

**MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY,
JUNE 13, 2017 AT 7:00 P.M. IN TOWN HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 84 SOUTH
MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410**

Present

Robert J. Oris, Jr., Chairman; Paul A. Bowman, Vice Chairman; Michael Ecke, Jeffrey Falk, Patti Flynn-Harris, Sylvia Nichols, Thomas Ruocco, Timothy Slocum, Peter Talbot. Staff: Town Manager Michael A. Milone, Town Attorney Alfred Smith; Finance Director James Jaskot; Tax Collector Donlin.

Dept. of Education – Jeff Solan, Supt. Of Schools; Shawn Parkhurst, Asst. Supt. Of Schools; Vincent Masciana, COO.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

3. ITEMS FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Personnel Matters (no executive session)

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

A. Proclamation for Flag Day

Chairman Oris read the Proclamation for Flag Day, June 14, 2017.

B. Certificate of Appreciation for Robert Ceccolini.

Chairman Oris presented former Parks and Recreation Director, Robert Ceccolini, a Certificate of Appreciation for his 23 years of service and dedication to the Parks and Recreation Department. He highlighted Mr. Ceccolini's many accomplishments as Director, and expressed appreciation and gratitude on behalf of the Council and citizens of Cheshire.

Town Manager Milone commented on Mr. Ceccolini's contribution to the Town's Crusade Against Cancer, and his decision to begin using safe organic products for the Town parks and ball fields. Mr. Ceccolini worked diligently to educate himself on the matter, insure fields were well taken care of, and he was the first Director in Connecticut to use organic products. Over the years Mr. Ceccolini became an expert on their use. Now, many towns use organic products for safe fields.

Bob Ceccolini thanked the Council and the Town of Cheshire for this recognition, and said working in Cheshire has been fantastic. During his service to the Town he received great community support, worked closely with Town Councils over the years, and it has been a great run.

C. Lanyon Drive sidewalk project public information session.

Chairman Oris summarized the issue of the proposed sidewalk project on Lanyon Drive. It was through a recommendation of the Public Works Department to the Town Manager who moved the issue to the Town Council. The sidewalk expenditure is in concert with other parts of the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). The project needed to go through a feasibility analysis before moving forward at a cost of \$100,000. The feasibility analysis report is almost completed. Shortly into the process there were concerns cited by the Lanyon Drive residents which the Council takes seriously. Mr. Oris noted this process was no different from any other sidewalk project; it was done through the normal capital expenditure (CEP) process; and is in compliance with the POCD. There was a public hearing held on the capital budget. As Council Chairman he had concerns about whether or not there was enough public awareness on the project, enough time for the public to understand and express concerns or support for the sidewalk project.

Council member Mr. Ecke met with some Lanyon Drive homeowners about their concerns. There was a public forum at the last Council meeting. From a Council perspective the need for sidewalks provides a safe passage to other areas of town. The POCD promotes safe access for residents. Mr. Oris, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Milone and Mr. Noewatne met this week to discuss the issues. The feasibility study is almost done; the project is feasible from a development and cost perspective; and only the relocation of utility poles needs to be addressed. The utility company is prepared to move these poles, but it could take up to a year. Mr. Oris advised that the project will not go forward this year, but will be addressed down the road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Michael Logue, 115 Lanyon Drive, read a letter into the record from Pat McKinley in opposition to the Lanyon Drive sidewalks, and the responsibility for plowing a sidewalk. In the letter Ms. McKinley questioned how the process began, priority of Lanyon Drive for sidewalk installation, and asked that the project be rescinded.

Craig Thorne, 221 Lanyon Drive, reviewed the time line of the sidewalk project, the project coming to attention of the town by a Westland Avenue resident. the \$100,000 cost in the 2016-17 CEP, no physical plans outlining the scope of the project, which side of the street will get sidewalks, submission of architectural plans for approval, or notification to neighbors on what was transpiring.

Chairman Oris explained the decision on which side of the street for sidewalks has not been made yet. This is all part of the feasibility analysis; the Town will engage with residents on the project and discuss impact on homeowners; and this project was treated no different than other sidewalk projects in town.

Mr. Thorne said in August 2016 there was no information to Lanyon Drive residents who are affected by this project. He commented on the financial crisis of the State, projected revenue cuts of \$7.5 million, teacher retirement contribution of \$3.4 million by Cheshire, and the sidewalk expense project for his street when people are opposed to the project. With regard to high school students walking to school, Mr. Thorne said that over 15 years no one ever requested taxpayer dollars for sidewalks on Lanyon Drive. A solution would be a school bus stop for CHS students, and the same could be done for other areas of town with lack of sidewalks. Lanyon Drive residents are willing to forfeit the \$100,000 for other town needs and concerns.

Marion Hourigan, 101 Lanyon Drive, is opposed to the sidewalks, and submitted a letter to the Council signed by other residents. The \$100,000 cost does not make sense during a fiscal crisis and possible deficit, and can be used for something needed in town. She said it is laudable to want Cheshire to be a walking town. Students do not use sidewalks to the high school; they can be transported by bus; the street has a steep incline and sharp curve and is a cut through to Route 10 and the high school. Cars travel fast on the street; it is unsafe for pedestrians; this will not change with sidewalks; and the road will not be safe. She said some streets are not designed for sidewalks, such as Academy Road, and Lanyon Drive is in the same category.

Phil Rizzuto, Lanyon Drive, walks two miles each day to Route 10 around the pond area near the old movie theater, and walks in the street to go south...there are no sidewalks.

Marilyn Ditota, 320 Westland Avenue, shared her past personal experience of a 7 year old child killed crossing the road, and the impact on everyone and change in the dynamics of her neighborhood. When she moved to Westland Avenue there were no sidewalks. She understands the concerns of Lanyon Drive residents. Ms. Ditota commented on the good work of the Public Works crews, working with residents for a pleasant outcome on the sidewalks. She noted there is a sense of community with sidewalks; neighbors help shovel her sidewalk due to her heart condition; once sidewalks are in place, people will use them, become more connected with each other, with neighbors helping each other out in time of crisis. Ms. Ditota stated that the public has no idea of the incredible work done by Town staff every day, and she thanked the Council, Commission and Board members, Town Hall workers, and said they are greatly appreciated.

Sonia Amann, Westland Avenue, 25 year resident with four children (12 to 23) said there is a hill and curve on Lanyon Drive that is dangerous, and high school students walk to the school, one mile away. When the road is icy students are driven to school, and she is unsure it is practical to add buses to the high school. She supports sidewalks; has safety concerns; and there will always be walkers.

Robert Allard, 167 Lanyon Drive, opposes sidewalks. He has a beautiful home and setting, and talked about a car crashing into a neighbor's yard, and another into his

yard. He sees 6 to 8 people a day walking up or down Lanyon Drive, and does not understand the judgment of the Council based on his understanding of this project. He said to put in speed tables rather than sidewalks. Cars speed 40 – 50 mph down the road; this will continue with sidewalks; create an additional safety hazard; and sidewalks will not be productive.

Mark Nash, 357 South Main Street, owns the property on Lanyon Drive and South Main Street, and said the black top sidewalks on South Main have been replaced with concrete sidewalks. He agrees with some of the safety issues, but believes sidewalks are necessary on Lanyon Drive. As a property owner there is nothing better than sidewalks.

Cindy Kleist, 251 Lancaster Way, urged the Council to listen to the people on the street and what they want, and said a majority do not want sidewalks. It is taxpayer dollars being spent. Lanyon Drive is like a park; people speed down the street; mature trees will be cut down; and the atmosphere of the neighborhood will be jeopardized.

Chairman Oris read the letter from Ms. Hourigan, which was signed by Lanyon Drive residents, and he read the names of the signers into the record. Mr. Oris also cited the names of residents who signed the petition submitted to the Council.

D. Public Comments

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting of May 9, 2017; Special Meetings of May 24, 2017 and June 7, 2017.

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

MOVED to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 9, 2017, and Special Meetings of May 24, 2017 and June 7, 2017, subject to corrections, additions, deletions.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-1

RESOLUTION #061317-1 **CONSENT CALENDAR FOR JUNE 13, 2017**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the Consent Calendar for June 13, 2017 as follows:

- A. Acceptance and appropriation of a \$682.70 reimbursement from the Highway National Grant for expenses for the attendance of two officers At the N.E. Child Safety Conference.
- B. Acceptance and appropriation of an aggregate of \$3,415.16 from the State Of Connecticut to the Police Asset Forfeiture Account.
- C. Acceptance and appropriation of an anonymous \$50 donation to the Human Services Gift Account for general purposes.
- D. Acceptance and appropriation of \$82 from the Cheshire Community Chorus To the Cheshire Fuel Bank.
- E. Acceptance of a sponsorship of \$300 from the Cheshire Cat & Dog Too to The Pool Gift Account, and appropriation of up to \$50 for the sponsorship plaque.
- G. Acceptance and appropriation of a \$50 donation from bingo friends in memory Of Ed Fleming to the Human Services Gift Account for the purchase of new Bingo equipment at the Senior Center.
- H. Acceptance and appropriation of a \$500 donation from the Cheshire Women's Club to the Human Services Gift Account for the Senior Center.
- I. Correction to May appropriation from the Widow and Widowers Club to the Jitney Bus Fund in memory of Ed Fleming; donation was \$25.
- J. Acceptance and appropriation of a \$200 donation from the Cheshire Lion's Foundation Inc. to the Police Gift Account for general purposes.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

7. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

8. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of submissions for 2017 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program.

There were no applicants for the program; no action required or taken.

B. Discussion re: potential fiscal impact of middle school construction project.

Chairman Oris informed those present that Mr. Milone, Mr. Jaskot and their staff put together an analysis of the financial impact of the middle school project to taxpayers and how it relates to the overall budget of the community.

Town Manager Milone gave a short presentation on the financial analysis.

Mr. Milone advised there was a detailed presentation to the Council last week on the debt impact of the two school proposals. This information has been taken and constructed into a five year budget with the school proposals and other assumptions built in. The Council wanted to have two perspectives. 1) what does the debt cost the town alone, segregated for the two school options; and, 2) when that is rolled into where the budget might be in the next five years, how this further complicates our financial situation.

Three variations were used:

- A) Status quo; the budget today with debt projections as built into the five year budget, assumptions with education growth in the town, but nothing unusual.
- B) takes the status quo budget and builds on top of it the school proposal for FY 2018 referendum for \$106M referendum.
- C) takes the status quo budget again and builds the FY 2019 referendum for \$111M.

Mr. Milone reviewed and explained the information in the financial analysis.

Updated existing debt analysis, exclusive of the middle school project; the five year capital plan was used for identifying how much it would cost in debt repayments to continue to finance what is being planned.

The \$106M middle school proposal and \$111M proposal were segregated; the debt on each one was looked at, going out 10 years, and the impact on the average taxpayer. Now that there is all the debt information, it was built into the budget in place, using the three scenarios – status quo budget, debt projections with the \$106M proposal, and debt projections with the \$111M proposal. This provided the totality of the expenditure side of the budget. To get to the estimated cost increases for education, a five year average was used, which was 2.33%; general government budget projection over the next five years was done looking at the past five years, which was 2.85%. This was built in for each of the five years; 2.3% education and 2.85% general government; debt numbers that were developed (1 and 2) and there was the totality of the expenditure budget.

There were assumptions to be made relative to revenues. Three assumptions were made. 1) assumption there would be no non-tax revenue growth; 2) assumption of losing \$2.5 million in revenue; 3) assumption of losing \$5 million in revenue.

There was determination of tax revenue needed to be generated for each of five years to meet projected budget expenditures. The town must have a balanced budget. The

non-tax revenue is subtracted from the total expenditures, and this balance must be raised from property taxes. This gross amount is taken, divided by \$2.718M, value of one mill. This determines how many mills are needed to support all the budget variations. Once the mill rate is determined, the Council wanted to see the impact of this mill rate and the budget scenarios on the taxpayer. There was a look at three residential properties – lower level of value, average value, and higher value, and two commercial properties.

Chairman Oris noted that non-tax revenue is based on what is coming from the State. The assumptions are generated based on what the town thinks will happen from the State. At this point, the Governor's budget is closer to a \$10M loss of revenue to Cheshire.

In the capital expenditure plan (CEP) Mr. Milone said the revenue reduction comes off the second year of the five year plan, i.e. \$5 million taken off year #2, and this number is carried through the other three years. We are in the first year of the five year plan.

Debt Service Projection/Impact of the two school proposals – at \$106 M and \$111M. They were calculated as to what the debt service would be in the next 8 years. \$106M – average is \$486.85 per year; \$111M – average is \$502.44.

The difference between the two school proposals was explained by Mr. Milone. The \$106M proposal must be submitted before June 30th; the \$111M proposal would be submitted after July 1st, well into next year. Between June 30th and next year the project costs increase; there is a \$5M escalator for inflation.

\$106M proposal – almost \$35M is reimbursable at 33.93%; \$71.1M would be bonded. With a one year delay the project goes up by \$5M; the State will not recognize a school that is 185,000 sq. ft. as being totally eligible for reimbursement. The State recognizes 160,000 sq.ft. space as eligible. As a result of the loss of 25,000 sq.ft. the reimbursement decreases. In addition, the State will be reducing the reimbursement level from this year to next year by 5% or 6%. At the architect's suggestion, to reflect the 25,000 sq.ft. (2nd proposal) not eligible for reimbursement, and reimbursed at a lower level, the 25% assumption was used for grant reimbursement for the \$111M proposal. Out of \$111M, the town receives \$27M in grant reimbursement, and must bond \$84M. In the first year for \$106M, only the interest is paid; borrowing is in 2019. For the \$111M proposal there would be two borrowings, one-half in 2019 and one-half in 2021. In the first year the interest is low, and payment is on 50% of construction. This is why we don't see the normal sequence of debt repayment.

Chairman Oris talked about taking out the years of transition on interest only to principal, and said it looks as though the \$111M plan is not much greater than the \$106M. If you excluded the phase-in interest only years, he suspects the number would be greater.

Mr. Milone said it would be greater. In the second scenario the project would be delayed, and the way we borrow would be 50% of the project over two bonding cycles. For the \$106M project borrowing would be at one time.

Status Quo Current Debt Projections Five Years 2018-2013.

Total average five year increase is 3.07%; General Government 2.85% used in each of five years; Education 2.33% used in each of five years; Capital Non-Recurring and Contingency remain the same; Debt 10.51%. This information became the construction of determination of mill rates etc.

Graph – Five Year Projection, Debt as % of the Budget. Cheshire is a AAA rated community and has concerns about maintaining this high level of credit; it is important for the financial viability of the community; borrowing can have a significant effect on lowering our interest rates. The guideline is for the debt not to exceed 10% of the Town's operating budget. This is the guideline the rating agencies use; they look at many factors when conducting a rating; one negative item alone will not drive the credit rating down; it depends on it works in combination with other things; and debt is a key factor that is looked at.

Staying on course with what the Town has, the graph shows debt rising a little, but will not exceed 8.3% (blue line) of the operating budget.

Red line – is \$106M proposal; debt goes up rather steeply; debt exceeds 10% in the third year of the budget at 11.84%.

Green line - \$111M proposal; debt will get to 13.29% of the operating budget.

The concern with the \$111M proposal is the debt graph continuing the trajectory.

Over the last five years debt has been declining by about 6.8% of the operating budget. This information is in the budget document and is on the Town web site.

Mr. Milone explained that three budgets were done. One, with no revenue growth; one with loss of \$2.5 million in revenue; one with loss of \$5 million in revenue. Three scenarios of expenditures were also done. One with no new school; one with \$106M school; one with \$111M new school.

Based on the information pulled off the Town budget, Mr. Milone said the mill rates were calculated to balance the budget in each of the five years. Annual average mill rate increases are cited; average mill rate increase has been 1.8% in the last five years.

Five different groups of taxpayers were looked at.

Average taxpayer – house with market value of \$332,017; assessed value \$232,450; and the mill rate is applied to these values; FY 2018 mill rate of 31.94; FY 2023 mill rate of 38.07.

Large taxpayer – house market value under \$1 million assessed value.

Small taxpayer – house market value at \$213,029.

Two commercial properties – one average for warehouse space and one in the top 10 of Cheshire taxpayers, a mail order facility.

The information shows how taxes change from year to year. The data does not show the cumulative increase at the end of the five year period.

Status Quo Scenario/Assumption of no revenue growth - Average taxpayer will have a 21% increase over five years.

Inclusion of \$106M school project, average tax increase is 26.4%.

Inclusion of \$111M school project, average tax increase is 27.9%.

Loss of \$2.5 million in revenue – Over five years with status quo budget, Average taxpayer will have a tax increase of 22%; Inclusion of \$106M school project, average tax increase will be 29.3%; Inclusion of \$111M school project, average tax increase will be 30.8%.

Loss of \$5 million in revenue – Over five years with status quo budget, Average taxpayer will have a tax increase of 24.9%; Inclusion of \$106M school project, average tax increase will be 32.19%; Inclusion of \$111M school project, average tax increase will be 33.7%.

Sample Cumulative Tax Increases-Residential Scenarios – this slide takes the five different taxpayer categories (blue is status quo; red is \$106M project; green is \$111M project). The graph shows the loss of \$2.5 million and \$5 million of revenue and the effect on the average, large, and small taxpayers. The trajectory of the increases is about the same, but the financial impact is significantly different on all three.

Sample Cumulative Tax Increases-Two commercial properties (warehouse and #5 on the top taxpayer list). The graph shows what is paid with no revenue growth, status quo budget; inclusion of \$106M school project and \$111M school project; and loss of \$2.5 million and \$5 million loss in revenue.

Mr. Milone advised these slides would be on the Town website on Wednesday.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Terry LaChance, 1076 King Road, supports the middle school project going to referendum so the people can make a decision on whether they want it or not.

Joe Kowalski, 1038 Avon Boulevard, commented on there being no reason to spend money on a new middle school due to the current State and Town fiscal situations. The Town cannot afford it; does not have the money; and people are being asked to support a \$106M or \$111M debt. He understands renovations are needed at the middle school. Since 1993 he saw the Town grow, and now sees it shrinking, with many for sale signs on houses, people leaving the Town and State, businesses closing. The Town cannot afford this; he cannot afford it; he is a retired disabled veteran; and 1038 Avon Boulevard is his home.

Guy Darter, 309 Cedar Drive, questioned the \$5 million loss in revenue, and said he has heard it could be up to \$10 million revenue loss. Mr. Darter asked about a \$10 million revenue loss and impact on the taxes.

Mr. Milone explained that one mill = \$2,170,000; with a loss of \$11 million, the \$2.1 million is divided into the \$11 million, and that represents just above five (5) mills of additional taxes. Every mill is \$220 on the average taxpayer; five (5) mills is another \$1,000 in taxes.

Stating he supports education, Mr. Darter said the 33% or 38% increase is a lot of money that can be lost. There should be improvements in the schools. His fear is this matter going to referendum, and not having a clue as to what the State will do to Cheshire. If the Town is hit with \$10 million more in losses, we cannot tax our way out of this. The BOE should push this school project off a year; look at other proposals; do renovations or changes. Once a new middle school is built, it will never stop, and there will be cries for a new high school and elementary schools. Mr. Darter said the total school facilities plan is about \$423 million.

Andy Falvey, 379 Peck Lane, former Town Council and BOE member, said he knows what the Council is up against, and appreciates their effort, thought and time spent on this matter for the best interests of the Town. Mr. Falvey commented on spending lots of money on enhancement of the school system. He talked about Cheshire having one of the highest graduation rates in the State, high achievement rates in Connecticut, one of the lowest per pupil costs in the State, and is getting high results at a lower cost. With the \$106M proposed middle school project this year results in an average tax increase of \$500 this year. This project is one piece of the capital plan, and the five year plan could go to over \$400 million. We are looking at \$500 tax increase for one project, and it could be \$2,000 tax increase per household for the full school projects. Mr. Falvey said less costly options should be considered ; retrofit/upgrade of schools is a less costly alternative; and, the State is close to bankruptcy. A referendum has the Town's hands tied to build something. There is no guarantee of State money, and the question is what do we do then. The Town must look to find ways to achieve high results without spending more money to do this.

Bill Miller, 135 Round Hill Road, has concerns about relying on State funding, which could be backed out at any time. The Town does not get an up-front check of \$35

million, and other promises can be postponed or eliminated, with Cheshire left holding the bag. The assumption must be doing the project with no promised State funding. He asked if the project is worth doing on our own, financed by tax increases. Mr. Miller said we should not rush into a decision because State funding might be reduced further, and the Town should wait until State funding is stabilized. There will be operating expenses needed and funded through local taxes, and too many unknowns to proceed with this project at this time.

Joanne Miller supported her husband's comments, and read three lines from Thoreau into the record. She supports renovation of the schools, but does not support destroying Cheshire Park.

Denise Hersey, Ives Row, supports sending the middle school proposal to referendum. She said people have questions and time is needed for answers, and people move to Cheshire because of good schools.

Kevin Kasack, 147 Country Club Road, stated the numbers cited by the Town Manager are very high for the average taxpayer. For a status quo budget it is \$900; \$106M is \$1,300; \$111M is \$1,330, and with \$2.5 M and \$5M revenue loss they increase even more. Numbers for \$10M revenue loss have not been calculated. Mr. Kasack talked about safety issues, road access to the proposed school, the high slopes, blind spots, and dangerous access point for school buses on Stony Hill Road. The drop-off point on Country Club Road is another dangerous point, and the school entrance is the site for top speeds of vehicles. These things must be addressed, with reconstruction of the road and need for more money to be spent as part of the proposal.

Chairman Oris stated that there is a site component of the budget but he is not sure how detailed this is at this time. Regarding safety issues the Cheshire Police Department would weigh in on the plans at some point.

Mr. Masciana, COO, Dept. of Education, advised that the project is not at this level of details. Within the \$106M project there is funding for site work, some road improvements, and more time will be spent on those details. We are the conceptual and schematic design stage. Access from Stony Hill and Country Club Roads are not the only alternates for road access, and there is possibility for access from Route 10, and off State property on Creamery Road.

It was noted by Chairman Oris that Route 10 access is the best way to go, but there is State owned property, with questions about acquisition of deeding this property to the Town.

With this road work there is more cost to the taxpayers, and Mr. Kasack talked about resident concerns over \$100,000 for Lanyon Drive sidewalks, when there is a \$106M school proposal which will increase their taxes. He commented on the school project being kept quiet; no information on the BOE website; retrofitting the middle school as

has been done with technical schools; increased taxes being too much for people to pay for a school that is not affordable; and there being less costly solutions.

Phil Rizzuto, 261 West Main Street, said this school will be across the street from the prison. He maintains his 175 year old home; is a senior citizen; cannot afford more

taxes; a new school is not maintenance free and costs money. Some towns have lower taxes; Cheshire increases taxes each year over his 32 years in town; property values are one-half lower than in past year; people are leaving Cheshire as they cannot afford to live here.

May Dileo, 441 Patton Drive, wants the school project to go to referendum for people to have a say. She understands concerns about the State budget, but Cheshire has aging schools, windows leak, roofs need to be replaced, and it makes sense to stop putting money into old buildings. If the proposal does not pass at referendum we must still deal with aging school buildings, which are pre-1950's, get great use, and must start to be replaced.

Amy Johnson, 160 Patton Drive, supports putting the school proposal to referendum. She said the schools are not new; we must invest in the buildings; the BOE took two years for this plan; and rehabilitating is also costly. She and her husband looked at other towns, and chose Cheshire because of the good school, and neighborhoods where children can safely play. The schools are too hot, with students going to air-conditioned areas, and this is dangerous. Ms. Johnson understands the concerns about taxes, but is willing to give money so the town has a future. The BOE has the best solution, and the school system will continue to attract people to Cheshire.

Song Yun, Ridgecrest Drive, supports the proposal going to referendum. She said the high school is one of the best in the State; she supports the BOE and trusts them; and we should keep moving school projects forward.

Jennifer Bates, 22 Brigadoon Drive, supports the new middle school project, creation of an environment for people to move to Cheshire, and said she owns a business in town. Ms. Bates said State reimbursement may decline, and this year it is \$35 million, with the project more expensive if done later. All the schools need work; it is short sighted to put band-aids on things; and we can start with something new. She asked if the status quo lines takes other things into consideration.

Mr. Milone said the numbers are just an average, and there is a danger that there is no ability to predict when a catastrophe will take place.

Ms. Bates toured the middle school; understands why the school cannot be renovated; a bigger space is needed; and renovation does not take into consideration the cafeteria, music room and other things. The BOE has reviewed the proposal for two years and looked at other possibilities, with the best plan for a new school. She said it is important

for people to decide on this project. Ms. Bates thanked the Council for their time and effort.

According to Mr. Milone the analysis includes the expectation that the size of the eligibility would be increased by 25,000 sq.ft. and reimbursement would be lower. The analysis went from using 33.93% down to 25%, on the advice of the architect.

David Schrumm, 369 Sir Walter Drive, is almost speechless from worry about this project and its costs. He said people move to Cheshire for many things other than the school system...its safe, nice, close to their job, affordable. He commented on the demographic changes, with young people not looking for property in Cheshire or Connecticut. Mr. Schrumm talked about the 1980's when money was coming in; the school population grew with houses being built; there was the 1990 crash with down slide of the State; and the crash of 2008 came with some people not recovered. He said we cannot build town finances under pressure of what is going on with the State. The Council just went through a difficult budget process; things could get uglier; and there could be a supplement coming in a few weeks. This is all without a major capital expenditure for a new school; this is not just about raising taxes for a new school; it could mean cutting Library hours, a police officer, park equipment, etc. A new school can be built but there will be a negative impact in other ways because the money is not there. The middle school is the first step in the grand scheme of \$400M, and Mr. Schrumm cannot imagine what things will be like 15 years out. For those concerned about the age of our school buildings, he talked about high school students taking Yale, Harvard, Wesleyan, Tufts, Trinity colleges off the books because their buildings are very old. The age of a building is meaningless, provided it is well maintained, lit, heated etc. The oldest school building is Humiston School which houses the Dept. of Education offices, is very functional, and the Superintendent's office is his former 4th grade classroom. Cheshire is a high ranking school system, with one of the top high schools in the State, has high test scores, and Mr. Schrumm questioned how this success was achieved if the schools are such dumps. With the financial things facing the town, all we can do is maintain what we have without adding onto it. There has been lots of money spent on school maintenance including a \$1million high school roof, new kitchen at Dodd, new classrooms at Norton. If the BOE wants to do something different, it can make a point of not building shiny new buildings, but put its limited finances into renovating good, solid buildings, as the town cannot afford a new school.

Mr. Schrumm said the nine Councilors know more about the underlying drivers of the town's finances than anyone else. The Town Manager has worked hard, with many Councils, to put the town in good financial shape. Cheshire has a AAA rating, did not get there by buying anything it wanted, but got there by being cheapskates. Cheshire was a farm town, with the tax burden falling on homeowners. The town cannot afford the new school; there is no industrial land left; and the burden is still on the homeowner, and it cannot be pushed onto the commercial property owners.

Jeff Natale, 512 Cardinal Lane, is a proponent of education for many years, but said this is not the right time to send the middle school proposal to referendum. He has heard the numbers, commercial people hit severely, and these business owners will leave and go to another town. The grand list will decrease and residential taxes will increase. There should be no referendum now, as more time is needed for discussion and looking at the plans. He heard the Town Manager say he does not have all the data, but people want to send the school proposal to referendum. Mr. Natale heard Mr. Masciana say plans are being developed, but wants to send the proposal to referendum. There have been questions about the site, and he has heard it will be Wiese and Academy Roads as the #1 site, which is not in the plan because the town does not own it. It would be appropriate for people to have a choice of the land for the new school. Mr. Natale pointed out the fact that the State deeded property to the town for Cheshire park, to be used solely, specifically, exclusively as a recreational area and park purposes. It does not say it can be used for a school. With the whole plan, he questions if Cheshire Park is the real site or a place holder. If it is the real site, how does the town get by with this agreement with the State.

Chairman Oris said he did not have an answer to those questions at this point.

Mr. Masciana is familiar with the language in the agreement, and said the land cannot be sold.

To go to referendum, Mr. Natale said we need numbers, cost, where school will be located. This is not the right time; more research is needed; and the \$106M and \$111M number needs real numbers and a real site.

Pam Gomez, 300 Patton Drive, moved from Florida to Cheshire for the school system. She has three sons with IEP's, and is cognizant and appreciative of how tax dollars are spent. Ms. Gomez said Ivy Schools have huge endowments, and even with proper maintenance and they do reach crossroads where things are not sustainable. We are at the point where things are not sustainable; we are at the crossroads; and a decision must be made. Cheshire is a well respected town, has a AAA credit rating, and is capable of coming up with a decision and solution.

Dags Chen, Country Club Road, thanked the Council for the information and presentation. He has children in the school system. The choice is framed between do it or don't do it, and there is a third option...we don't have all the sufficient facts to make an educated choice. The differential between \$106M and \$111M is significant. We are buying ourselves time, when the Town and State are at a critical junction, and warrants buying the extra time to fully understand, to fully scope out the project. We are not yet at that point. Mr. Chen said the Town Manager gave two scenarios of \$2.5M and \$5M loss of non-tax revenue. The scenarios should include the possible loss of \$10M. He asked Mr. Milone about whether or not the town's bond rating would be in jeopardy given the projections of going 10% being the cut off line, although there are other things the agencies consider. This has repercussions and we must recognize we are not

borrowing in a vacuum, but in the context of local capital markets, with investors knowing the fiscal situation of Connecticut.

Stating this is an impossible question to answer because of the number of variables the rating agencies use, Mr. Milone said the 10% is a very critical element of standard looked at by agencies. He would be very, very concerned about the impact on the town, but does not if the credit rating would go down. Rating agencies are looking at Connecticut with a different perspective than other states due to the fiscal climate.

There are things outside control of the town that affect the credit rating. Mr. Milone reported that the financial advisor of the town was given the packet presented at this meeting for analysis and advice and thoughts. Right now, Mr. Milone would be very concerned exceeding the 10%, but cannot say, with certainty, that the credit rating would go down.

Chairman Oris said the Council is thinking along the same lines relative to the town's credit rating. The Council understands the importance of retaining the AAA rating. Before the Council's final decision they will discuss the issues with the financial advisors.

David Veleber, 402 Hayledge Court, thanked the Council, BOE and staff for their work on the school project. He said there are still issues to be resolved. He grew up in Cheshire; has 4 children in the school system; and is invested in the town, the good solid school system and its reputation. Mr. Veleber believes something should be done about the schools; some work needs to be done; but, the tax implications of just the new middle school and other two phases is staggering. The school system is more about the teachers and parent involvement than the building in which education takes place, and this must continue to be encouraged. He has concerns about the potential benefit to new and updated schools, which will be overshadowed by the tax increases on the average taxpayers and small and large businesses. Driving out businesses results in the tax picture becoming more dire, and this is happening with the State. The debt load will change the bond rating, and increase the cost of doing future work. Mr. Veleber asked the Council to fully vet this proposal, and do what is best for the Town, and continue to provide prudent fiscal management. All options should be looked at, not rush to build a new school, and take the proper amount of time for such a huge project. He said schools need work and other towns have rehabbed their schools; they look beautiful; and State reimbursement rates could be higher than that for new construction.

Charles Pollizano, 100 Hawthorne Drive, said most issues on the school proposal center around financial implications. He has heard from the BOE, teachers, citizens, who all, erroneously, tout the advantages of a middle school with grades 6 to 8. A Duke University study disputes this information and he read an excerpt into the record. The study states that 6th graders in elementary school have a more positive experience, and 6th graders in a middle school have negative experiences. Mr. Pollizano gave the Council a digital copy of the report.

Supt. Solan advised that the Duke study is on the BOE website, along with additional information and suggestions which state otherwise.

Cathy Hellreich, BOE Chair, 525 Wood Hill Road, said the BOE has a vision for Cheshire, has been working on this for a long time, and information is shared with the Council, and is on the website. Ms. Hellreich talked about Cheshire being “cheapskates”, and being here where we are because of cheapskates. She cited the fact that in 1988 a new school could have been built for \$27M, with 56%

reimbursement. In 1990 a new middle school, converting Dodd to an elementary school, could have been built for \$38.8M, with 42% reimbursement. In 1991 there was referendum for \$24.4 M for a new middle school and conversion of Dodd to an elementary school. Since then, no new building construction has come forward until now at \$106M at 33.93% reimbursement. We have seen the numbers go from \$27M to \$106M, and where will it end as far as when it is decided to do something, with reimbursement going from 56% to 33% and down to 25% next year.

Regarding the \$106M building versus \$111M building and reimbursement numbers we are talking about \$71.1M versus \$84M bonding. Ms. Hellreich moved to town for the schools; her children went to Highland School which was 17 years old; and now 29 years later has never been asked as a citizen to pay for a new school for future generations. She said it is now time. The BOE looked at renovating Dodd at a cost of \$35M, but it did not add to the cafeteria, no auditorium, no gym space or band room, no 6th graders in the school, and the parking situation is not addressed. Ms. Hellreich commented on the problems at the current school with drop-off of students, residents in the area not being able to come and go into their homes due to the number of cars in the morning and afternoon. The BOE did not come to the conclusion lightly on this project. There are still some questions about the project, which will be answered as we move along. She said we cannot move forward with something unless it is known it will go to referendum to get more things ramped up. There is discussion with the State about getting Route 10 access; everything is still in flux; and even after referendum and passes things are still in flux. She pointed out that if the project goes to referendum, and the State does not come through with the 33.93% reimbursement, the town does not have to go forward with the project. Without the referendum we will not see the 33.93% reimbursement. Ms. Hellreich said the project should go to referendum and let the people make this huge decision. She thanked the Council for their time, and noted that the BOE has also spent much time on this project.

Chairman Oris commented on the \$35M cost for Dodd renovation, with the gross number about \$54M versus \$106M.

Ms. Hellreich said the renovation would not include some areas of the school. Regarding the City of Meriden’s renovation of a school, it was a hybrid project, adding

new wings and partial renovation. She said the State has clamped down on this type of project; it is no longer an option; and is without reimbursement.

As a follow-up question, Mr. Oris asked if this means if Cheshire wanted to expand in addition to renovating a school under the current format, there is no reimbursement or there is a different reimbursement. A portion of the project would be new construction with a higher reimbursement, and the renovation portion is at a different reimbursement percentage. He asked if the BOE looked at doing something more like a renovation as an option, and this option never getting the BOE to the place where they thought it was appropriate for the cost.

Even when renovating like new, Ms. Hellreich noted the architect said it is a 20 year life span added to the building. The BOE felt it would be 50 to 60 years for a new building. Also, Dodd Middle School is land locked. With a building expansion the parking lot is lost; 6th grade could not be incorporated into the school; and the goal was to move kindergarten to home schools and consolidate schools. In the Duke study, Ms. Hellreich said there is a caveat that it depends on the community and the school, and many studies dispute this Duke study. Dodd is a successful middle school because of the team system and commitment of teachers to this age of students. The new middle school curriculum is written as a package for 6th through 8th grade, with elementary curriculum written for K through 5th grade.

According to Mr. Masciana, the reimbursement rate for renovations and new schools is 33.93%, if the district meets the criteria for renovations, and that would be the entire building. Other renovations are 44.93%. There is no split; it is one or the other...44.93% or 33.93%.

Chairman Oris stated the BOE worked hard on the proposed plan, and the Council appreciates their hard work on behalf of the community and the students.

Breina Schain, 62 Hilltop Road, thanked the BOE for their hard work over two years on this project. She thanked the Council for the opportunity for people to speak on the issue. She took the tour of Dodd Middle School, and said it needs repairs. She has a conflict with her decision to spend the money or fix what we now have. Ms. Schain said the project should go to referendum, and she would accept what the Council decides in whether to send it to referendum or not.

Craig Basset, 31 Carriage Drive, said the town does a good job maintaining its schools, and he went on the tour of the middle school and considers the school to be in great shape. During the tour and the following meeting, it was stated that the air-conditioning system was tired, the tech-ed rooms were not big enough for students to work on a project. He looked through the floor plans of the middle school and high school, but there is no assessment about the HVAC system, which should be incorporated into the report. Mr. Basset did find that the assessment for the two schools was encouraging, and longevity of Dodd is not less than 30 years based on the observed physical

condition of the school. There is an identical statement on the high school assessment. As long as the town continues to maintain the schools, they are good for 30 years. Most of the building attributes were noted to be in good condition; some windows were rated poor with money appropriated for their repair. Mr. Basset commented on a new school increasing taxes, and making Cheshire an undesirable place to live and in which to do business. He suggested improving the Town Center area, like Southington and Wallingford which have vibrant town centers. Based on the 2017 rankings, Cheshire High School is #17 in the State. Mr. Basset agrees in having a long term facilities plan, but said the middle school project should not go to referendum as there are too many unanswered questions.

Ann Harrigan, BOE Member, 720 Ward Lane, thanked the Council for opening up the meeting for discussion on the school project. She read a prepared statement into the record. At this meeting she comes away knowing there needs to be more open discussion on the project, and it should go to referendum for this reason. There are facts and information, and five months before the referendum to get them to the public. In her statement, Ms. Harrigan noted the BOE started the process for a facilities plan for the public schools with Perkins Eastman and the design firm of TKSP. The first phase of the plan is building a new middle school. She said the proposal should go to referendum rather than be a decision of five Council members, and people need to decide on the project.

Adam Grippo, 1068 Avon Blvd. said Norton School looks the same as when he attended the school and he went through the Cheshire School System. He has read the facilities master plan four times, hoping the numbers would work for the \$320M expenditure over 20-25 years. Mr. Grippo did an analysis on the plan; and the debt service being taken on for phase #1, this project, is almost too high, and could pass the 10% debt service level set by the town. There are two other phases to this plan, and given a choice as to which school should be built first, he said it would not be the middle school. Over time he has heard how terrible the high school and elementary schools are, but we are building a new middle school. This matter should not go to referendum as it has not been thought out properly. Three phases must be considered. With building a new middle school we exceed the debt service ratio, which would be increased for some time. We still have Norton School and the high school without money; borrowing would be restricted; we could not borrow money to build another road; how could we pay teachers or fund all the medical benefits after borrowing in excess. Mr. Grippo requested the Council consider the entirety of the projects, offer options to be considered before going to referendum.

Robin Emond, 2060 Waterbury Road, talked about the State being dire straits, and to even think the town will get money from the State as promised, will be a rude awakening. In his comments, Mr. Schrumm said the town was being cheap, but it was being responsible and must continue to be responsible. There are many blue collar workers in Cheshire, people on social security, widows, senior citizens and others who cannot afford more taxes and could lose their homes. The school project is a big one;

it needs more information; it could go forward at a later date; and schools can be repaired and renovated. Ms. Emond commented on the Town of Southington's recent renovation of their schools when it could afford it. The building does not teach the children...it is the teachers; it is not the air-conditioning; and Ms. Emond asked the Council to seriously think about this project. The town must be more responsible with spending, and this project should not go to referendum.

Catherine Fabiani, 80 Autumn Court, BOE Member, noted the many good statements made by people about the project and its costs and what it means to the community. There is no question that with or without a new middle school, the town will continue to spend money on its buildings. Maintenance has been diverted over the years; the schools are not in good shape for any more significant life left in them; and for consolidation of the schools for more efficiency there are hard decisions to be made. There are many questions still out there, and Ms. Fabiani requested the Council vote to move the project to referendum. It would give several months to continue debate, get more information out there, and fine tune the project. There are compelling reasons to do this now, and it would be unfortunate to forego the highest reimbursement rate.

Fiona Pearson, 100 Strathmore Drive, had questions on the options presented. If there is a vote on \$106M project, and it does not pass, she asked if there be a vote on the \$111M project in the following year.

In response, Chairman Oris said if the Council chooses to do this, there can be a referendum vote on the \$111M plan, an alternate plan, or the same plan.

Ms. Pearson requested the matter go to referendum, as it will allow time to discuss it now. To delay the matter, members of the community will not be involved. This is the right plan; people can do research on information and mis-information; and there is a need for more opportunities for discussion. If the referendum does not pass, there can be discussions on alternate plans. Ms. Pearson said the referendum should not be tied to the election cycle; this is short term thinking; and we need long term thinking.

Stan Amond, 2060 Waterbury Road, talked about the financial difficulties of the State at this time. He said there comes a point, as a property owner, when you ask if you are the property owner, or paying rent to the town due to high taxes. He suggested thinking long and hard before sending the school project to referendum. Mr. Amond commented on Cheshire being a transient town, with the project hurting the blue collar workers.

Jamie Ferguson, Copper Beach Drive, sent an e-mail to the Councilors on the importance of sending the matter to referendum and letting people decide. All the details of the project will not be known on June 27th or June 30th. The matter has been vetted and is appropriate for residents to decide.

Chairman Oris thanked people for speaking on the middle school project and it going to referendum. There was nothing more to come before the Council on the matter, and Mr. Oris moved forward with the meeting agenda.

C. Approval of assignment of tax liens

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-3

RESOLUTION #061317-3

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council, pursuant to Sections 12-195h, 7-254 and 7-258 of the Connecticut General Statutes, authorizes the Tax Collector to assign for consideration such tax and sewer liens as deemed appropriate for assignment by the Tax Collection, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the consideration for such assignments be negotiated between the Town, acting through its Tax Collector and the assignee(s), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Council awards the assignments as presented to FIG Capital Investments, LLC (Purchaser) at 115.505% on the dollar.

Discussion

Mr. Donlin stated this is an annual event. In March 2017 there were 66 properties totaling \$496,000 in taxes due; \$278,000 has been collected; the property value is now \$140,252 for 24 properties. The RFP went out and FIG was the better vendor at 115.505%. The company has a Connecticut law firm representing them, and the town has a relationship with this firm.

Chairman Oris thanked Mr. Donlin for an excellent job on the tax lien program.

VOTE The motion passed 8-1; Ruocco opposed.

D. Approval of transfer of uncollectible property taxes to the Suspense List.

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-4

RESOLUTION #061317-4

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the transfer of uncollectible taxes, as presented and attached, to the Suspense Tax Book.

Discussion

Mr. Donlin explained that the suspense list is required; uncollectible taxes are identified; they are moved to the suspense list and removed as a town asset. They are turned over to a collection agency which charges an additional 15%. The list is about \$50,000, and standard procedures are being used for this program.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

**E. Formalization of Public Works and Parks reorganization in FY 17-18
Adopted budget.**

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-5

RESOLUTION #061317-5

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the reallocation of the budget of the Parks Division, formally of the Parks and Recreation Department, to the Parks Division of the Public Works Department, as presented as part of the Parks and Recreation and Public Works Department reorganization and as agreed upon in the adopted FY 17-18 general operating budget process.

Discussion

Mr. Slocum explained this is reorganization of the Parks Division and consolidation with Public Works. He pointed out that this is a “bookkeeping” entry, taking the operation of the Parks Division and assigning it to the Public Works Department. This agenda item just affects the Parks Division and was approved during the budget process.

VOTE The motion passed 8-1; Ruocco opposed

F. Town Clerk’s Salary

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Mr. Slocum.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-6

RESOLUTION #061317-6

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council hereby adjusts the salary of the Town Clerk by 2.5% from the current salary of \$78,903 per year to \$80,875.58 per year, effective January 1, 2018, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Council adjusts the salary of the Town Clerk by 2.5% from the \$80,875.58 established as of January 1, 2018 to \$82,897.46, effective January 1, 2019.

Discussion

By Town Charter the salary of the position of Town Clerk must be set 120 days before the November election. The position will receive a 2.5% increase.

VOTE The motion passed 5-4; Opposed – Talbot, Flynn-Harris, Ecke.

G. Reclassification of positions reflecting the FY 17-18 adopted budget.

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-7

RESOLUTION #061317-7

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the reclassifications of the following positions as reflected in the adopted FY 17-18 general operating budget:

Collector of Revenue from E-2 to E-3

Director of Fine Arts from N2 to N-4

Aquatics Director from N-4 to E-1.

Discussion

The first two position are reclassified with no salary increase; the Aquatics Director will receive a \$5,000 increase, and move into a classification without overtime compensation.

VOTE The motion passed 8-1; Ruocco opposed.

H. Amendments to job descriptions reflecting the FY 17-18 adopted budget.

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-8

RESOLUTION #061317-8

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the amended and new job descriptions as presented and attached, and as reflected in the adopted FY 17-18 general operating budget, for the following positions:

Director of Recreation

Program Supervisor (Recreation)
Program Coordinator (Recreation)
Director of Public Works and Engineering
Operations Manager/Town Engineer
Highway and Public Grounds Superintendent
Assistant Highway/Public Grounds Superintendent
Fleet Manager
Crew Leader
Public Works Maintainer
Public Works Groundskeeper
Assessor

Discussion

This is a summary of reorganization of Parks Division and Public Works. Mr. Ruocco said the position changes codify the changes. The Assessor position is a job revision. He supports restructuring of town departments and hopes there are more to come.

Mr. Milone informed the Council and public that this reorganization saved \$200,000.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

I. Approval of Non-Union Pay Plan

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-9

RESOLUTION #061317-9

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the Non-Union Pay Plan for FY 17-18 with a 2% increase in the maximums, as presented and attached.

Discussion

This is an annual review of the pay plan, and Mr. Ruocco noted there is increase in the maximum levels by 2%. He does not believe the maximum levels should increase each year.

Mr. Milone advised there are 8 people at the max level, and with the increase it will only be 3 or 4 people at the max level. They get a bonus without a cumulative effect on their salaries.

Mr. Oris stated he is not in favor of increasing levels each year.

VOTE The motion passed 8-2; Opposed Ruocco and Slocum.

J. Approval of Non-Union Personnel Rules and Regulations

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-10

RESOLUTION #061317-10

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the Personnel Rules and Regulations, amending Section 10-4.1 by increasing the premium share contributed for HSA from 6.5% to 7.5% effective January 1, 2018 and increasing the Blue Care Specialist co-pay from \$40 to \$45 effective July 1, 2017.

Discussion

Mr. Ruocco noted there are changes to premium share contributions for the non-union employees which is consistent with the union employees.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

K. Approval of Library Non-Union Pay Plan

MOTION by Mr. Ruocco; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-11

RESOLUTION #061317-11

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves the Library Non-Union Pay Plan for FY 17-18 with a 2% increase in the maximums, as presented and attached.

Discussion

Mr. Ruocco said this plan is the same as the other non-union pay plan.

The Council was informed by Mr. Milone that there are no people at the max level in this pay plan.

VOTE The motion passed 5-4; Opposed – Oris, Bowman, Ruocco, Slocum.

L. Short term extension of Campion Ambulance contract

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-12

RESOLUTION #061317-12

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council hereby approves and authorizes the execution of a 90-day extension of the Emergency Medical Services Agreement by and between the Town of Cheshire and Campion Ambulance, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Manager is authorized and directed to execute on behalf of the Town said Agreement in the form and upon the terms and conditions as presented at this meeting.

Discussion

Mr. Slocum advised this is a 90-day extension of the current contract.

Mr. Milone reported that one year was added to the original five year contract. Campion is proposing another five year contract as a successor agreement. The Budget Committee will meet and decide on this issue.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

M. Call for public hearing on Charter Revision Commission Draft Report

MOTION by Mr. Oris; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council approves Resolution #061317-13

RESOLUTION #061317-13

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council shall hold a public hearing to consider the draft report of the Charter Revision Commission, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Manager shall cause a notice of said public hearing to be posted and published according to law,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the date, time, and place or any postponements thereof shall be determined by the Town Manager with the approval of the Chairman of the Council.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

N. Proposed Economic Incentive Policy

No action taken; this matter will be on the agenda of June 27th.

O. Police Collective bargaining agreement, possible executive session.

No action taken; will be on the agenda of June 27th.

10. TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Monthly Status Report - in Council packets**
- B. Department Status Reports: Police, Fire, Fire Marshal. In Council packets**
- C. Other Reports –** Due to the late hour of the meeting, Mr. Milone will e-mail his report to the Council members.

11. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL.

- A. Chairman's Report**
Chairman Oris cited the following referrals:
 - i. Referral of request to name the former Dime Savings property to the Planning Committee.**
 - ii. Referral of Chamber of Commerce fireworks request to the Planning Committee.**
- B. Miscellaneous**

12. MISCELLANEOUS AND APPOINTMENTS

- A. Liaison Reports**
- B. Appointments to Boards and Commissions**

MOTION by Ms. Nichols; seconded by Mr. Talbot.

MOVED that the following appointment be approved by the Town Council:
The Beautification Committee – appointment of Jessica Fischer (R) to replace Lynn Voelker, term of office 6/13/17 to 1/31/19.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

- i. Correction to term for appointment of Christopher Daddi to the Cheshire Housing Authority.**

MOTION by Ms. Nichols; seconded by Mr. Bowman.

MOVED to correct the term of office for Christopher Daddi as follows:
5/9/17 to 5/31/22.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

13. TOWN ATTORNEY REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Attorney Smith reported on the DOC lawsuit. The judge has requested additional comments on order of the law, and it is expected there will be a decision within the next few weeks.

14. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

A. Letters to Council.

B. Miscellaneous

15. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Slocum; seconded by Mr. Ruocco

MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 10:59 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk