

TOWN OF SOUTHLINGTON
SENIOR PROPERTY TAX RELIEF COMMITTEE
JUNE 19, 2006
7:00 - Town Hall Council Chambers
75 Main Street
Southington, CT

Chairman DAVID ZONI, called the meeting to order at 7:03 o'clock, p.m., with the following in attendance:

Christopher Palmieri, Dolores Longo, Josephine Therriault, Robert Verderame and Leonard Marcheselle*

Also present: Mark Sciota, Town Attorney
Herb Braasch, Assessor

Ex-Officio: John Barry, Chairman Town Council

Absent: Mary Ellen D'Angelo
Peg Rancourt

A quorum was determined.

(*Arrived with meeting in progress.)

DAVID ZONI, Chairman presiding:

II. Approval of May 15th, 2006 Minutes

Mrs. Longo made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Palmieri seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

III. Review of proposed Tax Freeze Program

The Chair indicated that we came to a general consensus at the last meeting that that's the way we wanted to pursue this as far as giving some real tax relief.

Herb and I spent a little time together and we've come up --- you all have this in your packet --- the tax freeze program information. We've selected four different levels of qualification for income and Herb has suggested different levels of participation based on his knowledge of this type of program.

I'll let Herb explain what we did, where we are and some of these charts and then we can talk about them.

Mr. Braasch said he had Richard Lopatosky run from the Department of Motor Vehicles Grand List wherein birthdays are entered how many individuals, first of that were born 1935 and prior. Of that there are 3623 motor vehicle registrations with the birth date prior to 1935. There may be some duplication because there may be multiple registrations. The figures presume each individual would be a participant.

Explained the numbers for the State level, \$33,900 income would indicate that 725 taxpayers or individuals would qualify.

(Mr. Marcheselle entered the room)

The average residential assessment for the revaluation of 2005 is \$185,302. That would give us an assessment of \$134,343.00. The estimated mill rate change based on an approximate 4.5 increase would be from the set mill rate of 21.4 mills for this year to an increase of 22.36 mills.

The excess of the frozen amount would be \$129,373.00. That would require a .03 portion of a mill to offset the redistribution of the revenue from the over 70's to the rest of the community.

Continued explaining the numbers on the Chart through the years to the year 2010. In that year, it would require .18 of a mill to compensate for that distribution of the burden. That amounts to a sum of \$707,763.00.

Carrying this onward, we are looking at an estimated 25 percent or 30 percent participation all with the income guideline at 33,900 for the individual or household.

Discussion on the estimated percentage numbers.

Homeowners, who think they might qualify, would have to apply each year.

Mr. Verderame pointed out you have to figure in the homeowners at Spring Lake Village and the mobile home areas in Town. Mr. Braasch indicated this would include those because it is taken from the motor vehicle registration.

Discussion.

Mr. Braasch noted that going through the packet, you'll notice the income level is increased from 33.9 to, as requested, a 40,000 level, a 45,000 level and a 50,000 level. One can assume and I did with Dave's concurrence, the larger the income the greater the participation would be.

- 40,000 approximate 35% or about 1268 individuals
- 45,000 approximate 45% or about 1630 individuals
- 50,000 approximately 1992 individuals

These would have to come in each year to prove their status as having the taxes frozen.

On the last page, you are looking at a redistribution of about \$355,000, which would increase to almost 2 million at the end of those five years for that wide of participation. It would require a half a mill to offset that redistribution.

Every five years we have a revaluation. Assuming that assessments will change, I wouldn't anticipate them changing as drastically as they did in the past five years because the market has slowed down and interest rates have changed, so I would say we could look at perhaps a 2 or 2.5 percent increase in value over the next five years each year instead of the ten to twelve we experienced from 2001 to 2005.

Nevertheless, the mill rate would change and we would start the process all over. The taxes these individuals would pay would still be maintained at a specific level from whenever they signed up.

Attorney Sciota commented he had a large concern at the 50,000 and a lesser concern for the 45. Certainly, if you take the 50 and if the participation is anywhere close or over these numbers, the program could be voided by the State and we'll really be in trouble. The 50 bothers me.

The 45 also comes close. So, if you go to this percentage number of participation, you could get close to those numbers. I wouldn't want the program voided. So, if we start off with a number that's high, that concerns me only because we don't know how many people are going to be in this program. This program would provide a lot of benefit, so I think you'll get a lot more people.

The big problem I have with these is the legal problem. Once we get close to that number, the State could technically void our whole program and that would be anarchy. That would be crazy trying to figure that out once they voided it.

Mr. Braasch explained that this additional program will mean that his office will need to have additional staff to complete the work on schedule.

Extensive discussion comparing the numbers Mr. Braasch provided.

Mr. Marcheselle asked Attorney Sciota to elaborate on his recommendation.

Attorney Sciota said 50,000 is scary because I think the program might go over the State guidelines and we're all going to be in trouble. And, 45 comes close to that and that bothers me.

The 33.9 and the 40,000, I think both of those are safe under the 10 percent guidelines. That's fine with me. I just don't know what the number of participation is going to be in there. I don't think there is going to be a massive difference between 33.9 and 40,000. That's a decision this Board needs to make to recommend to the next level.

Mr. Verderame pointed out the State recommendation is 33.9 for married and 27,000 for singles. I can't see why we can't go into a first year and use that number.

We're looking at:

Married Single Age

33,900 27,000 70

You are going to get that thousand people in the first year. Maybe off by one year. I would take the second page, on the 33.9 and start looking at the percentage of participation, 25 percent, on up. This is a higher number in the first year.

Discussion.

Mr. Verderame agreed we should start out low.

Mr. Palmieri agreed because right now this is real relief that is not available for anyone. We start there, if we don't get as many as we're thinking, we can change it the following year.

Discussion of whether the 33,900 was too low.

Mr. Marcheselle asked the Chair the charge of this committee. Chairman Zoni responded: Our charge is to bring tax relief to seniors presumably on the lower end of the economic scale, people that actually need real relief. Property tax relief.

Mr. Marcheselle asked: You don't think people making \$40,000 a year need relief?

Discussion.

Ms. Longo liked the \$40,000 figure. It also doesn't put the whole program in jeopardy, either.

Ms. Therriault indicated last time she felt the 33.9 was too low and in the back of my mind, I had the figure 40,000. I still feel that way.

Discussion of how the 33,900 was arrived by the State. Income under the program is any income that comes into the household, including tax-exempt interest, annuities, pensions, social security, IRAs. CDs. The only thing not part of it is State grants to grandparents looking after grandchildren. SSI or worker's compensation is not included, either.

Discussion.

Mr. Verderame said the 40,000 doesn't bother him, but going to 50,000, 60,000 -- I mean, we're covering the seniors who I love and we have to cover everybody else whose going to be paying for it. We have to be thinking of them, too.

Discussion.

Mr. Marcheselle pointed out some seniors at 70 will be paying for some of this and not only younger people.

Discussion of the federal poverty level figures.

Mr. Braasch pointed out that the State guideline at 33,900 is adjusted based on the cost of living adjustment each year. We get a memo from the Office of Policy and Management. So, it would go up by the cost of living rate each year. At some point our program could come up to the 40,000 level at 2 percent increments over a period of years.

Mr. Verderame offered, in his experience, the figures he sees seniors coming in with for the renters program, for example. He again stated he had no problem with the 40,000 but if we start going over that, I have a problem.

Chairman John Barry asked: If the Town were to enact a program at a 40,000 income level, there will be people over 70 that might have to pick up a little extra. How is that perceived? Is it a problem for members of AARP? I would hate to enact a program that would hurt more people than it helps.

Mr. Marcheselle responded, I don't know that it is going to hurt more people, but it is going to hurt some people. Somebody has to pay for this.

Chairman John Barry asked Mr. Braasch, based on the 40,000, the first year; it would be a .06 mill rate increase. If you calculations are correct, can you tell what would the impact to the rest of the taxpaying citizens? Mr. Braasch said the excess amount beyond the frozen would amount to about a \$12 increase per taxpayer on an \$185,300.00 assessment.

Discussion.

Chairman John Barry offered that he believed people would be in favor

of paying a little amount more to help a senior stay in their house so they don't have to worry about an increase the next year. Now they know the taxes are not going to go up and that's one less worry they have and they're able to stay in their house.

Ms. Therriault stated that would be true especially if people understand the tax consequences of putting people in nursing homes. We all pay much more than \$12 a year to keep many, many people in nursing homes. As long as we keep people in their own homes and supporting themselves to a level that doesn't require a lot of outside help, that will save us all money.

And, AARP members want to help people who need help and they don't want to shift burdens from people who don't need help to people who probably need it more than some. We want to help those in need, but every elderly person is not in need. We have to look at income levels.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota asked the differential between married and single if you have 40,000 for married. A \$5,000 differential might be something to look at rather than using the same ratio the State uses.

Discussion.

Married: \$40,000

Single: 35,000

IV. Public Input

SANDRA FELD: What year was the current rate that the State allows set? Attorney Sciota noted it goes up every year by the cost of living increase.

Discussion.

The other question, I know you're worried about going as high as 50,000; we had some information from some Towns in Connecticut, like Wilton. What was that amount, do you remember?

Attorney Sciota said, my problem wasn't that. My problem was us getting to 10 percent. That's the problem. The State only allows us to go to 10 percent. If it gets to 10 percent based upon the numbers in front of me, the whole program gets thrown out by the State of Connecticut. So, if we did that, the whole program is shot and we have to somehow try and bring it all back again and that's a problem.

Discussion.

Chairman Zoni noted the Wilton is only a deferral of a percentage of the tax. It's not truly what we're doing. This is a tax freeze.

Ms. Feld urged the committee to start higher than the current 33,900.

I'll be one of the people who will be paying that because I am not in that bracket. Even though my husband is over 70, we're not in that ballpark, happily. But I don't think 33.9 is a livable number to start with.

Please start a little higher.

CARMELIA KIMMELL: 1067 Woodruff Street. I agree with Sandra's comment.

And, as to the comment by the lady from AARP, we don't realize the amount of people who will be going on Title IXX soon because of the baby boomers. They're coming the age of retirement. Explained.

That means an increase in your State taxes which of course and the extra \$12 a year is more acceptable than having your State taxes increase. This is just one more point I'd like to make.

LOU PUGLIELLI: Candlewood Lane. I just have a few comments here listening to some of the figures you're throwing around. I also believe the figure is too low, but that figure is going to be arbitrary.

You're saying anybody 70 would fall under this program, whatever the numbers turn out to be. I've lived in Town over 30 years. Somebody moves to Town and has been here 1 or 2 years, happens to be over 70, they would get the break and I would not. Is that correct?

Attorney Sciota agreed saying they'd have to live here one-year prior.

Mr. Puglielli asked, why are you penalizing me because I'm not 70, but I've lived here over 30 years or 35 or 40 years. That's just not fair.

Discussion.

You say 40,000 is such a high number and that's absolutely not true. When you work, it sounds like a high number. But to us retirees, I get no cost of living for my retirement fund.

Discussion.

What if the husband is over 70, he falls into the category, in the next year he dies, his wife is 10 years younger than him, does she still get the freeze? Attorney Sciota said if she is a qualified widower of a 70 year old, she does, as long as she meets the income requirements.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota clarified that when the program begins, he has got to be 70 and she's got to be at least 62.

(End of Tape #1, Side A)
(Beginning of Tape #1, Side B)

Discussion continued.

Chairman Zoni added it's the State Statute. We're trying to take advantage of the State Statute. We have to follow the State guidelines. All taxation follows State Statute.

I've been paying taxes here 30 years and I get nothing. I don't understand that.

Chairman Zoni said it is really not a reward for people who have been paying taxes to the Town of Southington. It's to give relief to those who can't pay that are over 70 years old.

Mr. Puglielli said it is penalizing the person just because they're not 70.
Discussion.

Mr. Puglielli mentioned what other States are doing. For example, you can't go higher than five percent of your tax bill.
Discussion.

Down the road, this is going to impact the old-timers.

That's my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Palmieri brought up Cheshire. They want to amend their ordinance to help those living in Town a long time. Can we restrict it to more than five years living in Southington?

Attorney Sciota said the State Statute calls for the person to live in the municipalities one year. There are Towns who have put a greater number in. Legal opinions have been written saying although there's never been a case on this, they don't recommend any municipality going more than what the State allow which is the one-year. Can you do it? Yes. But the Attorney General's Office and CCM advise all Towns not to do it because the enabling legislation calls for them being one year prior to being eligible.
Discussion.

LARRY DEPAOLO: Blatchley Avenue. Clarified the mill rate increase numbers with Mr. Braasch.

Is there any way of you knowing how many people make 40,000 in this Town now? Mr. Braasch responded: None whatsoever.

Mr. Braasch clarified how he got his estimate.

Mr. DePaolo said that anybody who qualifies is going to participate because they'd be foolish not to.

Mr. Braasch agreed indicating that the unknown number is how many are going to qualify.

Mr. DePaolo said: How can you base your program on an unknown as great as that? Mr. Braasch said you have to make some kind of an estimated projection.

Discussion.

Mr. DePaolo said it is important to start at the low number because you have no way of knowing how many will qualify.

I know its State mandated, is there anyway that this Town could freeze the people's taxes and lien their property. Attorney Sciota said that is an option with this program, but up to this point, the sentiment was not to do that.

Discussion.

I don't see why we can't consider getting that money back later on after the person is gone. I'm in favor of that. That is a way where the Town would not lose anything. You're going to get 100 percent participation.

Chairman Zoni said in prior meetings we had discussed liening the property and the majority of people on the committee felt that no one would apply for the program if there were a lien put on a property. It would make the program worthless.

Mr. DePaolo said if there is a need, the people will apply.

Discussion.

Mr. Palmieri said the committee has evolved from looking at some kind of lien on the property to some type of real relief for the people that qualify at these levels. We decided that would not be a program we would like to look at --- if there's a lien, people won't want to apply for that of program.

Discussion.

Discussion of how much taxes are going up July 1st.

Discussion of how this tax freeze relief would work if a reverse mortgage were applied for. Attorney Sciota explained a reverse

mortgage requires the taxes to be paid through the bank so it would have no effect.

(Inaudible Name): I'm laughing when I hear this gentleman talking about 80 or 90 dollars. My house went up from 140,000 to 250,000. Assessment. I figured out it comes close to \$900 a year.

Where do you come from with \$80? I wish mine was \$80.

That's all I've got to say.

CARMELIA KIMMELL: 1067 Woodruff Street. I just want to point out that the mill rate for the 40,000-income level would only increase for the average home assessed at 189,000, of \$12. Double that, \$24 a year.

I wish this committee would consider making the minimum \$45,000 to begin with. How much increase in the mill rate would that be?
Discussion.

Mr. Braasch said it was \$12 for the first year and for each year it would increase proportionately. Explained.

Ms.Kimmell repeated: Your taxes will go up here or they'll go up on your State level. And, the State will be giving you less and less in return. So, I really highly recommend that we do it on the local level, which is less painful than doing on the State level. Very less painful.

Will veteran's benefits be included in income qualifications?
Attorney Sciota responded this doesn't change anything you normally use for the State program. Mr. Braasch said it would be the same. Veteran's pensions do count against the income.

If you're at the 2,000 benefit level, that would still remain the same. It wouldn't count.

Attorney Sciota pointed out the programs are not mutually exclusive. Just because you get this off your taxes, it's not income as based upon the guidelines.
Discussion.

Ms. Kimmell wanted to know why we couldn't have the same income for the Town freeze level as we do for the veteran's income level. Mr. Braasch said that would be determined.

Chairman Zoni again pointed out the concern is we don't really know how many people will apply for the program and we do have a limitation on how much we can shift the taxes. We have to be careful.

If we start off at a more modest level, if we don't get a lot of participation, the Council could then review it periodically and say we want to increase the level so that we'd get more participation and help more people.

Discussion.

Please consider a more reasonable amount.

SANDRA FELD: You need to be commended for the job you're doing. It's fabulous. We always new it wasn't unconstitutional.

Being a half a pie person, I'm going to suggest that the difference between -- let's 33.9 34 and the difference between 34 and 40 is 6 - let's split the difference and start at 37.

Thank you.

Chairman Zoni asked the procedure now.

Attorney Sciota it would be written up as an actual Town Ordinance. You could recommend several things to the Council for their final decision:

- Put a cost of living rider in there, which is what the State does for theirs.

- The program doesn't begin until October 1, 2006.

So, our public hearing on this won't be until after October 1, 2006 because the law doesn't come into effect until after October 1, 2006.

- A future Council could look at it, because it's a regular Ordinance at that point. Under the modification of the Ordinance, they would send it back to the Board of Finance for them to review any kind of modification as it impacts the budget.

Your recommendation technically is to the Board of Finance. They look at it and they would do a financial impact. They simply then send their financial impact to the Town Council along with your report and the Council then chooses to schedule a public hearing on this, or not. It's up to the Council at that point.

Discussion that assets have no bearing on this program. It's just your actual adjusted gross income figure.

V. Discussion of recommendation to Town Council/BOF

And

VI. Action on Tax Freeze Proposal

Attorney Sciota the procedure now is that you or your representative prepares a presentation to the Board of Finance. The Board of Finance then takes your numbers: for example:

We would like a program where there is a tax freeze for everybody above the age of 70 years old or someone who is 70 and is married to a spouse who is at least 62 years old. We want a number of "X" if you're a married couple and a number of "Y" if you're single.

We estimate to you, Board of Finance, to our Assessor's Office that "X" number of people are going to be involved in this program.

We would like you to consider that by working with Emilia in the Finance Department. Have whatever kind of meeting they want to have, and then issue a financial recommendation to the Town Council.

At that point, their presentation and your presentation would be given to the Town Council and the Council then chooses whether they wish to go forward with a public hearing to pass an Ordinance.

The public hearing cannot happen until after October 1, 2006.

I would write the Ordinance as soon as the Council says they want to go forward with it. I would draft a proposed Ordinance, send it back to the Council, we'd go back and forth on it, and then once they're happy with it, then we could schedule a hearing after October 1, 2006.

Chairman Zoni opened the floor to discussion.

Mr. Palmieri liked Ms. Feld's suggestion of splitting the difference and going with \$37,000. It's just the unknown factor. We really don't know. And, there is no way of knowing. Go kind of in the middle between the two and then after a year see what impact this has. We're still going higher than this and slightly lower than this. We see the impact and then we know what to do for the following year.

Mr. Marcheselle pointed out you are going to get 100 percent participation. If they are eligible, they will all come forward to participate. They have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

I don't like 37,000. I like 40,000. I think it's a fair number. It won't hurt the Town that much. The right number is 40,000 I think for us to start with. We don't have to compromise. It's \$12 a year.

Ms. Therriault agreed she liked the \$40,000 number as well. Something tells me that the numbers who will qualify are probably not going to be nearly 50 percent of the people in that age category. I don't think the numbers are going to be outrageous as far as people who will qualify. I think making 40,000 a year and trying to hold on to a house and all the other things that go along with living independently, it's not a very high income. I'd like to see it start at 40, if it's possible.

Ms. Longo said she would like it 37 for married household.

Mr. Verderame said he thought there would be a lot. It's going to be tough to try to stop or it or what happens if we don't put somebody on it, we go over the amount 10 percent. I like what Sandy said, going to 37-something. A lot easier to start out as a smaller number and next year is next year and we gradually put it up. Something's telling me there's going to be a lot. I'm for going with a lower figure than 40.

Chairman Zoni said it looks like a split 50/50 here.

Chairman Barry added said it's not really much of a difference in terms of the impact. I think it's about participation levels.

Chairman Zoni agreed we really don't know what the participation is going to be. He wanted to lean towards 40,000 himself only because I think it will help more people. I don't think we really run the risk of coming near the ten percent.

Mr. Palmieri said he believed strongly in offering this program. I really push this. What bothers me is the unknown. We have no way of knowing how it affects everyone else. If I had facts in front of me -- we don't know any of that. That's why I suggest a compromise between the two for a year. We can then review it and see what impact it has when we have hard facts.

Chairman Zoni pointed out that one of the other Statutes we did talk about mentioned relieving people when their taxes exceeded 8 percent of their income. The State really has thought about this a little bit, thinking that 8 percent --- we're already at 10 percent at the 40,000 level. The Chair indicated he liked the 40,000 number and would like to go forward with that.

Mr. Marcheselle made a motion that the committee participate in this program and with the first year ---

(End of Tape #1, Side B)

(Beginning of Tape #2, Side A)

--- a tax freeze program at 40,000-income level for the married level.

Ms. Therriault seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Palmieri: Based on what I mentioned earlier with the information, I would just feel more comfortable with a slightly smaller figure. Without facts in front of us, no.

Mr. Verderame: No

Ms. Therriault: Yes

Mr. Marcheselle: Yes

Ms. Longo: No

Mr. Zoni: Yes

Tied: 3 to 3

Mr. Palmieri said again, looking between 33.9 and 40,000, we asked for public input and we heard a suggestion to split the difference between the two. We've got such a great program here and that's the amount that is holding us up. It is a compromise between the two as it is.

I'd like to make a motion to approve the tax freeze program at \$37,000 income level for married couples.

Ms. Longo seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Palmieri: Yes

Mr. Verderame: Yes

Ms. Therriault: Yes

Mr. Marcheselle: No

Ms. Longo: Yes

Mr. Zoni: No

Motion passed 4 to 2. Make the recommendation of \$37,000.

Attorney Sciota noted we need a motion for singles now.

Ms. Longo made a motion for \$35,000.

Mr. Verderame seconded for discussion.

Mr. Verderame suggested that there are a lot more single at age 70 and they're not going to be making that much. Since, we have 37,000, I think 32 would be fine.

Ms. Longo said she would modify her motion to 32,000. Mr. Verderame modified his second to 32,000.

Mr. Marcheselle said he was disappointed in the Board in that we are not helping people at all. We're worried more about the Town.
Discussion.

Ms. Longo said we are concerned about both, the people and the Town.
Discussion.

Mr. Verderame commented he is looking at the Town as a whole and at seniors. And, without positive figures it's kind of tough to really look at this.
Discussion.

Mr. Palmieri said it is very clear we do care about seniors; otherwise this committee wouldn't have been formed. We have nothing currently. We just enacted a program to start to help people. Let's see some hard facts of how it does help the people and affect the Town. Then if it's affordable, then we modify that plan and make it even more.

It's a lot easier to start it and then raise it then to start it high and lower as it goes on realizing we're in over our head here. I think we are trying to balance the needs of the Town with the need of the seniors. I think that's why we're where we're at.

From the beginning we discussed a 5,000 differential between married and single which is why that motion was modified to 32,000.

Chairman Zoni addressed the panel: We are moving into uncharted territory here. This is a new program. These are new concepts that have never been in place in Southington. We're offering real tax relief. The State Statute allows us to do it and we're taking advantage of it. Maybe some of us were willing to go out on a limb, go out a little farther, but in reality, we do not know the impact of even the 37,000.

So, to say we don't care about the seniors is absolutely not true. We're here because we do care about the seniors. We're here because we want to enact something where nothing existed. We will do that tonight.

We need to vote on the motion.

Motion is for single at \$32,000.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Palmieri: Yes
Mr. Verderame: Yes

Ms. Therriault: Yes
Mr. Marcheselle: Pass
Ms. Longo: Yes
Mr. Zoni: Yes

Mr. Marcheselle: No

Motion passes 5 to 1 with Mr. Marcheselle opposed.

Attorney Sciota indicated one more motion has to be made per the Statute and that is you recommend that the Town does not or does through my office file a lien on the property.

Mr. Palmieri made a motion that we do not file a lien on the property based on these proposals. Mr. Verderame seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Palmieri: Yes
Mr. Verderame: Yes
Ms. Therriault: Yes
Mr. Marcheselle: Yes
Ms. Longo: Yes
Mr. Zoni: Yes

Motion carries.

VIII. Miscellaneous Discussion/Comments

Attorney Sciota noted you have met our qualifications to get this done during the 65-day timeframe. Your next report should be preliminary to the Town Council.

Then at that point with Mr. Braasch and Emilia, prepare a report to present to the Board of Finance probably at their September meeting.

The Board of Finance cannot make modifications --- they can only recommend. The Town Council can change it any way they want. Or not enact it altogether. They can change the numbers.

The Board of Finance cannot reject it. They can give a negative recommendation. They give a financial recommendation, one way or the other, to the Town Council.

Attorney Sciota noted that per the Statute this is all the work you have to do on this right now.

When you give your recommendations or your presentations to future Boards, (Board of Finance and Town Council) most of you should try

and make those to answer any questions that might come up.

Chairman Zoni said it has been a pleasure working with everybody on the committee and I think we've really made some good progress. And, I hope that the seniors that are here tonight are happy.

(Applause)

And, I'm sure things will progress from here in a positive way.

IX. Adjournment

(Upon a motion made, seconded and passed unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 8:53 o'clock, p.m.)

David Zoni, Chairman
Senior Property Tax Relief Committee