

SECOND TAXING DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

Regular Meeting Minutes

February 16, 2016

Present:	David Westmoreland Maria Borges-Lopez Mary Geake Mary Mann Sandra Stokes Martha Wooten-Dumas	Chairman – via phone Vice Chairperson
Absent:	None	
Also Present:	Paul Yatcko Kevin Barber Lisa Roland	General Manager Director of Finance & Services District Clerk
Public Present:	None	

Call To Order:

Commissioner Borges-Lopez called the Regular Meeting of The Second Taxing District Commissioners to order at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2016. The meeting was held at South Norwalk Electric and Water, One State Street, Norwalk, Connecticut.

1. Acceptance of the Minutes

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “I would like to call the regular meeting of the Second Taxing District to order and I would like to have the District Clerk read the legal notice to the Electors please.

Lisa Roland, District Clerk read the legal notice for the record.

[Commissioner Wooten-Dumas arrived at 7:05 p.m.]

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “Thank you. I would like to entertain a motion from the floor to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 19, 2016.”

Commissioner Mann: “I Mary Mann make a motion to accept the minutes.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “May I have a second?”

Commissioner Geake: “And I’ll second it, Mary Geake.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “All in favor?”

Commissioners Unanimously: “Aye.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Abstentions, opposed?"

Public Participation

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I didn't forget this time, but we don't have anyone to participate in the public meeting so we move to the regular agenda. Item number 2 oh, no I need a motion from the floor to add library parking signs to the regular agenda."

Commissioner Stokes: "I make a motion."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Sandra Stokes made a motion, do I have a second?"

Commissioner Geake: "I'll second it."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Mary Geake, all in favor?"

Commissioners Unanimously: "Aye."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Abstentions, opposed?"

Commissioner Mann: "I abstain."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "One abstention - Mary Mann. So who is going to speak on the library parking signs?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Well, I will."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Ok."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Can you hear me?"

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Yes we can hear you."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I received a request from Sherelle Harris the Director of the South Norwalk Library. It was also backed up by Commissioners Dumas and Mann asking if the Second Taxing District can fund the signs in the parking lot behind the library that say 'Library Parking Only'. Apparently, the First Taxing District provided similar signs to the main Public Library at their cost recently. They did provide us with an estimate, which I received today of about \$48.00 per sign from the Rising Sign Company, so you know it's less than you know, less than a \$1,000 expenditure probably less than a \$2,000 expenditure. I thought it was, you know, from a District point of view, it's a way to help out the library and the community and parking there is an issue it would probably be a reasonable thing for the commission to consider."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "So did everyone hear what David Westmoreland had to say about the parking signs, and now I will need any comments or...?"

Commissioner Geake: "I have a question. How many signs have they decided on David?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I don't know, they said that the main library put up like 20 to 22 signs, so that would be like \$1,000 on the spending, they would put one up on each space, so I think if we set a budget not to exceed \$2,000 that would be enough."

Commissioner Geake: "Yes, because they could actually just put them up on the fence rather than having to put it on a pole and put it down, so that would cut out a little bit of that you would think."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yes."

Commissioner Stokes: "So David, are these signs, cars are towed if you park there? Like how do you regulate them?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "That's up to the library, the library would have to enforce the towing. We are just going to provide the signs for them."

Commissioner Stokes: "Ok."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "David, the sign is only to say 'No Parking, Private Property' you know, 'Library Only'?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "It's going to say...it's my understanding they want it to say 'Library Parking Only'."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Ok, and how many signs again?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I don't know exactly, it probably depends on how many spaces they have. I'm guessing it would be 20 or less."

Commissioner Mann: "Yes, I believe there are 16 spaces, I am not sure. I believe there are 16, I would have to check that."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Any other questions? We need a motion from the floor to either approve or go forward with the signs and..."

Paul Yatcko: "If I can ask a question?"

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Sure."

Paul Yatcko: "Is it your intent to try to fund that out of the current appropriations or do you want us to include that in the 2016-2017 budget?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "What is easier for you?"

Paul Yatcko: "I think we've got the..."

Kevin Barber: "If I could, looking at the budget from last year, we do have an allotment of \$3,000 in what is described as 'miscellaneous projects for the District'. And I think that could be used right out of those funds."

Commissioner Geake: "Ok."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Well let's fund it out of that."

Paul Yatcko: "Ok, that's fine."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So I make a motion to fund the library signs out of the account that Paul just mentioned whatever that is, the special projects account."

Commissioner Stokes: "It's miscellaneous."

Commissioner Geake: "I'll second it."

Kevin Barber: "Its Miscellaneous Projects."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "One other thing, David just to clarify. Were you going to set a cap not to exceed X amount of dollars on your motion?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yes, not to exceed \$2,000."

Commissioner Borges Lopez: "So there is a motion on the floor and can I have a second?"

Commissioner Geake: "I'll second it."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "All in favor?"

Commissioners unanimously: "Aye."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Opposed, abstentions?"

Commissioner Mann: "One abstention."

Commissioner Borges Lopez: "One abstention, Mary Mann. Now we move on to the second item on the agenda, which is the Customer Appeals Committee – Vacancy."

REGULAR AGENDA

2. Customer Appeals Committee - Vacancy

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Basically the Appeals Committee had three commissioners and one alternate and Mimi Burgess is no longer part of that committee so we need to reappoint or replace her position and...yes David?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Who else is on it?"

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I'm sorry?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Who else is on it?"

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Myself, Mary Mann and Mary Geake as an alternate. So we need one permanent."

Commissioner Geake: "I will do it."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Yeah, ok, Mary would like to move from an alternate to be part of the committee and so we will need to appoint an alternate."

Commissioner Dumas: "I will do it, if there are no objections."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "So Martha Dumas will be the alternate, I need a motion to accept Mary Geake as part of the committee."

Commissioner Dumas: "I will make a motion."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Second."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I'll second it."

[Laughter]

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "All in favor?"

Commissioners Unanimously: "Aye."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I need a motion for Martha Dumas to be an alternate."

Commissioner Stokes: "I'll make a motion."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Second?"

Commissioner Mann: "I'll second."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "All in favor, opposed?"

Commissioners Unanimous: "Aye."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Alright, we'll move on to the item #3 – Commercial Refund Policy."

3. Commercial Refund Policy

Paul Yatcko: “As it says in your book Commissioners, our legislature, in its wisdom last spring, its budget implementer included language that permits the Municipal Utilities in the State to refund up to 50% of a customer’s deposit if that account has been in good standing for two years and it also allows us to accept in the place of cash or letter of credit it also allows us to accept a surety bond as a form of deposit. Our policy currently does not allow for the surety bond and also provides for no provision for refunding a non-residential deposit. So clearly in order to conform to the statute, we have to change the policy. Now it seems to me that you’ve got two policy objectives that are kind of bumping up against one another here. A policy that does not routinely refund parts of non-residential deposits is designed to protect the other customers in case a commercial establishment goes out of business. On the other hand, a policy for non-residential deposits that permits us to refund it, basically is more business friendly and could conceivably help some businesses that could use that cash in their productive or their service processes. So we have given you two sets of language here, one which essentially permits us to review the customer’s required deposit and then based on their historical usage, adjust it either upward or downward and if the excess is more than 20%, if they have an excess deposit, if its more than 25% of the requirement, we will refund. That’s a more restrictive version of it. A more liberal version is what we provided as option B, which is language that states that we will refund half of the deposit if the customer’s account has been in good standing for two years or more and they request it. Again the one is more restrictive and more protective, the second one is more business friendly.”

Commissioner Mann: “Through the Chair? I have a question in regards to option A that when you do review the customer’s usage, you could actually charge them more of a security deposit because it says either upward or downward?”

Paul Yatcko: “Theoretically, that is correct. So, if the estimated use upon which we base the original deposit turned out to be incorrect and perhaps they’ve installed more equipment or running a second shift or something like that so they are using more, then arguably our exposure is greater.”

Commissioner Mann: “While I recognize our exposure is greater, I guess my question would be the language from the legislature that initiated this whole thing you know, would that be looked upon as us penalizing and are we going to end up with more problems if we were to go that route?”

Paul Yatcko: That is the danger of adopting a policy like that, yes.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Because it just contradicts, if we are talking about the sake of public good it’s...”

Paul Yatcko: “And that’s why we gave you two sets of language.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Yes, I wish you could merge...I mean I like A, I like B, but I don’t think...it’s definitely the upward or downward or charging people based on their history.

I, like I said, it doesn't...it contradicts us doing work for the public good, but I also don't feel that option B has all of the language that you need, minus the upward or downward and adjusting it. It feels like it's still missing some language."

Paul Yatcko: "Ok."

Commissioner Geake: "Through the chair? Is this commercial properties only?"

Paul Yatcko: "Commercial properties only."

Commissioner Geake: "I just wanted to make sure on that. Thank you."

Paul Yatcko: "Residential properties we don't routinely give the deposit back until the customer leaves us. And then it gets credited against their outstanding balance and any excess refunded to them."

Commissioner Stokes: "So, if they don't request the deposit, then what happens to it?"

Paul Yatcko: "They will get it back if they leave us."

Commissioner Stokes: "Ok."

Paul Yatcko: "But if they don't...if you make it option B, if they don't ask for it back, it just sits there in the balance of the deposits. I will tell you, there is at least one customer who is very interested in this and who has called me about it several times."

Commissioner Stokes: "Oh really."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I believe I know who the customer is. The customer has mentioned it to me as well."

David Westmoreland: "Paul is that because the customer wants to do the bond or they want some of their deposit back."

Paul Yatcko: "They want their cash."

Commissioner Mann: "What is an average for a large commercial property? What is an average security deposit that they currently owe?"

Paul Yatcko: "The commercial class is kind of funny because there is no such thing as an average, you can get everything from a small shop all the way up to LaJoie's."

Commissioner Mann: "Yes, that's why I was talking about the large ones."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "What is the largest deposit that we have on one customer \$35, \$40 \$50, \$60 thousand?"

Kevin Barber: "It's actually, I think a lot more. It is 50 Washington Street and I don't recall the exact amount, but it is quite large. We have other ones that are in the \$30, \$40 thousand dollar range. The majority of our commercial are less. I mean, it does depend on the type of business they are, restaurants tend to be larger than small, you know little offices due to the nature of what they do and the amount of electricity they use, so it is kind of hard to say, restaurants can be anywhere from \$5,000 to \$20,000 depending on the size and the type."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So Paul under either of these two policies, if we reduce their deposit do they have to provide a bond?"

Paul Yatcko: "No."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So then, my concern on this whole thing is just that you know the residential customers you know, they move because they're moving somewhere else, the businesses move you know, half the time it's because they're going out of business, and you know particularly Washington Street you know where all these restaurants. They just go out of business and then they are going to stick us with the bill. I don't want to increase our exposure."

Paul Yatcko: "Unfortunately any policy that provides for a refund of their deposit based on good payment performance is going to by its very nature increase our exposure."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Well your option A doesn't seem to increase our exposure at all."

Paul Yatcko: "The question with option A David is whether or not it meets the legislative intent."

Commissioner Mann: "Yes."

Paul Yatcko: "Which was your point?"

Commissioner Mann: "Yes, because if we review these accounts and we are asking them for more of a security deposit, I think we are going to be in for a big headache."

Commissioner Geake: "We won't get it."

Paul Yatcko: "It certainly isn't customer friendly."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Right."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So what is the history with commercial account failures?"

Paul Yatcko: "Do you have anything you can shed the light on here?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "For Non-payment."

Kevin Barber: “Not easily off of the top of my head. I do know we have some from years ago from the before the policy was enacted where we did get...take big losses on some commercial establishments, mainly restaurants down on Washington Street, which I think was one of the driving forces why deposits, the commercial deposits policy was enacted. It has been better obviously because of the deposit policy and I would probably defer back to the write-offs that what we receive on a quarterly basis.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “I don’t remember seeing many commercial write-offs.”

Commissioner Geake: “I have seen, every time we have a write-off there is always two or three, whether your realize it or not they are always well over \$1,000. They’re not really, really bad, but every month whenever we have them it’s always there’s at least a couple.”

Kevin Barber: “And I like to remind the commission that the write-offs that you see are actually from I believe six years ago. We don’t write off until six years later.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Right, it’s not current information.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “Just for clarification, so you said option A may not meet the legislative intent.”

Paul Yatcko: “Yes.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “How about option B?”

Paul Yatcko: “Option B clearly does because it provides for the return of up to 50% of their deposit based on their payment record.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “Ok.”

Paul Yatcko: “Option A does not do that.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “So...”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Can you provide us with a list, like a total by year or something of commercial accounts up to present date that have not paid?”

Paul Yatcko: “Yes we can do that.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Ok, why don’t we do that and just table this until the next meeting.”

Paul Yatcko: “Ok, we’ll get that information for you.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “What do you guys think, is that ok?”

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: “Yes, that’s fine.”

Commissioner Stokes: “I have one other question Paul, so even though you’re saying that the policy needs to comply with the new statute, does A, even though we know it’s not customer friendly, is it still complying with the statute?”

Paul Yatcko: “Well, it depends on how you interpret the word ‘may’. If it truly means it’s permissive and not coercive, then we are probably ok, but it’s going to make some customers clearly unhappy.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Yes.”

Paul Yatcko: “If on the other hand you read the ‘may’ in this case as being coercive, you read the ‘may’ as a shell then it’s not compliant.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Right, so regardless of, if we look at the accounts, what difference does it make with the language? Are we going to base it on the number of accounts, like once you do that report, what difference would it make? I mean, I don’t understand how it’s going to affect our decision if we are doing it for the public good and if we want to comply with the statute, how will that influence our decision?”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Well, let’s define public, what is public good? My definition of public good is making sure that the constituents of the Second Taxing District and the customers of SNEW are protected. That at the same time, I would prefer to be business friendly, I would prefer to adopt option B.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Right.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “But I don’t know, I can’t tell what my action would be or my vote, will that support, I don’t know how much, I don’t have any sense of how much that’s increasing our exposure, which is going to cost everybody else money when commercial accounts fail, that means all the other rate payers basically end up paying for it. So I want to kind of understand what the magnitude of the issue is, if its relatively small then I would prefer to adopt option B and be more customer friendly and see what happens. If it’s not, then I would want to know, explore what our options are under maybe modifying option A more, but my concern again is minimizing the risk to the current rate payers because that’s what we’re doing here.”

Commissioner Stokes: “I agree.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “We are increasing everybody else’s exposure, I mean I don’t want to pay more on my own bill because some restaurant on Washington Street goes out of business and sticks us with a big bill. I mean that’s effectively what we would be enabling.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "As a point of clarification again, I just want to make sure, so then we're asking also for option A, the verbiage to be reworded so that it meets the legislative intent?"

Paul Yatcko: "Understood."

Commissioner Stokes: "I agree."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Yes, ok, alright. So then I need a motion from the floor to table item number 3, Commercial Refund Policy until next meeting."

Commissioner Stokes: "So moved."

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: "Second."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Second, all in favor?"

Commissioners Unanimously: "Aye."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Opposed, abstentions. We go onto item number 4 Customer Assistance Program."

4. Customer Assistance Program

Paul Yatcko: "David you asked that this one be on the agenda today."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yes."

Paul Yatcko: "We tried to engage Person-to-Person to help us with this. They are thrilled at the prospect, but unfortunately they are currently resource and budget constrained and can't put anybody on this until they get into their new budget year on July 1. We talked to the Norwalk Housing Authority, they are not set up to handle it. ABCD is unable to help us. We even talked to a couple of local churches to see if they'd be interested, but the scale is too big for them. So what we currently done we've engaged in a design process here. Staff has given me a process design that I'm currently reviewing and we could conceivably implement as early as next week, starting to distribute the funds on our own. The concern that I have is, I don't want us to be accused of not fairly distributing the funds. If we have an objective third party other than SNEW distributing the funds, it's easier to call the project bias free and objective. I am a little bit concerned about us being in the business of handing out funds and having somebody look at it and say 'well they got is and I didn't' you're not fair. I really want to avoid that, so we're going to have to look at this process and the criteria very hard, but we can conceivably put something in place as early as next week."

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: "There has always been kind of like a process that also was set up along with the utility companies Eversource, gas or electric that a guideline

that you have to follow also. There was a process of how much can you contribute before we allocate the money to assist you along with what the utility companies would accept. Because some people came in, I mean their bills were over five, six hundred dollars. Well if you could come up with a hundred of it, then we can make arrangements per se with a utility company, then maybe we can give you at least two fifty of that, you know something of that nature.”

Paul Yatcko: “Staff has given me just such a process and some criteria. What we want to do is to make them make sure they are thoroughly vetted and they work the way they are intended. Right now our concept is, we would give no individual recipient any more than \$500 for example. They have to fill out an application, they have to disclose certain financial data to us and you know we are trying to bullet proof this thing. I don’t know if we can, but we are going to try.”

Commission Stokes: “Can you use benchmarks from other companies to help you with the criteria?”

Paul Yatcko: “Everybody does it a little bit differently. We have talked to Third Taxing District about their program. Theirs is a little different, but they are working with Person-to-Person right now, which is why we went to them and theirs includes some personal budget counseling and some expense control counseling to help people not to have this trouble in the future. So it’s not just about giving away money, it is also helping people to become better home budgeters and we like that and that’s why we really wanted to work with Person-to-Person on this. So I’m not precluding working with them, I hope that come July 1st we can put together an agreement that has them handling this for us.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “I think NEON also used a certain criteria directly from the State department, from the State.”

Paul Yatcko: “Yes, there is a State application.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “Because they also received you know, funds from the State to subsidize some of the heating and you know the utilities and so on and so forth.”

Paul Yatcko: “Yes.”

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “So they worked in combination with the State and they used the same formula I think to administer the SNEW as well.”

Commissioner Mann: “If a person qualifies for the energy assistance program, the majority of the time and that is a State program that you are talking about, any energy assistance program they would qualify for this program, but my concern is once word gets out in the community that we are participating in this program meaning SNEW, are we able to accommodate the number of people that you might have sitting in your lobby waiting to complete these applications for energy assistance? That’s my question.”

Paul Yatcko: "That's a very good question. I don't have a sense for what the scale is going to be. That's one of the things we are going to have to work our way through. We do have a full time collection specialist that right now is working with people on payments arrangements. We've had several conversations with her, she seems to indicate that she can handle the volume. I need to see the numbers first and make sure that we can."

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: "I mean it's a lot, this is usually done by appointment."

Paul Yatcko: "And the other thing I will point out is that nobody is going to get shut off this winter. We are in the winter moratorium period and we don't come out of it until correct me if I'm wrong Kevin, May?"

Kevin Barber: "Yes, I believe it ends on May 1st."

Paul Yatcko: "And so nobody is in danger of being shut off at this point in time."

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: "April 31st."

Commissioner Mann: "Ok."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "So I need a consensus here because from what I'm seeing here and what I'm hearing, I don't think we are anywhere at a point where we need to vote on this?"

Paul Yatcko: "I don't know that you have to vote on this at all."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "No?"

Paul Yatcko: "I just think that we're doing this because David wanted us to have this conversation and we could implement this just by management decision."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Ok."

Paul Yatcko: "The funds have been budgeted for it already and our concern now is dispersing the funds in a way that the people who really need it get it."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I think that, I appreciate that you guys have taken this on, I know it's a headache, but I think is important to the community to make it available. I think that we should move ahead and be mindful of the issue that you brought up that it's probably going to be an issue sooner or later that it will not be viewed as neutral as a neutral third party, so I think that moving it, continuing to pursue Person-to-Person or someone else probably does make sense for the long run."

Paul Yatcko: "We should be able to get them in place for the next budget year, but in the meantime we've got \$25,000 sitting here that could be helping people."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yes. Thank you."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: “Ok, so no vote or decisions on it, so we move on from the Customer Assistance Program. We move on to item number 5, which is 2016-2017 District Budget – Analysis & Discussion and it looks like Kevin Barber is getting us all situated and Paul is taking over.”

5. 2016-2017 District Budget – Analysis & Discussion

Paul Yatcko: “Actually I like to begin the discussion of the draft budget by first thanking Kevin who had to do a lot of structural work to make the budget fit together this year. As you recall we changed our organization back in October, moved a bunch of lines and boxes around and when you do that you move dollars around. You move recording relationships around and it causes you to re-analyze how the things fit together and Kevin did a terrific job in creating the budget structure that staff could work through to get this to come together. I also like to thank my staff, having been in this business for forty one years now, I know that under normal circumstances it can be a challenge to put together a budget, but when you inject a new General Manager into the mix who’s got different crazy ideas, who’s got preconceived notions and who’s got a different process in mind that you ever had before, it can explode in an hurry. Well, I think staff did a great job this time working with me, learning what my notions of budgeting are and understanding what it was I was driving to and it made it come together really in a timely fashion and I think we have a pretty good quality product here at this point in time. So, if we can just move ahead. All budget’s foundations are set on coherent assumptions and this one is no different. We built a general wage in salary increase of 2 1/2% in for January 1, 2017. We assumed a health insurance rate increase of 15% also on January 1.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Does that seem really high?”

Paul Yatcko: “Well last year, this past year David the first cut out at it was about 10.8% when we got the first quote in, Mike Sutton haggled them down to 5, the trouble is you can’t predict what it’s going to be, you know it’s arguably high. I would rather have a little more money in there than come up short.”

David Westmoreland: “Alright.”

Paul Yatcko: “We are funding forty seven positions and that’s consistent with what we asked for back in October. It includes two positions that we haven’t filled yet the Safety and Security Coordinator, which I believe it was a critical function in the organization and that you all agreed with, and also a Key Accounts Manager which we are not going to fill until January, but the reason I believe we need that one is that if the SONO collection continues to move ahead we are going to need somebody in our organization to be able to interface with that project, liaise with their personnel and keep things moving internally because that project is bigger than anything that SNEW has ever done in its history. So we are planning on filling those two positions as shown. After pushing the numbers through about five or six times Kevin and I have agreed that we’re going to need a water rate increase in this budget and you can wait and do the one big increase in the order of

15 to 20% or you can do a series of small ones. In order to make this budget work, we believe we need a 3% increase in water rates effective this coming July 1.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Refresh me on how do we enact at a 3% increase? What’s involved in doing that getting that done by July 1.”

Paul Yatcko: “We’ll have to bring it to the commission for approval, it will have to be publicly noticed, you’ll have to hold a hearing on it and then you’ll enact it.”

Commissioner Geake: “I have a question.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “When was our last increase, it wasn’t this year it was the year before last right?”

Paul Yatcko: “It was October, 2014.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Ok, alright.”

Commissioner Geake: “I have a question David. Paul I thought that if it was less than 5% we didn’t need to have an electors meeting to have it approved?”

Paul Yatcko: “I don’t know if you need the electors or not. You certainly need the commissions approval.”

Commissioner Geake: “Well yes, I understand that, but I didn’t know if you needed them.”

Paul Yatcko: “We’ll research the Charter. Procedurally we’ll do it right. We are anticipating that we are going to incur some costs for that major commercial development out on West Avenue. We are assuming that we are going to receive 100% contribution in aid of construction, so in this budget we are budgeting for certain capital expenditures for transformers and switch gears and so forth because you have to provide for the lead time in ordering that equipment and we are assuming that they are going to pony up the costs so that it will be in and out in the electric budget. You’ll see that a little bit later. I am going to warn you that because of the organization changes, we’ve looked at labor allocations and looked at overhead allocations and some costs have been moved between departments. We also thought about some positions differently, some positions for example were historically charged 100% to electric or 100% to water. We’ve taken another look at that and we’ve split some of those positions and moved those dollars around, so you’re going to see some changes and some numbers in here that are really one time changes. They are not reflective of increases in cost, but they are reflective of reallocations between departments. And finally, how do we make this thing come together? We looked at our OM&A expenses and our capital expenditures and we basically managed them downward to avoid major drawdowns of the fund balance or the creation of a negative fund balance at the end of the end of the fiscal year. And that’s really why, how we ended up with a 3% water rate increase. We made what we believed were some prudent cuts in the proposed budget amounts for water and in the end the

numbers didn't quite add up and we needed a shot in revenue. Now, let's look at the District Budget, which in your book is page 3 in the budget document. There are really no major changes from the prior year's budget, district revenue is just limited to a small amount of interest income, about \$550 and the operating expenses total \$154,000. There are no changes in the salary items, meeting costs are virtually unchanged, the legal fees we didn't change them, but there are some risks here of continuing Ryan Park related litigation, so that is a risk point in the budget and I would be interested in getting your input on that."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Paul could you...you cut out I couldn't hear what you said about legal fees."

Paul Yatcko: "They are unchanged in this budget David, but frankly there are some risks of continuing Ryan Park related litigation and that remains a risk factor in this budget that I want your input on. We may want to put a few more bucks in that line item as a contingency against what might happen."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Ok."

Paul Yatcko: "We have slightly higher insurance premiums and that's based on the direct quotes that we got from our insurance carrier. Kevin and I did meet with our insurance people back in December and we got a pretty good idea as to what our premiums are there. We've essentially not changed the community service related costs, street lighting expenses this year are \$174,000, that's up about \$11,000 and that reflects slightly lower purchased energy, but also greater allocation of labor as a result of analyzing where street lighting labor has gone in the last couple of years. If you turn to page 4 in your book, when you push all those numbers together the negative, the net income is negative \$357,000 that's almost identical to last year. We are going to transfer \$95,000 again each from water and electric to the district budget to cover general expenses and we are going to transfer \$174,000 from electric to cover the street lighting bill and that's consistent with what we did last year. The net change in the reserve fund is a negative \$13,000 and net, net, net the reserve fund balance remains healthy at almost \$1.2 million. What questions or comments do you have for me on the district budget?"

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "No comments."

Paul Yatcko: "Hearing none, that's the easy one because almost nothing changed. Let's turn you to page 5 in your book, which is the first page of the water budget summary. Sales revenue in this budget is \$8.55 million up \$215,000 from the prior budget and that basically assumes that water sales are going to be flat, but we are going to impose a 3% rate increase but that's not applied to public fire protection because we are out of sync with the city budgeting and they wouldn't have a chance to budget for this so we are not applying the 3% increase to the public fire protection line item, but everybody else gets it."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "We haven't increased though, the charge for the public fire protection as I understand it in years and years and years and I am wondering if we need to look at that and figure out how to implement that."

Paul Yatcko: I think we should probably talk to some people over at city hall as we move forward with that thinking. I mean they need to have a heads up if we're going to make a move in hydrant rates, they need to know about it so they can budget for it."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I agree with that and the city's budget process is under way, but it's my understanding that we haven't actually every adjusted what we charge for hydrants in years and years and years and it just doesn't make sense to me that the cost for that did not go up as the same we are charging our customers. So all I am saying whether we include it this time or some other time I kind of feel like we need to look at that, it doesn't have to be a part of this budget process, but I think it's something we need to just really understand."

Paul Yatcko: "I think that's a good point. We'll do that. Kevin do you know how long it's been?"

Kevin Barber: "It's been quite a number of years. I don't know exactly but every time we've gone through a water increase the same issues come up with the city, we have to give them a year's plus advanced notice so it's, being that are never in sync with them, it always just kind of just slipped through."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Norwalk is going to, I don't know what Wilton's budget cycle is, but Norwalk's budget process is happening right now, so we could notify them right now, but you could talk to Bob Barron, the city's Budget Director and find out and I don't have any idea about Wilton, but it seems really unfair to me that you know we keep raising the rates for our residential customers, but the town you know, we are not really increasing...they are not paying their fair share, particularly towns to the north of us."

Paul Yatcko: "Alright, will do. The other revenue in this budget for the most part is unchanged, but there are two items that did change. We did do an analysis of recent history in the water laboratory services and we raised the budget for those revenues based on what we've been selling in terms of services in the last couple of years. We also raised the revenue for the so called miscellaneous income. We have historically not budgeted anything in there, but we are getting a good slug of revenue from renting out our water tanks for the locations of cell phone towers and so we've included that in this budget and that's \$43,000. So total revenue is \$8.8 million and it's up roughly \$283,000."

Commissioner Mann: "I do have a question here on these laboratory services. You know, we're talking about \$13,000 increase. Are we doing something totally different from what we were doing in the past, is it supplies that are costing us more money, well what is it?"

Paul Yatcko: "That's not a cost, that's a revenue coming in, that's us selling services to people who have the water tested."

Kevin Barber: "Is it safe to say that year during our budget process we actually went down to what I might describe as ground zero and started to build it back up."

Commissioner Stokes: “Yes.”

Commissioner Mann: “Ok.”

Kevin Barber: “And we started really looking at a lot of the revenues to make sure we can budget for them accordingly and that was one of those that we did see that we historically been bringing in more than just the \$5,000. While that helps at the end of the year when we receive more money than we budget, it kind of doesn’t help us when we’re in the middle of the budget process though, it’s just a truer representation of what we’ve done in the past.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Ok, just because I don’t understand, what are examples of laboratory services?”

Kevin Barber: “We run a fully state licensed lab so we can do certain testing of water for private wells.”

Commissioner Stokes: “For private wells, ok.”

Kevin Barber: “For customer who have wells, lead testing and water quality test.”

Commissioner Stokes: “Got it.”

Paul Yatcko: “Ok, moving away from revenues and out to the ugly side which is costs.”

Commissioner Mann: “Yes I was head of myself.”

[Laughter]

Paul Yatcko: “Source of supply expenses are \$176,000 if you, and that’s the number you would get if you add the number for operations and maintenance under Source and Supply, it’s about half way down on page 5. And that’s up about \$29,000 and most of that is just labor allocations from other accounts that would drop as a result and associate overheads. Pumping expenses are \$239,000 up only about \$2,000. It turns out we been running some equipment at the filtration plant a little bit differently than we had been historically, so electricity is costing us more therefore our Eversource bills are higher than we had been anticipating, but in this budget it’s also offset by reductions in the labor and overhead allocations. Water treatment, which is the cost to run the filtration plant is almost \$1.5 million. That’s an increase of \$9,000 and that reflects the costs of the repair of the fluoride tank that is also offset by reductions and labor and overhead being allocated somewhere else. Transmission and distribution, which is essentially the pipes in the ground part of the business, a little over \$1 million, down about \$416,000. Last year’s budget if you recall, had about \$510,000 in it I believe, for painting the Summit Avenue tank, and that’s on track to be completed this spring, but clearly we don’t need that money in the budget and we also had some money in last year’s budget for large meter testing that’s not in this year’s budget either. Customer Account Expenses are \$572,000 that’s up almost \$2,000 I’m sorry, that almost \$200,000 that’s due to the cost

being placed in different places in the organization than they were before and reallocating some employees, in the historical budget like I said earlier, we had several positions that were being charged to electric only but we, as Kevin indicated, we took a really from the ground up approach and looked at those positions really hard and in the new organization they are providing service to both electric and water, so their costs and overhead have been split. The other thing in customer accounting expense is when we do customer friendly things like starting to taking credit cards, we also incur credit card processing fees. In the water budget I believe, if I remember that number correctly it's about \$83,000."

Kevin Barber: "No, the water is about \$45,000."

Paul Yatcko: "I'm sorry, electric is \$83,000. It's a significant expense you pay on a transaction basis for this stuff. A&G expenses, which is basically all the non-operating stuff, that's \$3.14 million up almost \$350,000, but it includes a number of things. It includes the OPEB Expense, which we had historically had not budgeted for, it includes the allocated portion of those two new positions that I mentioned earlier. We are also adding some additional safety consulting. I replaced our safety consultant just last month and I'm also paying them for more hours than we were paying the old firm. That's because I think that there are some safety situations around here that need attention and I wanted to get a pair of fresh eyes on them. And we've budgeted additional funds in here for the Wilton Tax Appeal related legal fees. Don't know how long that's going to go on but we considered it prudent to put some additional costs in there and general benefit costs primarily led by the health insurance. I increased that one line item as well. In total expenses are \$6.65 million, net, net, net that's an increase of \$117,000 or 1.7%. So it's a very modest increase in expenses. On the following page in your book, page 6 we are assuming flat property taxes. Total expenses then coming to about \$7.1 million or 1.6% higher than last year. We'll talk about capital expenditures on the next page. Debt service is unchanged, so even with this rate increase, the change in the water reserve fund is \$338,000 negative, but the closing balance in the water reserve fund is a positive \$59,000."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So you're saying that we, this budget assumes that we don't get any relief from the Wilton Tax?"

Paul Yatcko: "That's correct."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Ok."

Paul Yatcko: "And your guess is as good as mine on that one, I mean I think we are on the side of the angels in that litigation, but who knows."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Alright, but even with the 3% increase in July, we still have a decrease in the reserve fund?"

Paul Yatcko: "Yes."

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Yikes.”

Commissioner Mann: “Yeah.”

Paul Yatcko: “Well, it’s consistent with my observation when I started here a year ago, that this business is being run on a shoe string.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Right.”

Paul Yatcko: “You’re bumping along budget year to budget year to budget year right on the edge.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Right.”

Paul Yatcko: “And part of that happens because we are funding \$530,000 of capital expenditure out of current appropriations. Frankly I like to spend more capital than that. There is no way I can squeeze it into this budget.”

Commissioner Westmoreland: “Right.”

Paul Yatcko: “The water capital expenditures as I said total about \$530,000 in this budget. They are summarized on page 8 of your budget summary, but those numbers, I don’t know about you guys, but my eyes are getting bad enough that I can’t read numbers that tiny anymore, so I’ll summarize them for you. We’ve got \$150,000 in the budget to purchase and install AMI Water Meters that figure can fund roughly 500 new meters, so if we continue on our program of going to automated meters on the water side. There’s money in there to repair the pope pond bridge, that’s the bridge that goes from the dam at pope pond out to the gate house structure. I brought a photograph of it and if you look carefully the, I’ll pass this around, the planking here and this structure and this beam sit on top of pilings. The structures on top of the pilings, which is another cross beam, have actually rotated because the whole structure has shifted, so now those cross pieces are no longer lying flat. We could walk on that bridge, but we probably shouldn’t so that. It needs to be repaired and we put \$121,000 in the budget for it, hoping that we can do it for a little bit less. There \$56,000 in there for variable frequency drives at the filter plant. That will make the filter plant run more efficiently. There’s \$50,000 in there for doing hydraulic modeling of our distribution system. I’m not sure whether to put that in extraordinary operating and maintenance or put it in capital. We are still talking back and forth about where that belongs, but we wanted to get the cash outlay in there. We put a total of \$50,000 in the budget for updating our website \$25,000 of it is reflected here in the water budget. We put \$25,000 in there for replacing a vehicle that the meter people use. They’ve got a pretty beat vehicle there that’s got a lot of engine trouble, it’s a horrible vehicle that they have to weld the door hinges back on twice; it’s just a dog. We’ve got to get that out of service.”

Commissioner Stokes: “It’s like the bridge.”

[Laughter]

Paul Yatcko: “We’ve got \$50,000 in there for a miscellaneous unspecified capital in case something comes up and we got \$66,000 in there for other small items like a leak correlation system that will help us locate leaks more precisely, there’s about \$15,000 in there for IT capital, there is some money in there for confined space entry equipment, office furniture there is a couple of thousand bucks in, so that’s kind of the nits and gnats.”

Commissioner Geake: “I have a question. Through the chair? I have a lot of negativity about our website that we’ve got now. If you look at anybody else in the city, the First Taxing District, the Third, the Fourth I mean it’s just fabulous, it draws people in. Ours throws them away. I mean it is bad, but for \$25,000 it’s incredible.”

Pat Yatcko: “Actually there is \$50,000 in the budget only \$25,000...”

Commissioner Geake: “Ok, \$50,000 is just like, I mean, it’s so unbelievable because I know of someone who personally did it for \$500 and had it done fabulous so the fact that they are getting you that much money it should gold plated.”

Paul Yatcko: “We haven’t hired anybody to do anything yet. All we have done is put money in the budget not knowing what it’s going to cost us because we haven’t even specified it yet.”

Commissioner Geake: “Ok, I thought you ok...”

Paul Yatcko: “I mean, we are going to want to do some things without its notification and public noticing on there that we never done before. Frankly, I don’t know what it’s going to cost.”

Commissioner Geake: “Is there someone that is going to be making a decision that we can, if we have suggestions, we can direct them to that person in particular?”

Paul Yatcko: “I can assure you that we will get your input.”

Commissioner Geake: “Ok. Whether you like it or not huh.”

[Laughter]

Paul Yatcko: “Well, I don’t know anything about website design, so it’s really easy for me to ask for help.”

Commissioner Geake: “See, my husband and I used to sell websites, so of course when I hear that I’m like, oh my gosh!”

Paul Yatcko: “So in a nut shell, that’s the water capital budget, we have funds that are already included in the OM&A that you’ve already seen. They are buried in those income statements that you saw. There’s money in there for certain door replacements, the

hatches at the Steven's Hill tank were found wanting by the DEEP and they are insisting that we replace them. As I mentioned earlier, we have got to repair the fluoride tank and we also got to do another round of granular activated carbon filter replacement. All those things total to about \$140,000 and they are in the budget that you have seen already. Additional questions on the water budget? Alright, let's talk about electricity. And we will turn to page 10. In the top portion, the revenue from electric sales amount to about \$16 million up about \$300,000. There are modest increases in the small and mid-sized customer classes that's due to budgeting for the PPA increase, the Purchase Power Adjustment that you all approved last year, but didn't make it in time for the budget and sales are again assumed essentially flat, no significant growth during this period. Those modest increases are partially offset by continuing weakness in large commercial. Large businesses continue to get more and more efficient as a way of making them more and more profitable. There is significant increases in other revenue. Interest income is at \$12,000, that's up over \$8,000, based on Kevin's analysis of our recent history and we are booking an amount for miscellaneous non-operating income of \$766,000. That is the contribution in aid of construction that we are assuming from that large development on West Avenue and you'll see later on when we talk about capital expenditures, there's an exact offset to that in spending for capital. So, total revenue is \$17.1 million and that's up over \$1 million essentially made up of catching up on the purchase power adjustment from last year and the contribution in aid of construction. So, continuing on page 10 down on the expense section, purchased energy is virtually unchanged. We are not going propose at this point in time that we change the amount that we paid CMEEC on a per kilowatt hour basis and with sales flat that arithmetic works out so that revenues are flat. Transmission and distribution O&M is \$1.23 million, a reduction of \$246,000, that's lower labor costs because we decided not to fill the mechanics position when he retired and it's also based on the analysis of history, not quite as much overtime in there, in this budget as we've had in prior budgets and we also reduced the tree trimming expense. And I'm on the wrong slide. Customer account expenses of \$579,000, that's up a little over \$80,000 again due to credit card fees, increased allowances for uncollectables again based on our analysis of recent history and those are partially offset by lower labor allocations. A&G costs are \$2.8 million, an increase of \$110,000. There were numbers of puts and takes that make that happen. Increased OPEB, which is as we said heretofore had not been budgeted. I put some amounts in there for consulting, unspecified miscellaneous consulting not knowing what we might need essentially a contingency amount, increases in benefits, increases in safety contracting, service contracts on various equipment including IT equipment and some money in there for repairs to the broken down line garage. There are lower labor allocations that tend to offset this, we reduced legal costs in electric because we are not anticipating any significant electric related litigation and lower insurance costs. So the total operating expenses for electric are \$15 million down about \$38,000 or 3/10 of a percent. So for all practical purposes operating expenses are flat. Income, less expenses, are \$1.8 million reflecting the increase in revenue of about \$1.1 million offset by higher capital expenditures, we'll talk about the capital expenditures of \$1.5 million on the next slide. The change in the electric reserve fund is \$463,000 downward, but the closing balance in the electric reserve fund is a very healthy \$11.8 million."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "So, Paul we should see a big bump up in the beginning, in the 2018 budget of revenues, once the mall goes on line correct?"

Paul Yatcko: "My understanding is that they are continuing to target October, 2018 for their grand opening. They basically want to get opened in time for the holiday season, a bump in shopping and I would expect in that budget you will see a jump in revenue. There will also be some capex in that budget too that we are going to have to spend."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yeah, but for the most part we, you know other than the purchase power, all of our other costs should stay flat and that should increase our margin. Aren't we are talking about a \$4 to \$5 million increase in revenues on the electric side just from the mall?"

Paul Yatcko: "You know I'm sorry David, I don't know that number. We had a meeting with the GGP people back in December and they basically told us that all the information that they had provided us about energy consumption they were rethinking and..."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Ok."

Paul Yatcko: "They were basically going to try to cut the energy foot print in half from the original stuff that they gave us."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Alright, oh, that's too bad, sort of."

Paul Yatcko: "Yeah, in order to do that they are going to have to spend a whole lot of more money."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yeah."

Paul Yatcko: "You know, they are talking some very big numbers, they are talking about close loop heating recovery systems, I mean it's amazing what they are talking about."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yeah."

Paul Yatcko: "The whole place is going to be on LED lighting and they are going to put, believe it or not, they are going to put the whole parking lot on dimmers so on off hours when there are no cars in there they are going to be able to dim the lighting and they are also talking about doing internal billing for utility services to make their tenants a little bit more sensitive to the amount of energy they use."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "That's a good idea."

Paul Yatcko: "So, I don't know if they're going to end up there, but that's what they were talking about when they were here in December."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Well, we should see a pretty significant increase with a couple of million dollars I would think."

Paul Yatcko: "Oh, I would think; but film at 11."

[Laughter]

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yeah, alright."

Paul Yatcko: "Ok, last item is the capex on electric. It's estimated a little over \$1.5 million and again there is \$767,000 in there for transformers and switch gears for that new commercial customer. We are going to try to replace a line truck, truck number 26 is beat and spends too much time in the shop; we will do that for \$228,000. \$75,000 is in the budget for continuing meter replacements, the annual appropriations for whole replacements and transformers are \$94,000 and \$80,000, respectively. There are some improvements we want to make to the new substation. We want to put HVAC in the switch house, we want to put a storage shed on site for the storage of equipment and I believe there some SCADA funds in there as well for \$34,000. We're doing some overhead switch replacement, replacing some of our old night switches for \$33,000. There is an electric share of the website, there is also electric share of the meter vehicle replacement, miscellaneous...I'm sorry go ahead."

Commissioner Stokes: "What's SCADA?"

Paul Yatcko: "System Control and Data Acquisition. It's basically telemetry and some switching."

Commissioner Stokes: "Got it."

Paul Yatcko: "It allows us to monitor conditions in the station on a lap top screen."

Commissioner Stokes: "Got it."

Paul Yatcko: "We're doing some of that work right now under the current budget. We hope to have three computers hooked up to the SCADA before the end of this fiscal year and that's just for a little more work. Miscellaneous Capital that's for things that we can't foresee, it's essentially the contingency item of \$150,000 and some other small items totaling about \$17,000 that are in the budget. So, that's what we have in there for electric capital. That would look like \$750,000 if the cost for that commercial development weren't in there, which is a little bit more typical for the electric business. And finally we have \$40,000 in extraordinary maintenance. We've started a complete system wide pole survey in this fiscal year, we have to put about \$40,000 in next fiscal year to complete all the poles in the system."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "And what does that do, just surveying their condition?"

Paul Yatcko: "Yes its condition assessment, so we basically know how to budget the pole replacement on a go forward basis."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Good."

Paul Yatcko: "And unfortunately there's only one company left that's doing this in Connecticut. They either bought up all their competition or they drove them out of business, so you don't have much leverage with them. So, that in summary is the budget, Kevin and I are here to take questions that you got beyond this."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "Any questions from the floor?"

Paul Yatcko: "Kevin is there anything else you'll like to add?"

Kevin Barber: "No, nothing, I think you covered it all."

Commissioner Dumas: "Yes, this on page 4, I'm just looking at this. What is the Monroe Street Parking?"

Paul Yatcko: "If I recall correctly they raised the road beds on that one did they not?"

Kevin Barber: "It's the same project right out here where they redid Monroe Street."

Commissioner Wooten-Dumas: "Right before...under the railroad bridge?"

Kevin Barber: "Under the bridge, correct, so that is just the fact that the project was completed a while ago and if finally made it through the State auditing process. So it's almost complete."

Paul Yatcko: "We are still waiting for the payments and then we could close that project."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I think they have run out of money."

[Laughter]

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "So no other questions, we need to adopt the budget?"

Paul Yatcko: "Well it's still a draft budget and we're still doing some fine tuning to it. I believe the next time you will consider it is at the March Meeting and at that meeting you have to, correct me if I'm wrong Kevin, at that meeting you have to adopt it and it would go to the electors."

Kevin Barber: "That's correct."

Paul Yatcko: "I would not recommend that you adopt this budget."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "So no action."

Paul Yatcko: "Because again there are still a few moving parts, but not many. Again you got input for me on budgeting for legal costs for the Ryan Park situation, you need to

reach out to me on that. If there is a number that I am really uncomfortable with in the budget it's that one because you never know where the litigation is going to go."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "It could be anybody's guess. I think that, I mean ideally you know I think we all thinking it's going to be resolved. That's not to say we wouldn't want to proactively file some of our own law suits for the trouble this has caused, but I wouldn't know how to...not sure really how to estimate that beyond what we are already spending."

Paul Yatcko: "All I know is that our attorneys are billing us in five minutes increments."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Yeah, I am sure."

[Laughter]

Kevin Barber: "And, if I could interject, that our schedule is to provide the commission with the...I guess the final draft budget on Friday the 26th. So, if you have comments, I suggest getting them in to Paul fairly early so we can get them incorporated into the budget."

Commissioner Stokes: "Before the 26th you said?"

Kevin Barber: "We will be distributing the next version of the budget on the 26th."

Commissioner Stokes: "Ok."

Kevin Barber: "So it would have to be provided to us before that date."

Paul Yatcko: "Ideally, if you can get something to us, if you got anything in the next seven days that would help us a lot."

Commissioner Westmoreland: "Alright it looks good to me."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "I'm sorry?"

Commissioner Westmoreland: "I said it looks good to me."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "It looks good to you, ok. It looks to everyone here since everyone was pretty quiet about it, so we need to move on since there is no action on the budget right now. And the next item on the agenda is to adjourn. A motion?"

Commissioner Mann: "I make a motion."

Commissioner Geake: "I second it."

Commissioner Borges-Lopez: "All in favor, opposed, abstentions?"

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Attest:

Lisa G. Roland
District Clerk