add that to the ballot in November.

Alderman Marini stated, we actually had a motion from Phil Tripp...

President Sharkey stated, that was accepting them all.

Alderman Tripp stated, and to add them to the ballot.

President Sharkey stated, oh, I didn't hear that.

The secretary confirmed the motion that the four items, 1, 2, 3 and 5, should be passed on to the ballot.

Alderman Knapp WITHDREW his motion.

Alderman Marini stated, as you know I'm Chairman of the Charter Revision Commission and I think we have a wonderful opportunity to do good for the people of Ansonia tonight. We have four revisions. All these recommendations will save time and money for the people of Ansonia. The fourth is really important - we spend a lot of time talking about ways to spend money, we talked about the bonding project and I do maintain that the bonding project is necessary and for the good of the people of Ansonia as well. This proposal here tonight allows the voters to finally be in the driver's seat in terms of budget. It allows them to have a direct voice in the system. It makes the system a better, more open system, a more transparent system and a more accountable system.

Tonight the vote is to approve the recommendations and to send them to the ballot. In terms of the details, as long as we have an agreement on the substance tonight we can tweak those proposals as we go forward but the important thing is to put these to the ballot. Republicans and Democrats together to say as a group that we want to give that opportunity to our voters to allow them to have a say in what the budget is. There is going to be disagreement but this is an opportunity for us to directly poll our constituents and hear directly from them on the most important thing a municipal government can do, what to spend, when it comes down to it. We've heard from a lot of different groups tonight. From the Board of Aldermen that their feeling is they don't really set the budget. We hear from the Board of A&T that they act as fiduciary but they don't really make the financial decisions governing the contracts. If they were here today you'd probably hear from the WPCA that they set the sewer fees but they don't negotiate contracts and they don't deal with all the other parts of the budget. So what you have is all these parts of the

government pointing fingers at each other. But who is making the important decision of pulling the trigger in terms of the municipal budget? Who is accountable? With this proposal we're making the public accountable. We're there as the government to guide, but we're allowing the public to come in for the first time and put their stamp of approval on what we're doing.

We've heard different things. We talked about grants not being included. That can be remedied simply by putting a definition as is very standard in Charters or Statutes just saying the definition of a spending increase does not include grants. That solves that problem. In terms of the dates, as we move forward we can scale those dates back. Overall, all four proposals are sound. All four are rock solid proposals that will start to move the City forward.

Alderman Adamowski stated, first let me say I am in full support of giving the public more say in the budget process. The questions I have are, 1.5 percent of what? Is that of the mill rate, the budget, per each department, of the overall budget, does it include the Board of Education budget?

Secondly, it can conceivably be, if we had a zero dollar increase, but we got a \$1 million grant from the State of Connecticut. That would have to go to referendum because we're taking in \$1 million and sending out \$1 million theoretically. It's over the 1.5 percent. So for us to get \$1 million without raising the mill rate or taxes or anything else, we'll have to spend \$10,000 on a referendum to see if that's okay. Just a point.

Third, if the local share of the funding stays consistent for the State educational funding is not, as Mr. Norman had mentioned, you would have to go to referendum for that if you want to put that money in before hand. You would be forced not to, and the past 20 years the State has been late in making their decision on when they actually set the budget. We know they're not on the ball with that. We will always be behind the 8-ball on what our numbers are actually going to be when it's our budget time. If we were going to do this, we would have to move our whole process back six months. One other issue I don't think anyone has thought of is, Mr. Norman said they're done the third week in May, so in order for us to get the tax bills out we have to have everything completed by then. The only other way to do it would be to spend another \$5,000 after that if the tax bills are wrong. Because we don't have our money right. So now in October, we'd have to say, well, our numbers weren't right so we have to spend another \$5,000 in mailing to send out new tax bills. We may have to say we overcharged you and give you a credit. I don't know.

Alderman Marini stated, it would be a lot like other towns that have referendums, like Seymour. They have them no matter what the spending increase is. Those towns don't push their budget process back six months. In fact, it actually mirrors a lot of Seymour's dates. Is it doable? Yes. Is there much to laugh at when you look at Seymour going to vote five times? When you take a look at their budget and realize they're spending about \$10 million less per year, there is nothing funny with that.

The Charter Revision Commission doesn't want to see us going to a referendum because we got more money in from the State. So the solution is that we put in a definition. It's standard definition that says the spending increase in this section does not mean grant increases, whether it be education, municipal or otherwise. That just clarifies it.

I think there is a fair point at the Board's pleasure to roll it back a month or so to give a little more time. That still puts us in budget season and I think it works out. To say that the entire budget process can't work with a referendum, that it would have to go back six months, that flies in the face of so many towns in Connecticut that are going to referendum an unlimited amount of times.

In summary it's the spending we're talking about. We mean turning to the taxpayers and saying we're going to need more of your money to make things work. That's what the issue is here; it's not grants. We can turn to Corporation Counsel Blake for the fine tuning. Tonight we need substance; tonight we need to be on the same page. We can do it tonight. If you're in favor of a referendum we can do it tonight.

Alderman Stowe stated, I appreciate everybody coming out tonight. I'm glad to be involved with this process; I want to see Ansonia go forward in a positive way. Economic Development and I'd like to see the taxpayers have the right to have some say about what is going on in their life. I believe if we put this freeze on the real estate values will eventually go up in a short time. I believe that. People aren't going to be looking saying oh if I move to Ansonia my taxes may go up six percent - who knows what's going to happen there. It gives us some solidity. The reason for the 1.5 percent, most people who don't work for government are lucky if they get a 1 to 2 percent raise. So if you're getting 1 to 2 percent, and I know a lot of people don't - they have fixed incomes - it would possibly meet their raise. I would like the people to have a say if anything is going to go over this amount. It's only right based upon what's going on on the planet. Right now, the Town of Orange is at \$61.4 million. We're at \$61,086. We have the same budget as Orange. We don't have what Orange has. Why is that? We should all vote on it and see where it lies. We've taken enough of these people's time here. I think we should vote.

Alderman Marcinko stated, overall the Charter Revision is just a good way to go. I think you did a fantastic job. The gentleman asked who voted for the budget increase last time... we all voted for the budget increase last time - a 1.67 percent increase. I know I put a lot of time into it and I'm sure everybody did with regard to cutting as much as we could. We decided that what we cut wasn't enough with 1.5 percent. I know there was a huge room full of people here that were screaming bloody murder about the Board of Education. We seem to go back and forth as far as it goes. We're all for education but it's said I know as far as tax dollars being applied to education there's too much being applied to education. The 1.5 percent - we were at 1.6 and that was cutting everything. How much further down can we go? Quite frankly the public

should be involved in every little step that's taken. The other thing that worries me, you keep saying tweaking it, if we vote on this and accept it the way it is, we can tweak it after the fact? Isn't that doing things backward? There is nothing wrong with that?

Alderman Marini stated, if we agree on the substance we can obviously talk about the explanatory text and the fine points. We are basically saying we want to have... if the Charter said there is to be a referendum if the budget increase is over 1.5 percent, the understanding is expenditures that do not include grants, basically that would leave it up to us to figure out how to implement that. The Charter does not need to be specific, or dictate details. We are actually going above board and putting as much detail as possible. Tonight it seems we've figured out the things we'd like to tweak. We'll tweak them tonight and then it's done. In terms of the Explanatory Text and other language we can go forward with that after it's approved.

Alderman Marcinko stated, I'm agree with anything that would help bring taxes down, I know it's a question between whether we're spending too much on education or too much on other things and not enough on other things. Most of the stuff is going to go back and forth on the ballot. That is part of what the economy is.

Alderman Marini stated, when we were here talking about the budget, cutting it as much as we can. Remember, we were very frustrated that there were those elements that we couldn't control - renegotiating contracts, things sort of behind the scenes. Wouldn't it be good, really, like gravity, to have a force out there - as the people - to make sure those contracts are negotiated in a different way.

Alderman Marcinko stated, this is not for the overall budget, this is per particular department?

Alderman Marini replied no, the way it reads is the way it reads - this is for the entire budget.

Alderman Marcinko stated, then as far as the union contracts go, there is no issue with that?

Alderman Marini stated, our negotiating power in the City is obviously the Mayor's office. They will have to know they may [inaudible]. That is a way for us to exercise power - I mean, it's not for us to exercise power but a way for the people to exercise power across the board. Where everybody is pointing fingers at each other, this will allow the people to impose their say, as it should be, across all offices, all departments, all unions. The Mayor will have to negotiate knowing that he can only spend x amount. So those contracts will look different. We'll have to figure out and be creative with the way we look at the budget together, knowing there's a ceiling. The same with the WPCA and the same with the Board of Education.

Alderman Tripp stated, it's amazing to me that our neighboring town with the same size population as Ansonia - Seymour - is able to do a referendum year after year and that enables the Town of Seymour to have lower taxes with the same services. If you are a person that is in favor of the referendum, there is no better time than the present. The people are here tonight demanding this. I for one feel the people of the City of Ansonia have the right to vote and I am voting in favor of this tonight.

President Sharkey stated, first, sitting here my job is to make sure things are done correctly. For anything I say please don't think that I'm against any part of this going to ballot by any means. But I do have several questions. Number one, I am all in favor of the people having the right to vote on the budget. That being said, I'm a senior citizen, I'm retired, I'm on a fixed income. My taxes went up on my house \$550. Yes, I live on the Hilltop. We took the big hit up there. I still have to get things done the right way here.

I think the motion that was made and seconded is incorrect. That is why I asked for the clarification from the secretary. I think the vote said to accept the draft report and take those recommendations to the ballot. I don't think we want to do that. I think we want to take the explanatory text that explains the questions that are here, and take those questions to the ballot. There is a question here that shows up on the ballot.

First, our draft report has five things on it. We only want to take four to the ballot. So if we're accepting this whole thing and sending it, we're certainly not sending #4 to the ballot. That is a mistake already. So before we rescind any motions let's talk about them. That is why I started to say, do we want to take them individually.

Our #5 that I think almost every single person came here tonight to speak for is about a referendum on taxes. What is listed here on this is not what we want to put on the ballot at all. I will read to you what #5 says:

"Proposal that the City of Ansonia will follow the budget referendum of July 25, 2013 that a referendum will be held if the Board of Apportionment and Taxation has a 1.5 percent increase from the previous year."

First off, we didn't have a budget referendum on July 25th. That's a mistake. That was mentioned at the Board of Aldermen meeting - that proposal did not make sense. That being said, that's why I asked the Board to accept these two pieces of paper tonight. They make sense. We can take these to the ballot. We cannot take this to the ballot. You can't take #4, and #5 doesn't... your Proposal A on the back is fine, that could go, that's what we're talking about doing. But here is the whole thing that says what we're doing that is the Explanatory Text for City Question #4. We accepted this tonight, it was passed around. John passed out papers here tonight; we had other ones that were made and brought here. It says:

“The referendum shall be presented as follows:

- A. Shall the City budget as recommended by the Board of Apportionment and Taxation dollar amount for the fiscal year be adopted?
- B. Shall the Board of Education budget as recommended by the Board of Apportionment and Taxation dollar amount for the City of Ansonia for the fiscal year be adopted?”

Those are fine. This one on this paper isn't. So I'm just saying, we can't take that. One other thing. In the thing we're talking about doing - the proposal - we also had discussed that, and I highlighted this when we talked about it at the meeting. This is what we're going forward with. It says:

“The voters shall be given the option to vote either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ and additionally, the option to write ‘too high’ or ‘too low’ on each of the budgets.”

That's fine. That's in Seymour's, that's in Orange's, it's in everybody's. It goes down further to say:

“If only one of the aforesaid budgets passes, the budget shall be deemed to be approved. The budget question that is rejected shall be resubmitted to the ballot and resubmitted again after further rejection and further revision by the Board of Apportionment and Taxation until said budget has been accepted or until the total City and Board of Education budget represents less than a 1.5 percent increase from the previous year.”

That's fine. But what you're saying is it can never, even if you give every citizen in Ansonia the right to vote, it can never be higher than 1.5 percent. That's what that says; it can never no matter what. No matter what projects, no matter what bills, it can never be. That's what that says.

Alderman Marini stated, obviously this process is governed by State Statute. So we have to take a look at Chapter 99 that sets up [inaudible]. What we've voting on is not the Explanatory Text. We have two things. Number one, we have to accept the Draft Report as a Final Report. That is basically step one of the process. That Draft Report that you see is not what gets submitted to a ballot. What we need to take away from that Draft Report that is going to become a Final Report is to understand the substance that the Charter Revision Commission is asking us to approve.

I believe you take a look at that and especially that appendix, Proposal A, and you understand exactly what we're doing. The reference to that date, it's actually Jo-Lynn Flaherty, the Secretary, that typed that up just in enough time for us to look at it. It's basically asking us to adopt that Proposal A, which is completely fleshed out so there is no ambiguity. What Phil asked to do is to accept that Draft Report as a Final Report and we did. So Question #1 is taken out of the way. #2 is very simple - it's basically a majority vote by the

appointing authority to send the changes to the electors. It's that simple. There's no mention of referendum questions in this Statute, there's no question of any specific way to do it. It's simply what Phil asked us - send the four revisions to the ballot. So Phil got everything right. He asked for the Draft Report to be accepted as a Final Report, and he asked for the four revisions to be sent to the ballot. And Mr. President, the Statute is right here, that is how the process works. In terms of the actual language on Proposal A, which I think is completely clear, of course it could be over 1.5 percent because there are two ways that this gets accepted. Number one is obviously if it falls below the bar. So this goes out to the public, and they reject it, it goes back to Board of A&T, they move it under 1.5 and it gets approved automatically. However, you're forgetting, the voters could accept it. So theoretically it could be over 1.5 percent, it could go back to the Board of A&T and they could say, listen, I'm sorry, we've got to do it this way. Put it back out to the voters, get the City to wage an informational campaign, and the voters can say, listen, you know, it's got to be accepted. And they'll approve it at a 2 percent increase, 3 percent increase. Or, it's very possible that the first time it goes out, maybe education needs a bigger increase, maybe theirs is over a 5 percent increase. The Board of Education brings it to the people and the people can certainly say yes and accept it, and it's accepted. So there are two ways for approval, one is to revise it down to get it under the bar, and the second way is to accept it. That is the obvious way. In terms of what we're doing, is to accept the draft as a final report, we did that - that is specifically addressed right here in the Statute. The second is simply to send the changes to the ballot. It doesn't say how that has to be done. It talks right here about preparing the questions for the ballot. That is step 3. We've tried to be ahead of the game because of the time crunch. Accepting the draft as a final - we voted to approve to send the revisions to the ballot, so all that's left is to take a vote on that and move forward.

President Sharkey stated, one last thing; and that's why I prefaced it by saying I'm in favor of this. I'm just trying to make sure it's done correctly. Please be patient. I heard a couple of people say there would be some tweaking done. Are there any changes to be made of any of this before it goes on the ballot?

Alderman Marini stated, we need to have that definition section, I think it's understood, we can put it together with Corporation Counsel, but the understanding I think is clear. We need a definition that says "spending increase does not encompass increases by grants, whether they be education, municipal, state funding." We need to make sure that is clear, that we're talking about a 1.5 increase in the spending, not including spending outside sources. As long as that's understood we'll have that language and get that right. The other revision will probably be to maybe just move the budget process back by say one month, just to make sure there's some extra cushion room.

President Sharkey stated, my question was, are there any changes to this before it goes on the ballot. I say that for a reason. I've read the Statute very carefully; I'm going to ask our Corporation representative here, because we have a couple

of ways we can go tonight. My interpretation, I'll throw it out to Fran Teodosio over here, my interpretation of reading it is, if we send this on with no changes, it's final. If we make any changes, it has to go back to the Charter Revision Commission and come back to us again. That is why I'm asking, are there any changes to be made to the draft report.

Attorney Teodosio stated, if you decide to change the draft report section 7-191c makes it clear that the appointing authority, which you are right now as you sit, needs to refer it back to the Commission for those changes. Then after those changes are considered by the Commission, the two boards confer to get the final language. If you take it as is, you don't send it back to the Commission, you accept it as it's sent to you. You cannot write a definition into the Charter after the fact. You're going to need to have it as part of your recommendations. If you want that, you need to send it back to the Charter Revision Commission.

President Sharkey stated, that's why I threw that out there. That's why I say, I'm all in favor of sending it to the ballot. But if we make any changes it has to go back.

Alderman Marini stated, my read really isn't the same, because I think it's changes to the draft report and not the language.

Attorney Teodosio stated, but that's what you're making the changes to. You're proposing to take out Section 4 of your draft report, correct? You're proposing to add a definition to what is in Section 5. Those are two changes.

Alderman Marini stated, we're not changing the intent at all of the revision. The revision is what it is. All we're simply doing is clarifying. So it's not a change. Moreover it's not really to the draft report at all; it's just to the language that's going to give effect to the final report.

Attorney Teodosio stated, 191c talks about the draft report. That's what we're here with tonight, the draft report. 191c says that if the appointing authority makes no recommendation for changes in the draft report...

Alderman Marini stated, but there is no requirement that the draft report has to have any specifics at all; it could simply say, 1.5 percent or above should be a referendum...

Attorney Teodosio stated, understood, but you have a draft report here that you're talking about changing and I'm just telling you that if you're going to change that draft report, that section says it has to go back to the Commission. If you choose not to change that draft report you can go forward. It's up to you guys.

Alderman Marini stated, I don't think that's a change; I think that's a clarification. There is no change to the proposal.

Alderman Nihill stated, I don't think there's one person sitting here tonight that's against this - to put everybody at ease. There are innuendoes being thrown out here by certain people that people are negative against it and I for one am not negative against it. I don't think anybody sitting here at this table is against it. I think we're all for letting the Ansonia residents have a say on what their tax rate could possibly be. With that being said we should take the time to get this right, get the definition in there and clarify this so it's right. Not well we tried, it's not working out. Let's do it right. Take the extra week if we need to in order to get it right. I'd also like to say I'm glad to see the attendance in this room tonight. I've been on the Board maybe 12 years and at a lot of the meetings there is nobody here. It's nice to see people here getting involved in the City. We have a lot of vacancies on boards and commissions. It would be nice if some of the people in this room were to get involved in the City. It's easy to sit back and complain and be negative. I just want to let everybody know that I'm farthest from the smartest person in this room, I guarantee that, but I chose to get involved, I don't get paid. The people on the Board of A&T don't get paid. The people on the Board of Aldermen don't get paid. We pay our taxes just like you do. We've chosen to try to get involved to make our City a better place. I hope that's what everybody is here for. Maybe we can take some of this energy and move forward in a positive manner. I don't like innuendoes being thrown out by people here that people are negative. Like I said, there is nobody negative on this Board I think against this. Let's get this right. I think that's what we want to do.

Alderman Adamowski MOVED to send the Draft Report back to the Charter Revision Commission for clarification on the issues we need.

Alderman Stowe stated, I've sat at this Board now for two years and I've watched things get settled in this room rather than have to go back to a committee. What are we talking about here, the grants? What exactly is it that we're missing here so we can add it and pass this. This should not be belabored so it doesn't get up to the vote for this upcoming election. This was something that I mentioned before I got elected. I was in this room screaming and hollering about my taxes before I got elected. This could have been done 10 or 12 years ago. It's finally being addressed. Let's get this thing passed. If that's all it is is the grants that are in the way I can't understand why we can't address that right now, right here, and pass this.

Alderman Radin stated, my understanding is this is not a draft. Didn't we look at the other three at one of the last meetings? Was that part of the thing on here, that said draft, was that on there too? Then why is it we can't approve those three that we already approved and this one to go back for the couple of changes he talked about with the timeframe, maybe moving the budget back a while? My understanding was this is what we were voting on, not that draft you showed us, and those other three we already voted on at the last Board of Aldermen meeting.

President Sharkey stated, we accepted them.

Alderman Radin stated, so why can't we just send this back for the few changes? I don't understand. This is not a draft, right?

President Sharkey replied, that is explanatory text.

Alderman Radin asked, so why can't this be changed without going through what we were talking about drafts or something like that.

President Sharkey stated, Joan, that was my original question when I said, let's not accept that, let's accept these two pieces of paper, because these explained it a little bit more fully. These have the questions that were going on the ballot and that's what I was endeavoring to do.

Alderman Radin asked, why can't this go back to the Charter Revision Commission to change that section on the grants and also on the timeframe of moving it back a month. I can't understand why we have to go through this whole big thing about it. The people are here; they know what it is. We all want it. We want to see - I want to vote on the budget.

President Sharkey stated, I think before us, we can pass #1, #2 and #3 right now. There would be absolutely no problem with that. We can discuss the other one. We have a recommendation that if you change anything to it it has to go back. Before we even get into that one we can pass the other three. That's what I was trying to do. That's why I started reading and saying, I think that's where we need to go. No one is trying to hold anything up. No one is trying to keep people here. We just have to do it the right way. If we're going to change something it has to go back.

Just on that #4, we can send that back to the Charter Revision Commission to get it the way that they want. They could have a meeting Thursday night and bring it back to us Tuesday. You could all come here again on Tuesday. But I don't think - we either accept it with no changes or we send it back for changes. Only on that one question.

Alderman Marini stated, the report is the report. I don't think you can break it into pieces. You accept the draft report or not. So if it goes back to the Charter Revision Commission we can't accept anything here.

President Sharkey stated, you're basically taking #1, #2, #3 and #5 from the draft report and sending those to the ballot, after the Charter Revision Commission removes #4 from the draft report and makes the appropriate revisions to #5 as we've discussed tonight.

Alderman Tripp asked Attorney Teodosio, is there any legal reason by #4, that the Charter Revision Commission process be re-initiated immediately... is there any legal reason that cannot be on the ballot?

Attorney Teodosio replied, you need to understand what you're doing. Right now you are convening a meeting that has received a draft report - a very important word - a draft report from the Charter Revision Commission. That is in the Statute. Whatever that draft report is, whatever your records show that that draft report is, that is what we are here tonight to talk about. That draft report can include proposed Charter changes and Charter amendments. That is the operative document here tonight. So when you ask me the question you just asked me, is that what your package shows as the draft report from the Commission or the amendments from the Commission.

Alderman Tripp asked, is there anything illegal, is there anything wrong about Question #4 being put before the voters. I am looking at Charter Revision Commission draft report August 13, 2013. I've heard many people say #4 does not belong on the ballot. What is wrong with the people voting on this process being re-initiated?

Attorney Teodosio replied yes, the Charter doesn't control how the Charter Revision Commission gets appointed. It's a General Statute that requires the action of the City. The action of the City is what you took to put it into place. It's not something that the City votes on. Under the General Statute, you as the Board of Aldermen empower the Charter Revision Commission.

Alderman Marini stated, the concern about the grants is well heard, however at this point with all these meetings we've created legislative history. When we have to apply this we know exactly what we meant when we created this rule so there's no question as to what it means. However, I understand you want to make sure this is right. My main concern is that we want to do what's right for the people now. We don't want to wait a year, two years, they want to get this on the ballot.

We have to a) schedule a meeting of the Board of Aldermen, and in between the Charter Revision Commission would have to meet. We would have to be very dedicated to make sure this all comes together.

President Sharkey stated, I recommend that you get the Charter Revision Commission together this week, and we meet as the Board of Aldermen either Monday or Tuesday next week. We can do that.

Alderman Stowe stated, we take the changes, which I haven't heard them yet - it's grants, federal funding, and state funding. If we get any of those additional revenues they are not considered in the 1.5 increase. It should be simple enough right here and now to name those three things have to be reconciled by the Charter Revision Commission but we can vote on this based on if those items are taken care of. Why not.

Alderman Marini stated, that is not how the process works.

President Sharkey stated, I want to throw out one other possible change. The one that talks about people missing three meetings. We are now probably going to convene our fifth meeting of the Board of Aldermen in the last two weeks. We have someone that's been on vacation and will be back Monday. If we had another meeting, this doesn't fit. I would like to at least have the Charter Revision Commission say "if you miss three *regular monthly* meetings." That could take into account someone's sick, ill, had an operation, this sort of thing. God knows if someone was on vacation they would have missed five meetings this month already.

I would like to schedule a special meeting of the Board of Aldermen for next Tuesday to vote on what goes on the ballot and put this together. That is a suggestion. In order to do that the people that made their motions have to rescind their motions and take them off the table.

A show of hands reflected that a quorum would be able to attend a meeting next Tuesday the 27th at 7 p.m.

Alderman Tripp RESCINDED HIS MOTION. Alderman Adamowski RESCINDED his SECOND.

President Sharkey stated, the Charter Revision Commission will meet. The Board of Aldermen will meet at a special meeting August 27th.

The Aldermen reached consensus by show of hands on #1 - "That the Charter of the City of Ansonia be amended and revised to increase solicitations of bids and proposals by duly advertising by publication from \$5,000 to \$25,000."

The Aldermen reached consensus by show of hands on #2 - "That the Charter of the City of Ansonia be amended and revised so that legal notices where required may be abbreviated provided the full publication of the legal notice shall be on file with the Town Clerk and the City's official website."

The Aldermen reached consensus by show of hands on #3 - "Shall the Charter of the City of Ansonia be amended and revised to require an absentee policy."

"A member of an *appointed* Board or Commission of the City of Ansonia who is absent from three consecutive duly called *regularly scheduled monthly meetings* of said Board or Commission shall be considered to have resigned from such body and the seat occupied by such member shall be deemed to be vacant. Any vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The requirements of this section may be waived by the Board of Aldermen for good cause duly shown or where illness or other extenuating circumstances have made it impossible for a member to have met the attendance requirement of this section."

Alderman Nihill asked, it says vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. Will we have to hold a special election in order to replace a member of the Board of Education or the Board of Aldermen?

Alderman Marini stated, this should be amended to say “appointed” boards and commissions.

President Sharkey stated, I agree because it says “may be waived by the Board of Aldermen.” We are the appointing authority. Can we change that to say “any member of an appointed board or commission,” and also add “regular monthly meetings.”

The Board of Aldermen reached consensus to remove #4 - “That the Charter Revision Commission process be re-initiated immediately so that further changes to the City of Ansonia’s budgetary system can be considered.”

President Sharkey stated, once this one has terminated we have to go with the same process we did before. The Mayor’s appointments and we are the approving authority. That’s the way it has to be done again.

The Board of Aldermen reached consensus on Proposal A - we’re going to put a definition there to be clear it is not to include the State and Federal grants and the bonding, and also move the budget process back one month. And change this so it doesn’t say budget referendum of July 25th.

President Sharkey stated, we’ve all discussed what has to be tweaked and so forth.

Rich Bshara stated, if the public votes on a referendum such as the one that’s coming up in November and they approve it similar to the one they approved for the Riverside demolition, should those also be excluded as part of the 1.5 percent budget increase.

Attorney Teodosio stated, I would suggest as a recommendation that the Board of Aldermen send back to the Commission as a general recommendation to compare every proposal to the Connecticut General Statutes to make sure there is no conflict.

Alderman Adamowski MOVED to enlist the changes and send them back to the Charter Revision Commission; SECONDED by Alderman Radin. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 12-0.

President Sharkey thanked everybody for attending. He stated, I think we’re all in agreement and on the same page now as to what needs to be done to get this back next Tuesday. Our agenda will be to accept the revised Draft Report of the Charter Revision Commission.

Adjournment

Alderman Adamowski MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Radin. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 12-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Bruder, Secretary
Ansonia Board of Aldermen