

1. BET Decision Day Minutes

Documents:

[BET_DECISION_DAY_MINUTES_03-21-07.PDF](#)

MINUTES of the Decision Meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on Wednesday, March 21, 2007 in the Town Hall Meeting Room, Greenwich, CT.

The Chairman, Peter J. Tesei, called the meeting to order at 7:09 P.M., after which the members pledged allegiance to the flag.

Board members in attendance:

Peter J. Tesei, Chairman
Robert S. Stone, Vice Chairman
Alma Rutgers, Clerk
Nancy E. Barton
William R. Finger
James Himes
Edward T. Krumeich
Michael Mason
Arthur D. Norton
Laurence B. Simon
Leslie Tarkington
Stephen G. Walko (via phone)

Ex Officio Board Members: James Lash, First Selectman; Peter Crumbine, Penny Monahan, Selectmen

Staff: Roland Gieger, Peter Mynarski, Finance Department; Ed Gomeau, Town Administrator; Diane Fox, Town Planner; Lloyd Hubbs, DPW; Colleen Giambo, Greenwich Schools; Sam Diebler, Commission on Aging; Bill Kowalewski, Don Fritz, Nathaniel Witherell

Mr. Tesei announced that Mr. Walko would be participating via telephone, as he was ill and could not be present at the meeting.

FISCAL YEAR 2007-2008 BUDGET APPROVAL

Approval of the FY07 Budget

Mr. Simon, ranking member of the Budget Committee, read the departmental codes and moved the approval of the budget requests in each. *Where requests were amended, the amended amount is listed with an explanation of the change. Budget requests that were approved with a subject to release are marked with an asterisk (*).*

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Seconded by:</u>	<u>Vote</u>
<u>General Government</u> 101 through 196	\$19,877,843	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Fire Department</u> 201 through 209	\$ 11,609,519	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Police Department</u> 211 through 217	\$ 16,723,503	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Public Works</u> 301 through 351	\$ 20,060,262	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Vehicle Maintenance</u> 380 Fleet Department	\$ 2,852,092	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Health Department</u> 401 through 425	\$ 2,224,888	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>GEMS</u> 440	\$ 3,045,128	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Nathaniel Witherell</u> 450	\$ 15,689,312	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Social Services</u> 501 through 510	\$ 3,361,637	Ms. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Board of Education</u> 600 through 675	\$119,287,607	Mr. Himes	carried 12-0-0
<u>Libraries</u> 701 through 710	\$ 9,520,458	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Parks and Recreation</u> 801 through 834	\$ 10,640,556	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Fixed Charges</u> 901 through 999	\$ 78,542,793	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0

Mr. Simon explained that there are three changes to the Fixed Charges line.

The first amendment is to add \$60,690 to A926-57600 for a non-public school Health Service Nurse per Connecticut General Statute Sec. 10-217a, per Westchester Fairfield Hebrew Academy, 270 Lake Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this amendment to the FY 2007-08 Budget.

The second amendment is to delete code A925-57120 for \$12 million. This is to eliminate the transfer from the general fund to the capital non-recurring fund and is one of two matched transactions that offset each other and should be eliminated to avoid grossing up costs in revenues.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this amendment to the FY 2007-08 Budget.

The second part of this is to delete code A999-49123 for \$12 million. This is the offsetting of part of the previous transaction.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this amendment to the FY 2007-08 Budget.

The third amendment is to delete code A999-57123 for \$47,950,000. This is to eliminate the transfer from the general fund to the capital project fund. This is the second of two matched transactions that offset each other and should be eliminated to avoid grossing up costs in revenues.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this amendment to the FY 2007-08 Budget.

The fourth transaction is to delete code A999-49123 for \$47,950,000. This is the offsetting of part of the previous transaction.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this amendment to the FY 2007-08 Budget.

As a result of this the borrowings for the capital projects will be recorded in the capital projects fund not in the capital non-recurring fund and this will make the true capital costs of the mill rate calculation easier to identify.

<u>Total General Fund</u>	\$301,496,288	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Total Fixed Charges</u> 901-999 *as amended	\$66,603,483	Mr. Norton	carried 12-0-0
<u>Capital</u> General Government*	\$2,533,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0

This amendment is for Z134-90928003, Document Imaging and Archiving System, reduce the amount from \$1,766,000 to \$250,000.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, there followed discussion.

Mr. Gomeau said that he understood there was concern over implementation of this plan. The plan is to use the original consultant that first did the study and form a committee headed by the Town Clerk within the town government. It should take approximately three months to get procedures in place within the departments. It will be a de-centralized system, and each department will be trained on the system. The conversion of existing town records will take the longest and will be handled by the consultant, Blum and Shapiro.

Mr. Gomeau was concerned that \$250,000 would not be enough to start the project. He explained that the conversion alone is \$750,000. Some equipment may be purchased with \$250,000, but not much else.

Mr. Krumeich spoke in support of the amount being \$750,000.

Mr. Gomeau said that he would come back in July to announce the committee formation and the conversion timetable, and suggested holding the funds for a July release.

Mr. Gomeau pointed out that the project was funded over five years.

The motion carried 11-1-0, Mr. Krumeich opposed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Krumeich, there was no second to increase the amount to \$750,000.

There followed additional discussion. Mr. Lash noted again that nothing could be done with \$250,000, not even purchase of software.

Upon a motion by Krumeich to increase the total amount to \$750,000, seconded by Mr. Himes, there followed discussion.

In response to a question from Mr. Himes as to where the \$250,000 figure originated, Mr. Simon said that he took the full amount and divided it incrementally over 5 years.

Ms. Barton asked what the cost of equipment and software was, and Mr. Lash said approximately \$300,000. The Budget Committee originally voted on \$1,766,000. Mr. Simon explained that \$800,000 was for converting the documents and \$850,000 was for setting up and running the system.

Mr. Tesei asked Ms. Fox if the Land Use agencies had a written document retention policy. Ms. Fox responded that there is a system in place. A manual is utilized to describe the different filing systems utilized. Based on state statutes, microfilming is used for items that require public hearings documentations or transcripts. Other documents can be digitized.

Mr. Mynarski said that the Finance Department follows State of Connecticut record retention procedures.

Mr. Gomeau listed the proposed costs as follows:

- Hardware: \$312,000
- Software: \$300,000
- Conversion for BOE and town employees: \$750,000
- Implementation: \$150,000
- Training: \$100,000

Mr. Simon pointed out that while more than \$750,000 would be necessary, the entire amount would not have to be appropriated.

Upon a motion by Mr. Krumeich, seconded by Mr. Simon, the Board voted 7-5-0 to original approved amount of \$250,000 by \$750,000 for a total of \$1 million for the Document Imaging and Archiving System. Opposed were Ms. Barton, Ms. Tarkington, Mr. Walko, Mr. Stone and Mr. Tesei.

Capital

General Government*	\$1,767,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
Fire	\$70,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
Police	\$1,027,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
Public Works	\$22,914,000	Mr. Mason	

Upon a motion by Ms. Tarkington to delete \$300,000 for the proposed Greenwich Town Center Master Plan from the FY 2007-08 budget, and defer it onto the FY 2008-09 budget, there was a second by Mr. Stone. There followed discussion.

The point of deferring the appropriation was so as to provide time to determine critical elements of the central business district plan, including use of the Senior Center and Havemayer Buildings. There is also concern over the building superintendent's present and future workload.

Ms. Fox gave a brief update as to status of the POCD (Plan of Conservation and Development). The commission met and reviewed proposed consultant reports. Three were selected for interviewing, and she hopes to go to contract within the next month. The consultant will hold meetings with department heads and associations, as well as district meetings. The first meeting is not expected to occur until September.

Ms. Fox's staff is busy putting together build out analysis at this time.

Mr. Simon asked how the specific plan and what was presented to the BET provides more information to develop the POCD. Ms. Fox said that general public discussion, along with

suggested submissions from the First Selectman and other department would be part of the overall consideration. The public and the stakeholders input will be an important part of the process of development.

Mr. Tesei asked if Ms. Fox would have strong input in the writing of the RFP for this project, specifically as to focus on the areas that she would like to address. Ms. Fox has attended meetings and has seen the diagrams and conceptual plans for the Down town master plan. She said that this is just one piece of the entire plan.

Ms. Tarkington asked if it would not be better if the town first had input in terms of traffic flow and build outs before meetings as to input on POCD and its completion. She also inquired as to if there would be a new RFP or would Giasalfi and Associates be further producing a plan based upon their preliminary work.

Ms. Fox said that there are opportunities on both sides.

Ms. Tarkington asked if the POCD was better managed by Planning and Zoning or the Public Works Department. Ms. Fox said that the planning role of the Planning and Zoning Commission is in state statute. The ten year plan has to be updated and the role is assigned to the P&Z Commission. Ms. Fox said that being as inclusive as was possible is the goal, and that working in opposition is not an option. Any plan submitted by DPW will be presented to the public for general discussion.

Mr. Gomeau spoke with regard to timing. He said this is a town wide planning effort and it is critical that it be done in concert with the POCD.

Mr. Himes asked what the implication would be if the funds for the Down town plan and the POCD were not approved.

Mr. Gomeau said that the intention is to approve it for sometime in the future. He said that if it is not approved, then all of the work would have to be done again and it would have to be presented to the neighborhoods again.

Mr. Simon asked how the different plans were worked into the POCD, and if input from each neighborhood is modified.

Mr. Gomeau said that right now there are concepts, and he will work with P&Z to put in the specifications and come back to implement recommendations.

Mr. Finger asked if the same issues would be applied for the Byram Master Plan and its relationship to the POCD as the Down Town Plan. Ms. Fox said that it would.

Mr. Krumeich pointed out the importance of improving and preserving the Down town area, and that funds should not be turned down simply because it was going toward formation of a plan. At one time, there was federal money available for a streetscape study. At that time, the RTM turned down this money.

Mr. Simon pointed out that the POCD is a culmination of a number of planning studies. He asked Ms. Fox that without this study, how she would know what to do with the downtown area and the POCD. Ms. Fox said that peoples input would be collected, and that there would be a review of a series of recommendations. From the standpoint of getting the publics input, this is a normal part of the process. This will be done in all districts.

The Board voted 9-3-0 to retain \$300,000 for the proposed Greenwich Town Center Master Plan.

Mr. Stone made the motion to restore the \$400,000 initially reduced from the originally proposed \$1 million for Safe Routes, to code Z 312596-3028034. Mr. Krumeich seconded and there followed discussion.

Mr. Stone said that this was a decision originally taken in view of the apparent slow progress in dealing with a number of projects in this current year's budget. The rationale was that if this current years projected Safe Routes projects couldn't be dealt with adequately, that DPW would be overloaded with another group of projects. Since that time, Mr. Hubbs has indicated that it is likely those projects can be done this spring. Future projects will be adequately dealt with as well.

Mr. Finger supported the motion but asked that in the future DPW attempt to formulate a methodology for assessment of effectiveness of the work that is done in following the Safe Routes plans.

Mr. Norton asked for the status of the current appropriation, the outstanding \$600,000 and what bids are outstanding. Mr. Hubbs responded that he did not have the complete list, but there are a large number of projects in the \$1 million this year. Some are large dollar amounts, such as the Old Orchard sidewalk project at approximately \$300,000 to \$400,000 of the \$600,000, and will go out to bid for summer construction. Traffic calming will utilize the balance. Others include:

- Valleywood-temporary measures will be implemented to install traffic calming items
- Safe Routes- there are three pieces to this: 1) Striping and signage in Riverside, Dundee and North Mianus; vegetation removal is also part of this; 2) Traffic calming in a number of neighborhoods including the Riverside area; 3) Sidewalks-construction needs to occur n the summer. This year more design will occur before construction and this is easier to get mobilized in doing. More construction will be evidenced next fiscal year.

Ms. Barton is opposed to adding the money back partly because of the money that has gone unspent, but also because better control and management is needed.

Mr. Gomeau suggested that since the program is being restructured, perhaps the other \$400,000 could be conditioned.

Mr. Tesei was in support of adding back the \$400,000.

Mr. Walko said that when the Safe Routes program was started, the BET was supposed to get a report or an evaluation of the Cos Cob Safe Routes programs, and has yet to receive this. This is a question of process, and the guidelines included a presentation by DPW of a consolidated plan of who is managing it and how it is being evaluated. Mr. Walko was concerned that the appropriation would not be spent, and that there would not be an evaluation.

Mr. Tesei expressed optimism that Mr. Hubbs would adequately address the Board's concerns if given the time to do so.

Mr. Simon also supports the increase, but cautioned that next February more definitive solutions as to what the Town is trying to accomplish would be expected.

Mr. Hubbs reminded the Board that he inherited many of these programs that were generated out of the community. Mr. Hubbs said that he will come back to the Board and discuss what sidewalks and traffic calming needs accomplish. The program he is trying to develop will put an order and a framework to those two issues. Involvement of the community is important as well.

Mr. Lash said that the Pedestrian Safety Committee did a photo collection study regarding traffic congestion, and a public hearing was held. He said that he has no information from the Public Works Department as to how they will deal with sidewalks.

Mr. Walko asked what the timeframe was for Mr. Hubbs to address the Budget Committee or the BET as to the status of Safe Routes. Mr. Hubbs said that once the budget season is over he will be back, probably within two months.

The Board voted 11-1-0 to restore the \$400,000 initially reduced from the originally proposed \$1 million for Safe Routes, to code Z 312596-3028034. Ms. Barton opposed.

Mr. Finger made the motion to condition \$331,000 of the \$376,000 requested for the Deerfield Drive sidewalk upon providing the BET with more accurate construction cost estimates and further documentation demonstrating to the BET the need for the side walk, code 31259610-28027, and Mr. Himes seconded. There followed discussion.

Mr. Finger was concerned that this street did not get the type of pedestrian traffic that would warrant a new sidewalk.

Mr. Krumeich is opposed and said that there were dangerous area's here for pedestrians.

The Board voted 10-2-0 in favor of the condition. Mr. Krumeich and Mr. Stone opposed.

Mr. Tesei explained that the budget as recommended by the Budget Committee incorporated \$910,000 within the BOE Capital Budget. A member had requested a motion to delete that amount; the intent was to allocate it in Public Works.

Mr. Stone made the motion to spend \$150,000 in the following manner:

Phase I: Up to \$75,000 for a study of the Old Town Hall to determine its adequacy as a multi-purpose senior center for various programs currently delivered and those anticipated for delivery by the Commission on Aging. In this study are the following elements: 1) Conduct a consumer survey of representative sample of Greenwich Senior Center users, senior service providers and other senior constituencies to identify the needs of a multi-purpose center, should address expectations of the type of programs and services a center should provide, 2) Analyzing survey results to design a program appropriate to the needs, expectations and interests identified.

In the event that the present location is considered inadequate to meet those needs, even after refurbishment of the center, a study should then be made of alternative locations. Phase I should be presented to the BET for acceptance before proceeding to Phase II.

Phase II: Being aware of the results of Phase II and any other studies, spend up to \$75,000 to determine the needs of and headquarters location options for the BOE.

Because the scope of both eventual projects is unknown, each organization should return with requests for A&E funding allowing the BET and RTM adequate time for review.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Tarkington and there followed discussion. Ms. Tarkington said that this supports the study that the Commission on Aging and the Senior Center would like to have so that they better understand the kinds of needs they have before a study for a new facility begins. This also permits the BOE to look at feasible options for their headquarters.

Mr. Krumeich expressed opposition to the phased approach, but does not object to the concept of moving forward in steps. He said that the studies should go on concurrently and that one is not dependent on the other. He further said that the money should not be split, and that \$150,000 should go toward both studies. He felt that \$75,000 may be too much for Senior Center but not enough for the BOE study.

Mr. Stone said that the \$75,000 is more than adequate for the Senior Center study and the BOE study.

Ms. Rutgers agreed with Mr. Krumeich in that it is better to look at this as \$150,000 to determine two important pieces that were a part of the original \$910,000. The Commission on Aging had requested \$30,000 as part of their original budget submission to answer questions similar to this study. She also supports the concept, but not the arbitrary splitting of the money.

Ms. Giambo said that originally the \$910,000 had to do with the BOE constructing a building in the south parking lot of the Havemayer Building, having nothing to do with the Old Town Hall. When the proposal of the Old Town Hall came through, it was dependent on another option being found for the seniors. Ms. Giambo said that she thinks the \$150,000 is adequate and would not like to see it broken up.

Mr. Tesei pointed out that the intent was to address the senior question as a priority because the issue of housing the senior center came late in the discussion, and the question was raised as a result of the BOE vacating their facility for another use.

Ms. Giambo said that if it works out better in terms of timing and the seniors look at the Old Town Hall first and consider other options, that this should be fine.

Mr. Diebler said that when the study was first looked at, \$30,000 represented the first part of the study looking at a sample of seniors who are current users or non-users of the programs. He does not believe it would cost \$75,000. He wanted to be sure that if the senior center did not utilize funds that the BOE needed for their study, that those funds would be available from the \$150,000.

Ms. Tarkington suggested that simply removing the term “up to \$75,000 in Phase II” from the motion may address this issue, while keeping it as a phased study.

Mr. Stone agreed that this was a good suggestion and would accept it as a modification of the motion.

Mr. Himes expressed support of the sequencing of the project, but opposed the phasing aspect.

The BOE and the Senior Center will each have their own, different consultant.

Mr. Krumeich suggested breaking into a caucus in order to discuss it further.

The Board voted 6-6-0 to break into caucus, and Mr. Tesei abstained in order to break the tie.

The Board voted 8-4-0 to strike the phrase “Up to \$75,000 in Phase II” from the motion. Ms. Barton, Mr. Finger, Mr. Himes and Mr. Krumeich opposed.

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Seconded by:</u>	<u>Voted</u>
<u>Public Works-Capital Projects</u> as amended	\$23,464,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Fleet</u>	\$46,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Social Services</u>	\$23,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Schools</u>	\$36,273,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0

Mr. Simon made the motion to delete \$910,000, code Z68059560-28075.1, Mr. Mason seconded and the motion carried 12-0-0.

	<u>Request</u>	<u>Seconded by:</u>	<u>Voted</u>
<u>Schools</u> as amended	\$35,363,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Libraries</u>	\$490,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Parks and Recreation</u>	\$200,013,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Nathaniel Witherell</u>	\$626,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Total Capital Fund</u> as amended	\$64,889,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Total Overall Budget</u> as amended	\$366,385,288	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Sewer Maintenance Fund</u> 361	\$6,393,678	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Sewer Improvement Fund</u> 361	\$13, 817,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
<u>Parking Fund</u> 219 and 317	\$5,862,125	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0

Mr. Stone made the motion to reduce the appropriation by 50%, for a total of \$280,000 in order to limit the projected installation of a single set of traffic lights at the location of either the Lewis or Elm Street intersections, chosen by the department, instead of the originally proposed two sets. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tarkington, and there followed discussion.

Mr. Stone said that this was an effort to determine the efficacy of using traffic lights on Greenwich Avenue while at the same time retain the traffic directing police officers.

Mr. Krumeich spoke in opposition of the amendment, but support of the Budget Committee's recommendation of two sets of traffic lights. He said that a serious safety issue exists, especially after hours and on weekends.

Ms. Rutgers agreed with Mr. Krumeich, and also had concerns with regard to safety. Stores and business's remain open well after 5 PM when the police officers leave for the day.

Mr. Mason spoke in support of the amendment.

Ms. Tarkington spoke in support of the development of a street flow plan, as the overall impact of traffic lights on Greenwich Avenue is unknown. She said that this is a good approach without going to multiple traffic lights.

The Board voted 6-6-0, and Mr. Krumeich abstained. The vote was 6-5-1 and did not carry.

Parking Fund, State Portion

317	\$363,100	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
-----	-----------	-----------	----------------

School Lunch Fund

670	\$4,035,636	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
-----	-------------	-----------	----------------

Griffith E. E. Harris Golf Course Revolving Fund

824	\$3,398,138	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
-----	-------------	-----------	----------------

Other Post Employment Benefits

131	\$6,000,000	Mr. Mason	carried 12-0-0
-----	-------------	-----------	----------------

Resolutions

Mr. Tesei acknowledged Mr. Mason's and Ms. Barton's work on the resolutions. It had been a goal of the Budget Committee and the BET for many years to fine tune the resolutions.

Mr. Mason said that the Law Committee worked with the Finance and Law Departments to revise the resolutions. He hoped that the work that was done has made them easier to understand.

Ms. Barton said that the intent was not to change the substance of the resolutions. The substance, with a few minor exceptions that have been highlighted for the Legislative and Rules Committee of the RTM, has remained the same. Making them more readable and to organize them in such a way that people could find what they are looking for easily and quickly was the objective.

Mr. Simon said that there were two changes to make on the resolutions.

1) Page 12, the resolution authorizing borrowings in the aggregate amount of \$25,250,000 to meet a portion of the capital budget appropriations. This was for a series of projects other than Glenville School. Because a certain number of projects were being eliminated, the number would be reduced to \$24,124,000.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Mason, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the resolution as amended.

2) Page 21, the resolution reducing \$36,883,119 to \$7,300,000. Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Ms. Tarkington, there followed discussion.

Ms. Tarkington pointed out that the purpose of this is to support a request by TNW Board. The RTM had requested that TNW apply for construction funding on its renewal funding after it received municipal improvement approval and a certificate of need. This represents A&E money as well as deferred maintenance money.

Mr. Simon noted that the original project was \$36.7 million. The request for A&E is \$3.6 million. He wanted to be sure that the \$3.7 million of the recommended priorities projects was considered part of the \$36.7 million, and that the projects would be implemented whether or not a certificate of need was obtained.

Mr. Kowalewski said that the \$3.6 million are for fees and the \$3.7 million are for items that are a priority as far as infrastructure. The IP amount of \$560,000 is not part of project Renew. If a certificate of need is not obtained, Mr. Kowalewski said that a CIP request would be necessary to do mission critical projects. As soon as the certificate of need is in hand, the projects will be done.

Ms. Tarkington was of the understanding that all of the items in question would be included in the certificate of need. They are also items that credit would be received for in the certificate of need. The review of the timeline was supposed to look at those that were urgent. She asked if the certificate of need would have to include additional drawings for Phase II. Mr. Kowalewski responded that the Phase I drawings created would be sufficient to do the work. Mr. Kowalewski expected to have the certificate of need by December 31, 2007.

The Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the resolution as amended.

Two additional resolutions were presented.

1) Page 8, Parks and Recreation: “The Department of Parks and Recreation Tree Division is authorized to accept gifts of trees and plantings from the Greenwich Tree Conservancy, Inc.”

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Krumeich, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the resolution as amended.

2) Parks and Recreation: “The Comptroller is authorized to accept a gift of up to \$750,000 from the Bruce Museum, Inc., for construction of an Animal Control Shelter on North Street. Receipts from such gift shall be deposited into account A99849010, Gifts. Said gift will be paid to the Town in five equal installments commencing on December 1, 2007 with the final payment on December 1, 2011. In the event the cost of the shelter is less than \$750,000, the final payment due on December 1, 2011 will be reduced by the actual cost amount that is less than the \$750,000

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Krumeich, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the resolution as amended.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve all of the resolutions as amended.

Mr. Tesei thanked the Budget Committee and Mr. Walko, the other BET who participated in the process and Mr. Gieger and Mr. Mynarski for their many hours of input.

He noted that this is the eighth budget where the mill rate has been contained to under 3.5%, and this is due in part to the fact that a defined policy exists to contain increases to that level.

Mr. Tesei also thanked Mr. Lash for his input as well.

Mr. Lash expressed his gratitude to the Budget Committee and the BET.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Mr. Finger, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 12-0-0 to adjourn at 9:53 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Zebrowski, Recording Secretary

Alma Rutgers, Clerk of the Board

Peter Tesei, Chairman