MINUTES of the regular meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on Tuesday, September 18, 2007 in the Town Hall Meeting Room, Greenwich, CT.

Chairman Peter Tesei called the meeting to order at 6:38 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 A. Himes
Edward T. Krumeich, Jr.
Michael S. Mason
Arthur D. Norton
Laurence B. Simon
Leslie L. Tarkington
Stephen G. Walko

Ex-Officio Board Members: Selectman Peter Crumbine

Staff: Roland Gieger, Peter Mynarski, Finance Department; Ted Gwartney, Robert Shipman, Assessor’s Office; Princess Erfe, Office of Community Development; Bill Kowalewski, Ray Augustine, The Nathaniel Witherell; Sue Wallerstein, Board of Education

Other: Colleen Giambo, Leslie Moriarty, Board of Education; Lloyd Bankson, Thomas Saccardi, The Nathaniel Witherell Board; Marianna Pons-Cohen, BOE Candidate and Community Development Advisory Committee member; Jeff Ramer, BET Candidate

Mr. Tesei welcomed Mr. Jeff Ramer who will be serving on the Board in January once he is elected.

Mr. Tesei opened the public hearing on the 2008 Community Development Block Grant budget. He welcomed Ms. Princess Erfe, the new Director of Community Development. Ms. Erfe introduced the Community Development Advisory Committee members who were present: Ms. Marianna Pons-Cohen, RTM District 11, and BET members, Ms. Alma Rutgers and Ms. Leslie Tarkington. She stated that she was there to answer any questions about the 2008 CDBG budget.

Mr. Tesei noted that the former Director of Community Development, Nancy Brown, has retired after 30 years of able service. He wished her well, with the hope that she will return to the town in a volunteer capacity.
Mr. Tesei asked if there were any comments on the proposed Community Development Block Grant Budget.

Mr. Walko, chairman of the Budget Committee, pointed out that the hearing normally remains open until the end of the non-routine applications and asked that the same be done tonight.

**ROUTINE APPLICATIONS**

**HD-2 Health Department – Approval to Use - $66,000**

Request for approval to Use:
- $5,538 to F-187-51300 Temp Salaries
- 2,000 to F-187-52010 Legal Advertising
- 500 to F-187-52050 Postage
- 2,500 to F-187-52920 Work trnsfr To/From dept
- 3,000 to F-187-52950 Misc Services - NOC
- 1,000 to F-187-53140 Audio Visual Materials
- 1,000 to F-187-53500 Motor Fuel
- 1,000 to F-187-53520 Parts for Boats
- 2,000 to F-187-53950 Supplies & Materials - NOC
- 2,000 to F-187-54300 Maintenance of Boats & Marina
- 462 to F-187-57050 Social Security
- 45,000 to F-187-59260 Marine Equipment
- $66,000 from F-187-35024 RRR – Shellfish Permits

**HD-3 Health Department – Approval to Use - $8,182**

Approval to Use:
- $8,182 to F-4031-51010 Regular Salaries
- $8,182 from F-4031-51010 Emergency Preparedness Planning Grant

Mr. Walko asked to take SE-3 as a non-routine item since he must abstain from that vote.

Upon a motion by Ms. Rutgers, seconded by Mr. Simon, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the routine applications.

**NON-ROUTINE APPLICATIONS**

**SE-3 First Selectman-Additional Appropriation-$15,000**

Additional Appropriation:
- $15,000 to P-935-57350 Settlement, Frank Juliano v. TOG
- $15,000 from Risk Fund Balance
Mr. Walko pointed out that the Budget Committee did not take up application SE-3 because it is BET policy that settlements under $25,000 are taken up by the Law Committee and do not need Budget Committee approval.

Upon a motion by Mr. Simon, seconded by Ms. Barton, the Board voted 11-0-1 to approve this application, with Mr. Walko abstaining.

NW-1 Nathaniel Witherell - Transfer – $143,943

Additional Appropriation:
$143,943 to Z-450-59560-28020 Person Centered Satellite Dining
$143,943 from Capital Non-Recurring Fund

Mr. Walko explained that this application should be an additional appropriation for the “person-centered satellite dining” rather than a transfer as had originally been proposed. The Nathaniel Witherell will not spend the $150,000 that has been appropriated in its 2007-2008 capital budget for the Witherell Channel. While eliminating the Witherell Channel project, Nathaniel Witherell is requesting a new capital appropriation in its 2007-2008 capital budget for the “person-centered satellite dining.” This results in the reduction of $6,057 in the Nathaniel Witherell 2007-2008 capital budget. This request is the result of several issues that came up after the 2007-2008 budgeting process including a state audit, the finding concerning insufficient food temperature and a change in the provider of dining services. “Person-centered satellite dining” takes the serving of food from a central location in the kitchen to the individual floors. This allows for a greater degree of control over the temperature of food and a more efficient manner of food delivery. It also extends the hours during which residents can obtain their meals.

Mr. Walko reported that the Budget Committee had a full discussion regarding the process for allowing an interim appropriation for capital projects outside of the CIP budget cycle, but the Budget Committee still recommends approval of this request with a vote of 4-0-0. It was decided to put it on the agenda as a non-routine application so as to have the discussion that was warranted.

Mr. Bankson, Nathaniel Witherell Board member and Nathaniel Witherell Budget Committee chairman, said that the acquisition of TNW’s previous food service company, HDS, by Morrison in March of 2007 drove the analysis that pointed in the direction change. The written citation by the state concerning insufficient food temperatures has now arrived. For the past 3 or 4 weeks Nathaniel Witherell has been preparing this recommendation regarding a change in its food delivery.

Mr. Bankson also read from the written remarks made by Board Chairman, David Ormsby, which were presented to the Budget Committee the previous week.
Mr. Stone asked when plans had been made to take this corrective action relative to the state audit and the acquisition of the previous food service company by Morrison. He also asked when they were planning to implement these corrective actions. Mr. Bankson responded that this approach had been in the works when Morrison had made the recommendation, long before the citation. Nathaniel Witherell plans to get it in place as soon as possible. It was Morrison’s recommendation rather than the audit or internal complaints that directed this change.

Mr. Simon pointed out that the agenda should be changed to show this as a new appropriation rather than a transfer. He also pointed out that Nathaniel Witherell would be on the honor system to not spend the original capital appropriation of $150,000 for the Witherell Channel. He also asked whether the requested capital project ranking had been done. Mr. Gieger answered that the ranking turned out to be 23.3.

Mr. Walko pointed out that, as a result of this request, the BET will take a serious look at the bundling of projects in the 2008-2009 budget, to consider whether or not certain projects should be bundled and certain projects should be separated with independent capital codes. The lesson for the Finance Department and the BET is to clarify bundling of projects so that there is a shared belief as to the level of expectation for all capital projects.

Mr. Krumeich sees this plan as an example of good managerial decision-making that should be supported. He said that although the BET does not encourage interim appropriations, this is an appropriate situation in which to use one, when the ability to move quickly is needed.

Ms. Tarkington remarked that this was a major change in the food delivery at Nathaniel Witherell and that she would encourage Nathaniel Witherell to have a trial period for only one of the floors to see if this manner of food delivery works. She also said that this proposal should have been discussed with public comment at a meeting of The Nathaniel Witherell Board.

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Ms. Tarkington, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve this appropriation.

SE-4  First Selectman- Additional Appropriation - $54,100

Additional Appropriation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 8,600</td>
<td>A-105-53070</td>
<td>IT Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,500</td>
<td>A-105-57210</td>
<td>Grant to External Entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$54,100</td>
<td>General Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Walko said that the Budget Committee placed a condition on this application that made it a non-routine application. That condition is ‘Subject to the establishment of a not for profit corporation’ and this condition should be part of this resolution.

Ms. Tarkington said that she would abstain on this vote because she felt that Channel 79 should be judged similarly to other external entities during the annual budget cycle and that their capital
needs should be reviewed as part of the CIP process. She also would like to see more town government meetings televised such as a Parks and Recreation Board meeting and a Social Services Board meeting. She said that there is much about our town government that could be shared and that Channel 79 is creating interest and involvement. She said that there was not sufficient information to judge whether or not Channel 79 should become a non-profit organization. She said she is worried that, if Channel 79 should go to tax exempt, it might no longer provide good communications for the town.

Mr. Krumeich said that Channel 79 is a wonderful tool for educating people as to how government works. It is important for transparency in government and is a wonderful resource that is just in its beginnings, with a lot of room for growth.

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Mr. Simon, the Board voted 11-0-1 to approve this appropriation, with Ms. Tarkington abstaining.

**Close of Open Public Hearing on the 2008 Community Development Block Grant Budget**

Upon a motion by Ms. Rutgers, seconded by Mr. Walko, the Board voted 12-0-0 to close the Public Hearing on the 2008 Community Development Block Grant Budget.

**CD-1 Community Dev - Approval To Use (Accept) - $1,005,052**

Approval to Use:

- **$1,005,052** to Q-197 CDBG 2008 Budget
- **$ 950,000** from CDBG HUD Entitlement 2008
- **$ 38,718** from Repayment of Loan
- **$ 16,334** from Q-19707-59900-27218 2007 Contingency Fund

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Mr. Simon, the Board voted 12-0-0 to accept the 2008 Community Development Block Grant funds.

Mr. Walko commended Nancy Brown, outgoing Director of Community Development, for her work and the high quality of her reports.

**Resolution - 2008 CDBG Proposed Budget**

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Mr. Simon, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the Resolution concerning the Community Development Block Grant Proposed Budget for Year 2008 (see attached).
ASSessor's report

Mr. Gwartney presented the Assessor’s report to the Board.

Mr. Gwartney said that his office is now beginning to complete the work for the 2007 Grand List. Personal property returns will be sent out this month. At the BET’s request, he has prepared a report on Senior Property Tax Relief Programs in other Connecticut communities.

Mr. Tesei asked about the town implementing a tax abatement program. What might be involved in this? Mr. Tesei said that a tax relief program was put in place in 2001 after a lengthy process. He asked if we could take up a tax abatement program as a separate ordinance or would we have to take this up as part of the relief ordinance. Mr. Gwartney said he was not an expert on this but that he believes it could be taken up separately. Mr. Tesei asked if the date for the RTM to take up any revisions to the ordinance is June 30, 2009. Mr. Simon said it was his recollection that this was the date and that revisions can be initiated at any time.

Mr. Walko asked about the litigation over the 2005 Revaluation. He noted that the country clubs were among the major plaintiffs. He asked about the status of the clubs. What component of the total do they represent? Mr. Gwartney replied that they represent a large portion of the total, with 8 cases representing nearly 50% of the total. They currently pay the assessed value. The town will be going for a pre-trial discussion on November 26, 2007. Any reduction would then be reflected as a future credit. Mr. Gwartney said that he expected this to be resolved in 2007, or 2008.

Mr. Krumeich said that he finds Mr. Gwartney’s report on senior tax relief programs in Connecticut to be very useful and a good jumping-off point in evaluating possible revisions in our program such as the qualifying income and asset levels. In response to a question from Mr. Krumeich, Mr. Gwartney said that this report in preliminary form had gone to the Commission on Aging and that they would receive the final report. Mr. Krumeich also asked about the local deferral program. Mr. Gwartney explained that, according to Connecticut law, a deferral system allows a qualified taxpayer to defer a portion of the property tax until the taxpayer either dies or sells the property.

Mr. Himes suggested that the report should also show the total number of Greenwich households that would qualify for the local tax credit program in comparison to those that are actually served by the program and that the number of qualifying households be shown as a percentage of the total number of tax paying households in the town. He said he thought this would make it easier to evaluate how many households have access to the program as compared to other towns.

Mr. Tesei also suggested that the RTM committees that took up the tax relief ordinance receive this report as well as the Commission on Aging. The RTM should be aware that this analysis has been done.

Mr. Norton asked about the number of people of who apply for the state program in comparison to the local program. Mr. Gwartney explained the numbers are deceptive because applications for the state program are processed every other year, so that the numbers for any single year do
not reflect the total number of households in the program. The number shown in this report reflects the 2006 applications. Mr. Gwartney said, however, that more people do happen to qualify for the state program than the local program.

Mr. Krumeich said that it is essential that this information be disclosed. He asked if other towns include Social Security income in their income test. He said that he recalls that when Greenwich added Social Security income to the household income for qualification, the number of households qualifying for the program was halved. Mr. Gwartney explained that not all towns include Social Security income and that the rules are different from town to town. Mr. Krumeich pointed out that the goal of this program should be to shield people with modest incomes from having to sell their homes because the housing market has gone up.

Ms. Tarkington pointed out that a study on the ranges of years that these people have lived in their homes would help us know how long-time residents are benefiting from this program. She also said that it would be helpful to know the types of homes in which they live (e.g. single family, two-family, condo) and that an updated map of the locations of households benefiting from the program would be useful.

Ms. Rutgers asked whether Greenwich does not also now process applications every other year, mirroring the state program. Mr. Gwartney confirmed that Greenwich now follows the same pattern as the state.

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Ms. Tarkington, the Board voted 12-0-0 to accept the Assessor’s Report.

**BET COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS**

*Audit Committee- Robert Stone*

The Audit Committee met on September 11, 2007.

Those in attendance beside members and staff included: James Latham, Director of Purchasing, Maureen Kast, Director of Human Resources, John Wayne Fox, Town Attorney, Joseph Siciliano, Director of Parks & Recreation, Eugene McLaughlin, Assistant Town Attorney, Abby Wadler, Assistant Town Attorney.

The committee reviewed the status of proposed changes to the town’s purchasing processes. Mr. Latham reviewed the RFP process involved in the Valley Road sidewalk project that included background questions suggested by the Audit Committee. Mr. Fox agreed to the Committee’s request to further refine one area of inquiry, which will be used in connection with the RFP for the Glenville Fire House.

The status of a lease with the Byram Shore Boat Club was discussed, and Mr. Fox provided background as to why an operating agreement for the site was executed rather than a lease. He
stated that the agreement incorporated the same insurance and indemnification covenants that are required in the leases for sites of this type. The committee will be reviewing at its October 2007 meeting a summary reflecting the terms of leases and operating agreements of this type. The RTM approves leases with town owned properties. They do not have such a role concerning operating agreements. The Town Attorney did not believe there was a problem providing the information.

Mr. Fox told the committee that the Parks and Recreation Foundation is a totally independent organization and its management and direction should not be associated with the Town of Greenwich. Letters and literature written by the Foundation should mention that the organization is not a part of the town. He will prepare suggested wording to be used by the Foundation in its literature and web site to clarify the status.

Ms. Kast, Human Resources Director, provided an update to the committee on payroll processes that have been implemented since the internal audit concerning payroll. The process of introducing a new department to centralized payroll is going smoothly.

The committee reviewed the suggestions by the town Treasurer regarding fees to be charged NSF checks returned to the town. The committee reviewed and agreed to support the Comptroller beginning to charge a $25 fee throughout the town, with the exception of the BOE, for any checks returned to the town.

Retirement Board- Robert Stone

The Retirement Board’s budget was conditioned, up to 50%, on the adoption of provisions and guidelines for monitoring the performance of investment managers on an ongoing basis. They have yet to adopt such guidelines since they are waiting until a vacancy on their Board is filled. They have said that this should be accomplished in the next few months

Human Resources Committee-Leslie Tarkington

The Human Resources Committee met on September 12, 2007. All members were present, as well as Mr. Mynarski and Ms. Kast.

Guests included First Selectman, Jim Lash, and BOE Chairman, Colleen Giambo, Schools Superintendent Betty Sternberg, BOE Member, Nancy Weissler, and BOE Human Resources Director Ellen Flanagan.

Ms. Tarkington said that Ms. Giambo and Ms. Sternberg shared information and background on the M/C Pay Plan for the BOE employees that participate in that program; on the bonus recently paid to the “Cabinet” employees that include two M/C Pay Plan employees; and on the 457 Plan. It was agreed that additional information could and would be shared between the town and the BOE as it relates to these top administrative employees, including additional information that could assist with the town’s M/C Study currently underway.
Mr. Lash also provided an update and foundation for the First Selectman’s budget, yet in its early stages, as it related to Human Resources.

**M/C Pay Plan**

Ms. Kast continues to work closely with the Hay Group on the M/C Pay Plan study that is underway. After much analysis, including input from Mr. Mynarski, the sub-committee assisted Hay in selecting 6 comparable municipalities for benchmarking the town’s employees: Fairfield, Norwalk, Stamford, New Rochelle, Danbury and West Hartford. The HR Committee, Mr. Lash and Mr. Tesei provided input in addition to Mr. Mynarski. Hay Group is also using its tri-state database that includes both corporate and non-profit personnel. Twenty-seven of approximately fifty positions are being benchmarked. Hay is completing this next step this week.

**Hamilton Avenue School Building Committee**

Mr. Walko reported that the Hamilton Avenue School Building Committee currently meets every other week on Tuesday mornings at 7:30 a.m. in the Havemeyer Building. All are invited to attend. He said that he had voted against going into Executive Session to discuss the contractor’s explanation regarding the status of the project. The timeline for completion of the Hamilton Avenue School is now mid-December. The committee is working to facilitate communication between the architect, the contractor and the project manager in an effort to ensure completion of this project in the anticipated time frame so that the building can be turned over to the BOE and the transfer can happen relative to the Glenville School.

**Glenville School Building Committee**

Mr. Tesei reported that the Glenville School Building Committee had met that morning, September 18, 2007. One of the main issues for discussion was how the state Department of Education would classify this project: as renovation, renovate-like-new, or new. The classification status determines the rate of reimbursement by the state. The project was initially set up as renovate-like-new. After further explanation by Dr. Sternberg and members of the Building Committee, Mr. David Wedge, from the state Department of Education, has taken a more favorable view. It is going to be classified as new. It will be stripped down to the foundation. Because of these adjustments in the classification, it was necessary to tweak the design.

**The Nathaniel Witherell Building Committee - Leslie Tarkington**

The Nathaniel Witherell Building Committee has held four full committee meetings since the July 2007 BET meeting. At the end of July 2007 the Nathaniel Witherell Board approved and submitted specifications for its proposed renewal. Board members, Paul Toretta and Lloyd Bankson, have worked diligently to channel these specifications as needed.

Progress is being made on the preparation of the RFP’s for the architect and the construction manager. There will be a two-step RFP process, similar to an RFQ, where the group of potential candidates is narrowed by a first phase of information requirements and questions.
Finally it is probable that Nathaniel Witherell will hire a local attorney to represent it before Land Use Boards, and for other such work.

**COMPTROLLER’S REPORT**

Mr. Mynarski presented the Comptroller’s Report for the period of July 17, 2007 to September 18, 2007.

Mr. Norton pointed out that on page 4 of The Comptroller’s Report there is a reference to the Western Greenwich Civic Center rather than the Bendheim Western Greenwich Civic Center. Mr. Mynarski explained that the application specifically said Western Greenwich Civic Center and that all the documents referred to it as that. All the documents that he supplied note that the name has been changed. This is the name of the project that is on the books for reimbursement, but everyone knows that the name has been changed.

Mr. Walko explained that the Budget Committee is looking at the BOE transfers and that the committee decided to continue this for a trial period of 12 months to see if the program is a worthwhile venture and what can be learned from it. The Budget Committee hopes to have another discussion on this subject in September 2008.

Mr. Norton asked about the purchase of the Tuchman property and its effect on the Capital Non-Recurring Account. He asked if this capital account is still in existence and if the amount in this account as reflected in the Treasurer’s Report should be reduced by the amount of the purchase. Mr. Mynarski responded that the Capital Non-Recurring Account is still in existence and that the Treasurer’s Report does not reflect the land purchase since it has just occurred in September 2007. Mr. Gieger said that the balance in this fund is now about $2.9 million, which is the figure listed in the Treasurer’s Report minus $8.7 million. Mr. Gieger and Mr. Mynarski said that there are no plans to eliminate this account at this time.

Upon a motion by Ms. Tarkington, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 12-0-0 to accept the Comptroller’s Report.

**ACCEPTANCE OF TREASURER’S REPORT SHOWING INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIODS OF AUGUST 1, 2007- AUGUST 31, 2007**

Upon a motion by Mr. Norton, seconded by Mr. Stone, the Board voted 12-0-0 to accept the Treasurer’s Report.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Upon a motion by Ms. Tarkington, seconded by Mr. Himes, the Board voted 11-0-1, to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of the BET from July 16, 2007, with Mr. Walko abstaining because he was absent.

OFFICERS’ REPORT

There were no Officers’ reports.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Approval of OPEB Resolution.

Mr. Walko, who chaired the OPEB Ad-Hoc Committee, explained the development of the proposed Resolution and the Trust Agreement that would go from the BET to the RTM. He also explained that the OPEB committee members had originally looked at the OPEB account to get a handle on the accounting and the mechanism by which services and benefits were delivered from the account. The State Legislature has changed the law relative to the permitted investment allocation in such accounts. Although the BET currently controls the manner in which OPEB assets are allocated and managed, Mr. Walko said committee members believed that, according to statute, it could be done differently in order to maximize the returns.

According to the proposed Trust Agreement, The BET would select three Board members for the Trust who would oversee the management and investment allocation of the Trust assets. Currently the BET exercises this control.

Mr. Simon wanted to be sure that it was understood that this now moves onto the RTM and that the RTM could modify the agreement. He said that if the RTM modified it in an unsatisfactory way, the BET could exercise its control by failing to fund the Trust.

Mr. Mynarski said that the ‘explanos’ for the RTM would be changed so that they would be simple, not too lengthy, and direct enough that RTM members, who had never reviewed these issues before, would be able to understand them.

Mr. Walko suggested that all comments be sent electronically in Word to Finance by Friday, September 21, 2007.

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the OPEB Resolution.

Approval of OPEB Trust Agreement
Mr. Simon outlined the technical corrections that had been made to the Trust document.

Upon a motion by Mr. Walko, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 12-0-0 to approve the OPEB Trust Agreement.

Mr. Tesei thanked the committee members for their work.

Approval of Budget Guidelines for the 2008-2009 Fiscal Year

Mr. Walko presented the proposed 2008-2009 Budget Guidelines. He explained that these Budget Guidelines are the result of a great amount of work by the members of the Budget Committee and include additional input from the BET Human Resources Committee. These Guidelines call for an estimated mill rate increase of 3.5%. Mr. Walko said that, based on what is known at this moment in the budget forecasts, we are approximately $4.35 million over budget. That includes a capital budget, excluding Nathaniel Witherell, of $55.6 million. Mr. Walko thanked Mr. Simon for the great amount of work he has put into drafting this document.

BET members commented on the inclusion of a paragraph pertaining to workplace training that had been inserted in the Guidelines subsequent to their approval by the Budget Committee. Some members commented that, while workplace training is important, it should not be included in the Budget Guidelines. Ms. Tarkington expressed her concern that, if not included in the Guidelines, the importance of training might be overlooked in favor of other budget concerns.

Mr. Krumeich said that this paragraph, which refers to Human Resources issues, does not belong in this document since it is not budget related. Ms. Tarkington responded that workplace training was a way of mitigating risks and did have a budget impact.

Ms. Barton said that, as a member of the Human Resources Committee, she had spoken against including a training section in the Budget Guidelines. She said that the Budget Guidelines have gotten too long and that she was not in favor of adding things.

Mr. Simon said that the language in question was difficult to understand and that it was unclear what the BET would thereby be asking town departments to do.

Ms. Rutgers emphasized that this paragraph should have been proposed as an amendment since it was not included in the original Budget Guidelines that were approved by the Budget Committee.

Ms. Tarkington then made a motion to add the training language to the Budget Guidelines on page five under the section titled "Specific Department Issues," under the heading "All Town Departments."

Upon a motion by Ms. Tarkington, seconded by Mr. Norton, the Board voted 6-6-0 with Mr. Tesei, BET Chairman, casting the tie-breaking vote against the motion that was then defeated. Those voting in favor of adding
the training language were Mr. Norton, Mr. Mason, Ms. Rutgers, Mr. Stone, Ms. Tarkington and Mr. Walko. Those opposed were Ms. Barton, Mr. Finger, Mr. Himes, Mr. Krumeich, Mr. Simon and Mr. Tesei.

Upon a motion by Mr. Norton, seconded by Mr. Stone, the Board voted 12-0-0 to adopt the Budget Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Mr. Norton, seconded by Mr. Finger, the Board voted 12-0-0 to adjourn at 8:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Merz, Recording Secretary

Alma Rutgers, Clerk of the Board

Peter J. Tesei, Chairman

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROPOSED BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE HISTORY FOR YEAR 2008

WHEREAS, the Policy of the Town of Greenwich requires that the Board of Estimate and Taxation shall annually make and file in the Office of the Town Clerk a Detailed Statement of the Appropriations, with its reasons for said Appropriations which it deems necessary to meet the expenses and to conduct the affairs of the Community Development Block Grant Program of the Town of Greenwich for the ensuing Fiscal Year, that is to say, for the Year January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008 inclusive; and

WHEREAS, the said Board has so filed in the Office of Town Clerk a Detailed Statement of such Appropriations contained in a document designated as the Community Development Block Grant Proposed Action Plan, January 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008 pages 3 through 5, pages 36 through 83 and pages 131 through 133, it will also forward a copy of this resolution indicating approval of the Community Development Block Grant Plan and Budget for the Fiscal Year January 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008 by the Board of Estimate and Taxation; and

WHEREAS, the said Policy provides that the Board of Estimate and Taxation shall submit proposed Appropriations and make such Appropriations as may appear advisable, except that no Appropriations shall be made exceeding an amount for the same purpose recommended by the said Board; and

WHEREAS, said Community Development Block Grant Proposed Budget and Expenditure History – 2008 was forwarded to the members of the Representative Town Meeting on or about September 4, 2007 for action by the Representative Town Meeting at its Meeting to be held October 22nd 2007.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendations of the Board of Estimate and Taxation as contained in the said Community Development Block Grant Proposed Budget and Expenditure History – 2008 filed, as stated, in the Office of the Town Clerk and submitted at the meeting of the Representative Town Meeting be and the same hereby are approved as the Appropriations for the ensuing Calendar Year 2008, except that the following items shall be decreased or omitted as follows:
FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the event the entitlement amount should be more than anticipated, the additional funds will be appropriated to a contingency line item, or if either the entitlement is less than the projected $950,000 or the loan repayment is less than the $38,718, the priority for funding, after the staff salaries, will be based on an equal percentage reduction of the activities listed in the "CDBG Proposals – First Selectman’s Recommendation For Funding Year 2008"; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the First Selectman, under the provisions of Title 8 of the Connecticut General Statues, Chapter 130, Part VI, Community Development and Title 1 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Public Law 93-383, as amended (42 U.S.C. §5301 et seq.); the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. §3531 et seq.), be hereby authorized to accept grants for the purpose of carrying out an approved Community Development Block Grant Program for the Town of Greenwich; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Department of Community Development of the Town of Greenwich, for purposes set forth in this Budget is authorized to accept grants or funds made available through the Community Development Block Grant Fund.