

*Request - Tape Bd of Ed meetings -*

February 25, 2013

To: Town Council

From: Betty Wassmundt

I'd like to address the Alan request for reimbursement. I'm interested to see what you decide. My concern is that there was never a signed agreement with the Alans for the purchase of their property. With no signed agreement, there is no legal commitment by either party. The Alans have no claim to any expense money. Worse, **you** had no claim to their property. What would you have done if you voted to send this two school project to referendum and then the potential seller said, I don't want to sell or, I want much more money? With no signed agreement that could have happened. How many lawyers do we have sitting here? How could you do this? Doesn't the public have a right to expect this town to be operated in a businesslike manner? The other information in this packet, about this project, that concerns me is the deficit of \$127,000. Why do you do a budget at all? It seems that town management is free to say, "Hey, I spent \$127,000 more than I had so you'll have to fund it." I see repeated financial records of "transfers of funds". I'm led to wonder: first, does any town department adhere to the annual budget and second, how much extra money does town management have lying around to cover all these overages and, why?

Next I'd like to address the Governor's proposal to eliminate the tax on vehicles. At a recent meeting, I listened to a citizen explain that the tax would go from the vehicle to the house and it would be a wash. That's not true and I hope you all recognize what will really happen. There will be a shifting of tax liability. With some people it'll be a wash. To some, it will be an advantage but many will incur a large tax liability. I have a couple of examples. I'm using management's estimate of revenue loss of approximately \$1.8 million and, I'll generalize that \$1 million is equivalent to 1 mill. Data comes from the Assessor's records.

A council member: House assessment: \$318,290; the increase at 1.8 mills = \$573  
Vehicle assessment: \$17,690; the decrease at 27.16 mills (current mill rate) = \$480  
Council member pays an extra \$93 – not too bad

Citizen who spoke at meeting: House assessment \$303,730; increase at 1.8 mills = \$547  
Vehicle assessment: \$11,350; decrease at 27.16 mills = \$308  
Citizen pays an extra \$239 – that's a little worse; certainly not a wash

Glen Ridge resident: Unit assessment: \$114,660; increase at 1.8 mills = \$207  
No car; doesn't drive anymore  
Glen Ridge resident pays an extra \$207 – I'll bet this resident won't like this.

Lastly I'd like to hand around the photo Mike Sikoski referred to a few meetings ago. It's of a town fire truck parked at a private home on Chaffeeville Road. Mike said it was there for over an hour.