

**REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 22, 2013**

The Wethersfield Town Council held a meeting on Tuesday, January 22, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield.

Present: Councilors Drake, Hurley, Kotkin, Manousos, McAlister, Montinieri, Roberts, Deputy Mayor Console, and Chairperson Hemmann.

Also present: Christine Fortunato, Chairperson, WHS Building Committee, Larry Cannon, President of EnviroMed Service, RaeAnn Palmer, Assistant Town Manager, Jeff Bridges, Town Manager and Dolores G. Sassano, Town Clerk.

Councilor McAlister led the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Councilor Drake moved to **“ADD TO AGENDA A SECOND COUNCIL COMMENTS PRIOR TO PUBLIC COMMENTS”**, seconded by Councilor Hurley.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 8-0-1. Councilor Roberts abstained.

HEARING

An ordinance amending the Code of the Town of Wethersfield, inserting section 14-22, providing for the creation of a Trust in the Capital and Nonrecurring Expense Fund.

George A. Ruhe, 956 Cloverdale Circle, commented that is a good idea, but questioned the term “the funding is for capital improvements and nonrecurring expenses in the Town of Wethersfield”. Mr. Ruhe questioned if that meant an idea to spend \$500,000 on a nonsensical thing and the excuse being “well we weren’t prohibited from doing that”. He stated if that is truly a loophole, my counsel would be to look at it carefully, and if it is, close it.

Robert Young, 20 Coppermill Rd., commented that he would be very cautious of this because your history is not good spending and you spend more than what we have. He questioned if the Pension Fund was part of this in which Mayor Hemmann responded no. Mr. Young commented that we should not get involved in this and stick to business that is visible to the public and not a behind-the-scenes situation and urged the Council to vote no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

As motioned and passed above, Council comments were next presented before the public comment period. Attached is a link providing the council’s statement read by Deputy Mayor Console.



Wilkus-Dris_Jan222
(3).pdf

During Deputy Mayor Console's statement, members of the public voiced their disagreement and Deputy Mayor Console pointed out that he had the floor and did not appreciate the public making comments while he has the floor reading a public statement.

Commissioner Roberts asked Deputy Mayor Console if it is possible to include his remarks verbatim in the minutes or to attach to the minutes.

Deputy Mayor Console responded absolutely.

~~Commissioner~~ **Councilor** Manousos commented that he had something to add to that [comment] and stated that he believes that they said this last time, but what they supported was the will of people. He explained that there were two referendums that supported open space and the house and the lot. Councilor Console said the house and barns were always intended to be sold; and he has spoken to many people that have thought that also. He explained that the only reason we own it is because the sellers would not sell the farmland alone. The house and barns had to come with it. It was purchased with Wethersfield land acquisition fund money, which had no restrictions. So the intent the Council said was always to sell it. He explained that the Wilkus Farm Advisory Committee came after the referendum and that was when this idea came about to lease the land and bundle it with the home for farming use ~~or~~ **for** educational purpose. Mr. Jim Woodworth was very instrumental in getting that part [farming/educational purposes] looked at and they tried. Councilor Manousos explained that the whole purpose was to maintain the open space, but to use the farm for educational purposes and there was a particular person in mind when this was brought up and it was a goat and cheese dairy farmer that was interested in the farmland. He wanted to expand his business and he ended up not being a part of this bid process but that is why that bid went out the way it did several times it was for that. He stated that we made a good faith effort and there wasn't a bid that met that criteria and that's why the house and barns, why the Drisdelle bid was favored. It was the only bid other than the Rouquie bid that left the land as open space it was the will of the people. He explained that in the Ad Hoc Committee Report it actually states that the 138 Street house and barns were specifically purchased using the Wethersfield land acquisition fund and has no restrictions in their use by the town and that's where that started. He stated that they were charged with coming up with options, which they did, they came up with 46 suggested uses for the farmland, not the house and barns, for the farmland. Commissioner Manousos explained that during the public process, the public hearing process, that's when Mr. Woodworth and others had this idea creating a farm for educational purposes and stated that the report from the Ad Hoc Committee from which he read from stated "during the public hearing, there were a lot of requests to keep the land as some sort of farm in order to keep the property as it had been used for as a possible educational use for students."

This wasn't the use the Committee had felt feasible due to the many grant and bond restrictions but felt it was important to pursue it further per the public's request. Commissioner Manousos explained that this was when the State DEP person got involved and said here is a way that you can accomplish this goal and it is to carve out 10 acres under some formula so we could bid it out that way. So the Committee recommendation continued and it says "the Committee felt that whether the 10 acres was leased to a farmer or a possible future athletic field, the removal from the easement restriction would be leave future town councils with some flexibility in the use of the 10 acres." To be clear, the Committee feels that even though the easement was lifted for the 10 acres, it should remain as open space as that was the will of the people. So the bid that was approved is completely consistent with this will of the people. I voted for that, so I know what I voted for and I didn't vote for a bid that their trying to steer it to that actually takes those 10 acres away from the public and gives it to one person for 10 years. He stated that if someone is honestly in favor of keeping it as open space, why we would steer it to a bidder that is already haying the property now. So the property is being hayed now. Councilor Manousos asked the Town Manager if we knew who was haying it now.

Mr. Bridges replied yes, it is several farmers.

Councilor Manousos asked if one of them was Mr. Nowak.

Mr. Bridges replied that he helps once in awhile.

Councilor Manousos stated that we are already haying the property without any incident so why would we want to give it away for 10 years for the exclusive use of one person when the will of the people was to keep it as open space. 46 suggested uses by this Ad Hoc Committee that is made of respectable people in the community, so I think the question for me is why would somebody steer it in that direction if they were truly in favor of open space, they would have favored the Requiem bid because that didn't require the 10 acres and that still would have preserved the barn, the home and the house. So what has been a little more troubling for me, though, is the length that certain councilors will go through to try and steer this bid, but as they have done that, they have mislead the public, misstated facts about the process and they have taken the time to personally assault other sitting councilors, publicly trying to incite them and the public asking for ethics investigations, having it investigated by the police—that is not the kind of behavior we expect from our councilors in town. Mr. Manousos commented that I think we are pretty comfortable seeing that on the National level and the State level, but it is shameful behavior for sitting councilors at this table and Wethersfield doesn't need it. He commented that all while that's going on in the public, privately, the message from these councilors is we want an outcry, but don't file an ethics complaint because that will bring us political problems. Councilor Manousos commented that's not what we need from councilors in this town. In citing people to do something publicly, but privately into their colleagues and their party saying something completely different and what I would like to read is something that is very disturbing that was sent to me from a posting to Wethersfield Democrats and it came from a sitting counselor. Counselor Manousos read some of the posting and passed it out to the public and is part of the

minute's record. Councilor Manousos commented that he believes people deserve an explanation. He commented that he has talked to several people in this room over the last few days and if people come up with the same conclusion after listening to all the fact, I can respect that, but what I don't appreciate is misinformation out to the public, somebody saying publicly and different privately for political or personal gain and it's time to stop being politicians and start being public servants like we were elected to do. Councilor Manousos passed out copies of the post that he just read.

Due to the number of people attending the meeting, Mayor Hemmann limited the time to 3 minutes to allow everyone the opportunity to speak.

Shirley Steinmetz, 375 Brimfield Rd. commented that she has been a resident of Wethersfield for 47 years. Ms. Steinmetz commented that the notice that was sent out was read to everybody was a notice to have people to protect the Wilkus Farm and that it was not a political notice. That was what the notice was for. She explained that she has been a member of the bipartisan Wilkus Farm Committee and we worked very hard to have this referendum passed for open space and stated that she disapprove of the 5 member vote to have the houses on this property. She stated that we always felt as members of the Wilkus Farm Committee that the perfect use of that barn and that house was for a farmer, you had that before you and a farmer would have filled all that, lived in the house, put the roof on the barn and did haying. She asked if they are still interested in putting houses there or are they looking into it?

Councilor Drake responded that we have approved the Drisdelle bid and there is going to be an item on the agenda later on to forward it to Planning and Zoning.

Shirley Steinmetz replied that she strongly disapproves of it and that it is not what the people voted for and that it should be open space and that a farmer complies with that. She commented that she also understands how the people on Goff Rd. area are upset with the blasting, but she believes that you can take care of both items.

Rick Garrey, 35 Harding St., commented that being on the Wilkus Farm Advisory Council, it wasn't quite what Mr. Manousos said and explained that educational purpose was just one of our thoughts, but because we didn't get a goat farmer, the whole deal is off, is not what we suggested as an Advisory Council. He commented that a Wethersfield resident with generations of family history of farming was the high bidder three times and we had a guy willing to do everything that the council stated which was to get a farmer and we got one, but you didn't take him. Mr. Garrey commented that saving the agricultural heritage was the number one goal and you stated it over and over and the citizens stated it over and over and Drisdelle came out of nowhere. If you want to save Goff Rd., save it but don't give up the farm to save that piece of junk rock. Mr. Garrey commented that Drisdelle will get a prime piece of real estate instead of a rock on Goff Rd. and doesn't see how this is a benefit to the town at all. He also stated that as far as the 46 other recommendations, that has nothing to do with the house and barns that was sledding, nature trails, on the other part of the land and when we found out we could separate 10 acres, the only

purpose we did it was to entice the farmer. He stated that we do not win with your proposal and only Drisdelle wins and stated to do not vote for this because it is bad for the town.

Ann Griswold Willard, 72 Oldham Rd., commented that the best use for the Wilkus property house and out buildings is to sell it to a person who will be a steward of the land adjacent to the preserved open space, one who grew up on a farm and a person who has the talent and ability and motivation to repair historic buildings that need restoration and believes that Rick Nowak should be the owner and custodian of the Wilkus Farm and asked the council to reconsider their decision and allow Rick Nowak to purchase the Wilkus property.

Brenda Labella, 34 Deer Ledge Ln., read from the referendum from which everyone voted on which stated that the land must be preserved as open space in perpetuity. She commented that when she asked why the State had to set conditions on the purchase of this land, they said that we trust our Wethersfield elected officials to uphold the mandate of the people as determined by the results of the referendum. She stated that the results of the referendum were 3522 in favor or purchase to 2124 against and stated that if we cannot trust the Town Council to abide by this mandate, who can we trust in today's society.

Peggy Wagner, 203 Clearfield Rd., commented that she finds it shameful that you would vote on a proposal that you discussed for over three months without knowing what this referendum said and that you are elected officials and you should never vote unless you are very sure of what it is all about and this referendum spells it out. Ms. Wagoner commented that she is in favor of keeping the Wilkus Farm totally as open space which is what the referendum stated.

Joe Hickey, 28 Meadowview Dr., commented that the Nowak reuse proposal a far more appropriate reuse option and strongly urged the town council to reconsider its decision.

Hugh Lou Laccavole, 247 Ridge Rd., commented that the Petition which mentions the soccer club was not a soccer club product and the soccer club did not discuss, draft, or approve it. The people who drafted it might have been parents, coaches, players or former players acting as individuals and not as representatives of the organization.

Betty Rosania, 88 Desmond Dr. commented that we have organized referenda; we have given our input and want that land in perpetuity as open space.

Joel Wagner, 203 Clearfield Rd., expressed his support of the Wilkus Farm and stated that Mr. Nowak met five of the open space criteria. He also commented that the Drisdelle proposal if fiscally irresponsible.

Chief T. William Knapp, 171 Collier Rd., commented that he believes that nobody on the council has any ethical violations but did state that there are some morale ethics violations and that the soccer club affiliations and Dave's mother's property backing up to Drisdelles' property should

have been put on the record. He also commented that the electorate is angry and believes that they will have their way ultimately.

Beth Hackett, 507 Brimfield Rd., commented that the driving force behind holding the referendum was the threat of the developer purchasing the land and building houses and stated that she is very disappointed to hear that the Town Council has voted to allow the developer to build six houses on the property and believes that goes against the nature of the referendum and urges the council to reconsider their vote and to do what the citizens voted for them to do.

Mike Cuddigan, 49 Westlook Rd., commented the he believes having a few more soccer fields in the town would be a good thing. He also stated that he had a few minor dealings with the Nowak's in the past, not in the last six or seven years, however the fact that two Councilors McAlister and Manousos had the deciding votes to go ahead with the Drisdelle plan is to my mind a clear violation and stated that it seems like a conflict of interest and feels that those votes should be rescinded with those two councilors abstaining.

Judy Parker, 366 Pine Lane, commented that she has been up nights trying to understand why I am so upset at your decision to award the Wilkus Farm bid to Mr. Drisdelle instead of a local farmer. She stated that she likes Mr. Drisdelle and that he is a fine man and builds lovely high-end houses and has nothing against him. She stated that six of you came on to council following the 2009 referendum and were known to be unhappy with the outcome of that referendum. She offered Kudos to Mayor Hemmann for being honest about that, but respectful enough of the referendum process to accept the vote of the majority decision. She stated that the Wilkus farm house and barns bid went out three times and three times you have not given the bid to a local farmer even when his bid was the best proposal. She commented that the public doesn't know what goes on in executive session, but something doesn't feel right and appears that you are trying to get around the referendum result and that the issue has been clouded in many minds because of the separate Goff Rd. proposal supported by letters from neighbors and a separate soccer club petition. She commented that you have clarified that to some extent, however, each of these presented to council a petition or letter with a list of names. I'm not sure how many but I think less than 100 probably in total. She stated that the town 2009 referendum had over 5,600 people voting and it was won by 3,500 votes and asked isn't there some strength in numbers. She commented the petition is especially troubling to me since a sitting council member actually signed it and it promotes one bid over the others and the use of some Wilkus land by an organization whose President is another sitting council member and added that the petition was received in the midst of council deliberations on the latest bids. She stated that there are people in this room including herself who have sat in their chairs and who would never, never have considered signing a petition or even being associated with a petition or some similar action with such an apparent conflict of interest while negotiating bids and added that this is exactly the kind of action that makes the public distrust our politicians and gives you a bad name and commented that it just doesn't smell right. She stated that the saddest thing is that you have turned a past town-wide bipartisan effort by our residents into what now looks like a partisan issue. She commented that you have been a good council in many respects, especially in trying to control

costs in a difficult climate, but you may have found an issue that will bite you in the back and asked the council to please reconsider their vote.

Susan Grady, 25 Westlook Rd., commented that we the people of Wethersfield have spoken twice on the issue of Wilkus Farm. Through two referenda the people asserted that they want Wilkus to remain open space and do not want it to be developed. She stated that any new construction will be ugly and out of place because it is totally incongruous and unsettling to the peaceful setting and open space the land currently provides and will continue to provide for generations to come. She commented that she hopes that nothing is done in a short-sided manner detrimental to the town against the will of the people.

Rita Owen, 42 Wells Farm Dr., commented that she thinks it is pretty obvious that the intent of the townspeople was to keep that open space without housing development. She commented that the recent Planning Committee for Conservation Development took a telephone survey, had meetings and the results were pretty obvious, something like 52% want more open space and more spending for saving the farms. She then asked one of the five counselors who voted in the affirmative, to bring it back up for a vote tonight and get this over with and just overturn your present outcome.

Paul Gulino, 25 Farmingdale Rd., commented to the public that everyone is saying that the council members took backroom deals and stated that if that is true, he wanted to see the proof of it and commented that he doesn't believe they did. He commented that he believes that they are standing up for what they believe and what is best for their town and their views and their children. It may not always be the way the public likes it or the way I like it, but it's what they like. There are council members, they were voted there, they deserve to vote. He stated that it is our town, but it is theirs as well and to sit here and tell them as town resident's that they are not allowed to vote because they are on the council--read the constitution that's part of what it is. They have a vote, they have a say as do I, as do you. He addressed the council and commented that he applauds them for standing up for what you believe in.

George A. Ruhe, 956 Cloverdale Cr., commented that he has nothing to say and that he couldn't say anything as eloquent as has been said but will give all of his time to Judy Parker so she can read the poem that she was not permitted to read.

Mayor Hemmann asked Judy if she could read the poem at the end during the public comment period so to give people a chance to speak who haven't spoken yet.

Deputy Mayor Console commented to George that he cannot give his time to someone else and stated that if it wasn't for us you wouldn't be able to get a chance to even speak at these meetings.

Joan Biagioni, 217 Goff Rd., commented that she is in favor of the swap and stated that after speaking at a meeting in favor of a swap, she did not get people who were for the farm to try to

work with her so that they could work together and stated that people didn't want to hear her. She commented that she believes the council did what was best for the town and there will be 10 acres of open space and across the street there are quite a few more acres of open space. She stated that it isn't a rock up there on Goff Rd. and commented that outside of her window, she sees the woods, trees and deer and turkeys and it may not be farmland, but it is open space and commented that she is for open space and is really important to them and stated that if they work together, it would be great because they want that as much as you want the farm.

Jim Woodworth, 5 River Rd., thanked Councilors Drake and Console for meeting at Wilkus Farm with the barn experts and historical society members. He provided the long history and care for some barns that exist throughout Wethersfield and it's no shame in fact it's a badge of honor to change your mind and do the right thing by following your leader who grew up in that same Griswold Farm house and the voter's who elected you.

Lou Parker, 366 Pine Ln., commented that many years ago when he was part of an Indian guide tribe, one Sunday afternoon they went over to the Wilkus barns with their dads to watch dairy farming and one kid member of that tribe was Chris Murphy, our new Senator. He commented that it's hard to imagine that other young people might want to learn something about farming and might not have the chance.

Peter Susca, 52 Hawthorn Way, commented that he has been involved in the Wilkus Farm campaign for a quite a long time and can't say any better what a lot of these folks have already said. He commented that they are just trying to hold the council accountable to what they said they were going to do and that's all that this is about. He stated that he would like the council to align themselves and be effective following the will of the people in this town and what they have committed to.

Robert Smart, 62 Church St., commented that he voted for the referendum for that open space and trusted that the council would follow through on that vote. He commented that it is very clear that we have voted for open space and it is very disturbing that maybe we are going through a little bit of a double cross. He stated that we voted for it knowing that it puts increased tax pressure on us and were willing to pay that cost and stated that he is not willing to have a subsidized housing development as part of his tax burden.

John Miller, 45 Highland St., commented that if you pay twice what something's worth somewhere along the way, you're going to get in trouble. You tried to sell it once, you put your price on it at I guess based on what you paid the bids came in at half and you're in that position now, but if the emphasis is on open space and anybody listening to this program tonight, Councilor Manousos makes his point and that's my saying.

Brendan Flynn, 109 Springdale Rd., commented in following up with what John Miller said, there was a lot of debate in 2009 over whether the voters were being asked to pay more for the property than it was worth. There was a lot of debate as to whether it was more worthwhile or a

greater benefit to the town to purchase the property and preserve it or build houses. He stated that the voters heard those things, there was full exchange of views in the market place of ideas, the voters voted and they decided to buy it and preserve it and we should honor that now. He commented that the folks on Goff Rd. raise a valid point on the development of that parcel. He stated that you have the opportunity to protect that parcel, honor the letter and spirit of the referendum by bringing in someone who will farm the property and that will generate the funds in order to purchase the development rights of the Goff Rd. parcel and preserve to the extent possible. So please listen to the voters, honor what they are telling you tonight, honor what they said at the ballot box in 2009. He added that he respects all of the councilors and believes that they are doing what they believe to be in the best interest of the town and he just happens to disagree with the majority.

Robert Young, 20 Coppermill Rd., commented that he voted against the purchase of the property and always said the town has no business buying property that they are not going to use and look what you have today. You have special interests that voted and connived in order to get what they want. He stated that he did not know that there was a 10 acre parcel on that property that was not protected. He just thought the house and that little bit of acreage was, but as time came along he started hearing about that well after the sale had closed and it really made me wonder what in the world is going on here and I do know many of you members of this council and he doesn't trust any of them because of things that happen up here, how you vote. He commented that there are members up here who are soccer fans and how they didn't want the farmer to rent the 10 acres because the soccer people wanted that 10 acres. He stated that he made comment that maybe we should sell that property to the farmer and turn that money over and go and do something on the Goff Rd. and buy that and the only way you could buy it is outright, you're not going to buy the development rights. He commented that there are a lot of places in the budget where you can get some extra money and buyout that. Take the \$200,000 from the farmer and buy the Goff Rd. property and finish it up and stated that he doesn't believe we belong as owners of Wilkus Farm because of the mess we have.

Tracy McDougall, 45 Nott St., thanked everyone for their time and asked those folks who are in favor of selling the Wilkus Farm parcel to please reconsider their position. The intent of the voters was to preserve that as open space and it really doesn't seem fair and voters overwhelmingly approved support of the farm. The open space and our history is what makes Wethersfield a unique place to live and you have a chance to help preserve what makes us unique and an attractive place to live.

Amy Nix, 854 Ridge Rd., commented that she also did not vote for the original referendum because we were overpaying for the property and personally don't think that we as a people and council have the place to buy, develop and try to imitate developers because as town-elected council members that's not what you do and now we are in a conundrum on what to do with this. The referendum did pass in 2009 and based on the actual letter of the law which is what we all voted for, I would make a suggestion that you do abide by what the Wethersfield residents voted for and to modify your decision. She commented that she doesn't understand how someone can

accept bids for property and receive three high bids and still decline all of them and is curious about what our bidding process is. She commented that if you're not scratching heads wondering why the bids weren't coming in where they should be, maybe you're scratching your head wondering why we overpaid for the property in the first place.

Sue Skehan, 105 Straddle Hill, commented that she was the Treasurer for the original save the farm proposal and the intent was never to develop any part of that land but to keep it as open space. She commented that after looking at the numbers, nothing adds up and by exchanging one property for another, the values, what you're going to get, the numbers just don't add up. The person who seems to make out in this is the builder. She commented that from her perspective, that is not what she is looking for our town to do to take care of the builder. She is looking for people to take care of the townspeople. She commented that they need to communicate better on why we've had three bids, some excellent offers that would meet and fit with the original proposal and nothing has happened and all of a sudden Drisdelle comes out again and suggests that they need to communicate better what has happened because it doesn't make sense and is very discouraging.

Dan Lagosh, 78 Windmill Hill, asked the Council to reconsider their vote and stated that the people have spoken how they feel about this. He stated that there are not too many people here who were in favor of the vote and commented if the builder comes in and builds six houses, do you think the people in those houses even want a soccer field put in back of them. He commented that we should follow the wishes of the people and to please reconsider their vote.

Laila Mandour, 420 Ridge Rd., commented that she is new to Wethersfield and wasn't here for the vote in 2009 but did read the referendum and it seems very clear that it was a referendum for open space and it's also clear that the referendum was passed by a majority of the voters so voting is a fundamental right and if we take the time to get out there to vote and vote a certain way and the majority votes, that should be listened to and upheld. She commented that from what she hears tonight, the vote was for open space, there was no specificity in the referendum to say there was going to be some parcel part parsed out of it. She commented that she heard someone say that the referendum was written incorrectly so if it was incorrect in the past, then it should still be upheld but if it was incorrectly written, then it shouldn't have gone through if that wasn't the intent. She asked that the council listen to the majority of the people here and reverse their decision.

Peter Ryan, 244 Willow St., asked the council to reconsider the Wilkus Farm decision. He stated that he doesn't understand the 2.25 acres that was mentioned before. He commented that if this is a land swap isn't there a 1.86 acres or something here with the house, I'm confused. Then I heard two point something acres. Are you combining some more land to this portion and if you are would this easement or 10 acres—I'm wondering where the value between there and Goff Rd. is, considering you paid \$175,000 for the other property. He commented that now he is hearing soccer here and would like to hear where all the parking is going to be with all the fields and stated that if it's open space, you're going to asphalt the farm. I'm trying to figure your

rationality here for soccer fields and am a little confused. Mr. Ryan commented that he wishes the council would use some common sense and some straight-forward thinking and figure out all the problems that are going to come after this and if you are putting some more land to this portion to swap land, what stops you from putting more land and swapping from somebody else in town eventually, you are creating something that you have opened the door to. The referendum was written wrong in the beginning. I think the town hires the lawyers are they involved in this stuff before it goes out to vote? We pay good lawyers in this town, don't we? Let's reconsider and put everybody's thinking here the same, what's good for the taxpayers of this town.

COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor Hemmann reported that she did attend the Housing Authority meeting last week and also the Conservation Commission meeting last week as well.

Councilor Roberts reported that the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee met last Thursday. She reported that the Senior Services Coordinator, Donna ~~Madison~~ **Mattison** who has been with the town for 11 years is retiring at the end of January so we want to wish her well and she will be hard to replace because she really has made the Senior Center what it is today and has really brought it from a very small operation into a functional organization. Councilor Roberts explained that every year the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee sponsors a seminar in the Spring and have done stuff on Financial Planning and all sorts of topics of interest and this year the program is geared for seniors and anybody in the community who is interested. She explained that it is a program called Car Fit and it is a cooperative program among AARP, ~~Triple A AAA~~, The American Occupational Therapists Association and Hartford Hospitals Injury Prevention Center. She explained that basically they will take appointments and you come in with your car and they will see how the car fits you and you fit the car and make adjustments and make suggestions on how you can drive your car in a more ergonomic fashion. She stated that the program will be from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon and it will be advertized and that it is on May 4th and it sounds like an informative program.

Mayor Hemmann asked if it was only by appointment,

Councilor Roberts responded that there will be a few drive-ins allowed at the end but preference will be given to people with appointments and it takes about 20 minutes. She explained that there's a limited number of slots so people should really call for an appointment if they are interested.

Councilor Drake reported that the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee met again last week. They have one more meeting with Parks and Recreation and they should be putting together their recommendations for the year for Capital Improvements. He reported that Infrastructure also met last week and we will be bringing forward item 4.a which is the Energy

Committee is asking to allow them to fund a contract to go out and put together an RFP for performance contracting.

Councilor Kotkin reported that the Insurance Committee met last week, but was out of state and didn't attend but there are a few things worth mentioning. Councilor Kotkin reported that the claims data continues to be quite good for the town. He explained that we are well over \$1,000,000 below budget currently in terms of the expenditures on health care costs. He stated that the town is currently looking for bids for the health care administrator and to remember that we are self insured, but we currently have Anthem as the administrator. He explained that we are asking for a number of bids to see if we should stay with Anthem or if there is something more attractive and reported that the town's administration with the insurance carrier is going to be putting together numbers for next year in terms of what we need to budget for health care. He commented that it's something that used to escalate by 1 or 2 million dollars a year, but it seems to be flat to lower so that's very positive for our budget and for tax rates and explained that about 1 out of every 8 to 10 dollars goes to pay for retiree and active employee health care costs. He stated that the last piece is, at the meeting, there is also likely to be a recommendation that's going to come to the council concerning extending the current agents of record for both our health care administration as well as our property casualty. Councilor Kotkin stated that he thinks the Committee feels that they've done a very good job and every three years, we need to essentially reup. He explained that we rarely make changes, but we did a few years on property and casualty and stated that he thinks the Committee is very satisfied with their performance so far but this has to go to the council for reappointment for three years.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilor Manousos commented that he believes we are mostly hung up on what is the definition of open space and stated that to me the definition of open space is implicit that there is public access and so the Nowak bid does not allow that and that's really the problem for me. He commented that if there is a solution outside of that, then he thinks everybody would be willing to revisit it. He stated that we are supporting a bid that allows public access to those 10 acres and there's already haying going on, so that's what we would have to reconsider if we are going to do that. I just want to make sure that the distinction between open space and farming because that doesn't**[interrupted]**

A member of the public asked can we walk on the property of six houses that Mr. Drisdelle is going to build there?

Councilor Manousos replied no, but if the property...**[interrupted]** I'm sorry but the house and barns I've already told you what I thought that was, that was separate from the 10 acres, I don't know how you have open space on a facility with structures that somebody will own privately. He stated that's not open space, it's privately owned property, so 10 acres if it is given to one person for 10 years exclusively, it is not open space. There is 70 other acres that are currently being hayed. There is no contract for that. That gives them exclusive rights to lease that

property. That's open space; people walk their dogs on it, like my wife does. The kids go sledding on the hill. That's open space, so the only thing that I would support and reconsider would be a proposal that would leave those 10 acres as open space. Leaving it to somebody for 10 years exclusively, one person because it would be a lease between the town and that person solely, that's not open space. That is not the will of the people and that is not what this referendum says. It doesn't say that the land must be preserved as open space and farming. It says as open space and open space has a definition so that's the distinction. I don't think anybody is saying they wouldn't revisit something, but there is a distinction so hopefully that clears some of it up.

Councilor McAlister commented that he would like to second that and would definitely revisit entertaining this and stated that he thinks he was the only council member that actually supported the Rouquie bid because it didn't develop the housing and yet left the acres open for public access. Unfortunately, if I had went that route, nothing would have happened with the RFP because we needed five votes so I had to make a decision, do I want to take 10 acres out of the hands of taxpayers who paid so much money for that property or do I want to preserve that 10 acres and that's why I made my decision. If there were more people that supported Rouquie, we might be having a different conversation today. Or, if Nowak was interested in just purchasing that house and barns, it might be a different story today, but unfortunately, none of it played out, so that's how I made my decision. He explained that he interpreted open space as public access and the flyer that the committee put out actually said if you voted in favor of saving the Wilkus Farm back in 2009, they would guarantee public access in perpetuity. So, not really sure how you guarantee public access to that 10 acres or to that 1.86 parcel if you sell it to anyone. The only way to guarantee access is to just keep it which means we would have to find quite a bit of money to either take down the barns or we build them, which I'm not sure we have the money or the will to do that at this point. Councilor McAlister commented that the second thing is, I heard a lot of people talk here today about Drisdelle winning and I agree, it looks like the builder's winning and originally when we were talking about this, I had a conflict about, I didn't think council owned steering development from one part of town to another. So that was my big internal struggle to deal with that, but the people that are saying Drisdelle wins, I obviously got over that because I looked at the holistic approach of what I thought was best for the town, but the people that are coming up tonight saying that the Nowak proposal, Drisdelle doesn't win, I find that amazing because again, if you look at what the motion was, we were going to sell the property to Nowak. We were going to give up 10 acres to a single individual with no public access. Then, we were going to take the \$200,000 that we got from Nowak and give it to Drisdelle and limit him from blasting and only building two houses there and then he could turn around and sell those two properties. So he paid \$175,000 for the properties, he put a lot of engineering site work, which is probably \$50,000 so you're up to \$225,000 and then we're going to give him \$200,000 just to limit the blasting. We would have no money in our coffers for any open space in the future and then they can turn and sell those two properties, say at 200 each. That's where Drisdelle wins, so I don't understand why people are coming up here. If you understand what the Nowak proposal that was put in front of us really meant, so I appreciate everyone's comments and thoughts and it gives us a lot to think about, but I would encourage

people to find out more information about what you're speaking about and if you are going to argue that open space is haying and restricting open access and you're o:k with that, that's a great argument to have. I don't believe that, but we can discuss that because those are facts, but coming in and saying that Drisdelle wins, and I'm a financial person, and I just don't see how this makes sense. Look at the Nowak proposal that is a financial mess for this town.

Councilor Roberts stated that her comment is a procedural issue because I heard the statement that was read in the beginning and then I heard the people speaking out here and then I just heard Stathis and Jim talk about ways that they would look at the issue again. So, this is where I'm confused now. Procedurally, because I'm the only one who likes to talk about Robert's Rules of Order, if that's true that people want to reconsider, and this is you guys, tonight's the only time you can do it because it has to be at the ~~night~~ **next** succeeding meeting after a vote is taken and it can only be done by people that voted in the majority. Councilor Roberts stated if what you're saying about reconsidering and looking at things is true, tonight's the night that you would have to do that and explained that she was confused because John was talking about researching, doing more research on stuff, so I wasn't sure where you were headed with that, but just wanted to put that on the table that as they say, this is the moment, this is the hour. If you are going to reconsider it's now, otherwise it's a done deal.

Councilor Kotkin commented that he is not aware of any council member calling for a police investigation and stated that he certainly never suggested that there should be an ethics investigation filed. In fact, if we learned anything from the board, that situation is a bad precedent if one council member files an ethics complaint against another, given that any finding by an ethics board would have to go back to the council, so I think that would be bad precedent. Councilor Kotkin explained the motion I made did not contemplate that the Goff Rd. property would be broken up into two parcels that would be built upon, so I just wanted to clarify that. I think it was noted earlier that we would have two houses built. There is one house on the property, it is quite run down and potentially if the town either bought it or if it required development rights, potentially a new owner could put up a nicer house, one that is better for the community around there, but the idea is essentially that the proposal that I made and was seconded and failed unfortunately in the last meeting, was that we would take the \$205,000 that Mr. Nowak bid and we would apply that to acquire development right or the outright property purchase on Goff Rd. Councilor Kotkin explained that there is a very very steep slope on Goff Rd. and a lot of people were very concerned that that slope if it were developed, even though it did receive subdivision approval, that it would definitely worsen the neighborhood. You would lose trees, you would lose the slope and I think all of us up here are hoping that that doesn't happen, but potentially there is a house, there is a garage, up on top of the hill that is quite run down and perhaps whether it's Mr. Drisdelle or somebody else can make that something better for the community, but he would not be able to build any additional homes up on that property. That was what my motion attempted to do at the last meeting. So, I just wanted to clarify a couple of those pieces. I didn't want to do that until after I heard from the people who came here. I really thank everybody, I think there were almost 30 speakers who spoke to us about that and I think we all are in something due to that so I really appreciate you coming out and

hopefully, we'll find a solution that everybody in the room and hopefully everybody in the town will agree to.

Councilor Manousos wanted to clarify that that motion included a 10-year lease and that's not open space.

Councilor Kotkin commented that it did include a 10-year lease and he thinks it would have been helpful earlier today if you also mentioned that there is about 30,000 sq. feet of property that is not part of the 1.86 acres that has a house and barns currently that would be built upon. There would be two housing lots on about 30-35,000 sq. feet that I think most people assume was going to remain open space.

Deputy Mayor Console commented to Councilor Kotkin that on your motion last time, you did mention that you wanted to use the funds from Nowak, which would be considered, I believe, open space funds to buy development rights from a private individual and the town would get nothing in return. On your motion, so that property, even though we bought the development rights, someone would buy that property, so in essence, you are using tax payers' money that should go back into open space fund to purchase development rights which in turn someone would buy that property and the entire town would have nothing to show for it. Am I correct?

Councilor Kotkin responded that I think as I mentioned in the last meeting, I live in that area and asked for the town attorney for ruling as to whether I had a conflict and it was determined that I did not, so I did vote on this, made the motion voted on it. I think if you poll the people who live in that neighborhood and you said to them right now, there is an approved subdivision for five houses on Goff Rd. and if this went through and the owner of the property gave up development rights so at best you would have one house at the top of the hill, I really don't think that the people in that neighborhood would think that you got nothing out of it. What they're getting out of it is that they wouldn't have the slope basically demolished and they wouldn't have the trees removed. To say that you get nothing by basically eliminating a five-lot subdivision in one of the most difficult parcels to build on in the entire town from a grade standpoint, I just don't think that's correct.

Deputy Mayor Console responded but I really don't think you answered my question. I, as a tax payer, pay taxes. Part of that tax money goes into open space fund which I would think would be used to buy open space that the entire town could use--walk on it, sit on it, have a picnic on it. But what your proposal was to take that money, buy development rights on private property, that's where I had my big issue on your motion and by having that, the property gets sold off so I can't sit on that property, I can't have a picnic, I can't walk on it because it belongs to a private person so you're using the tax payers money to buy development rights and the tax payers in town get nothing back for it. The people on Goff Rd. may get something back because there is no house built across the street, but nobody else can do anything with that, it's not considered open space. So you're using open space funds, that where my big concern was with your motion.

You were using open space funds to purchase private property that the town could never use, never walk on, never do anything with. That was my big concern. Is that a correct statement?

Councilor Kotkin responded that the motion said purchase or acquire development rights.

TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Bridge had nothing to report.

TOWN CLERK REPORT

Dolores Sassano reported that she had three communications regarding the Wilkus Farm. They were from: Patricia Mulrain, 15 Old Common Rd., Gail Griffin, 52 Desmond Drive and Peter & Janet Mirabelli, 195 Goff Rd.

Ms. Sassano read all three letters into the record.

COUNCIL ACTION

Councilor Montinieri moved to **“APPROVE THE RESIGNATION OF MARK A. CONSOLE, 695 WELLS RD. FROM THE INLAND WETLANDS AND WATER COURSES COMMISSION”**, seconded by Councilor Hurley .

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Deputy Mayor Console moved to **“REAPPOINT TO THE DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANDREA L. BOYLE, 703 WOLCOTT HILL ROAD TO FROM 1-22-13 TO 1-01-16 AND REAPPOINT STEVEN C. HINE, 294 HANG DOG LANE FROM 1-22-13 TO 1-01-16”**, seconded by Councilor Kotkin.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Councilor Montinieri moved to **“APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF SHANELLE DATTILO, 84 ROUND HILL RD. FROM AN ALTERNATE TO A FULL MEMBER OF THE INLAND WETLANDS AND WATER COURSES COMMISSION, EFFECTIVE 1-22-13 TO 6-30-13 AND REAPPOINT JOSEPH H. HICKEY, JR., 28 MEADOW VIEW DR., TO THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE FROM 1-22-13 TO 10-1-16”**, seconded by Councilor Kotkin.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, APPOINTMENTS FOR INTRODUCTION

Councilor Manousos moved to **“ADOPT THE ORDINANCE REFERENCED AS CHAPTER 14 FUNDS, ARTICLE VI IN THE CODE OF WETHERSFIELD AS PRESENTED”**, seconded by Councilor Drake.

Mr. Bridges explained that before you this evening is an ordinance which would create a trust in the capital and non-recurring expense fund. We currently have a capital and non-recurring expense fund for capital expense and non-recurring expenses; it's a legal term within the Connecticut General Statutes as a mechanism by which towns can fund improvements. He explained that the proceeds, several years ago, the town was participatory in the sale of the CREC facility or the Northeast Utilities' facility. CREC, our primary concern at the time was the generation of taxes from the building. He explained that through negotiations with the parties, a one-time payment in lieu of tax of \$2 million dollars was provided to the town and at the time the desire was to put that in a revenue producing fund that would replace the lost taxes without touching the principal. This ordinance is that vehicle, so annually the interest would be used to supplement the capital and non-recurring fund which wouldn't receive as much taxes due to the sale of the property and the loss of the property from the grand list. So that is what this is for. There are mechanisms to protect the principal from any action of the council and stated that it needs seven members, so I think this is the product of the discussions we have had and staff recommends approval.

Councilor McAlister asked if this wasn't established where would the \$2 million have been put.

Mr. Bridges responded that it would go into the general fund, which if you wanted to move it somewhere else, you would then have to appropriate it out of the general fund into something else.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 7-1-1. Councilor Montinieri voted no and Councilor Roberts abstained.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Teacher's Contract: Acceptance of the labor agreement between the Wethersfield Federation of Teachers and the Board of Education. Remains unfinished business.

OTHER BUSINESS

Councilor Hurley moved **“TO TABLE THE MOTION TO REFER TO THE WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PER C.G.S. 8-24 THE ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF 214 GOFF ROAD BY THE TOWN OF WETHERSFIELD”**, seconded by Councilor McAlister.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion was tabled 7-1-1. Councilor Montinieri voted no and Councilor Roberts abstained.

BIDS

Councilor McAlister moved to **“MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE TOWN MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CELTIC ENERGY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$29,000 TO PROVIDE OWNER’S AGENT SERVICES FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING”**, seconded by Councilor Drake.

Town Manager Bridges stated that Celtic Energy would act on behalf of the Town. The Wethersfield Citizens Energy Advisory Committee thinks the Town will not have the expertise or time to oversee Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC), and the lack of an expert in this field will work to defeat the energy savings desired. Celtic Energy would oversee energy savings performance contracts as a means to implement a number of capital improvements that pay for themselves through reduced energy costs. The Committee’s research indicates hiring a consultant to oversee the contractor is strongly recommended to ensure the projected savings are realized. Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) hired Celtic Energy to help develop its best practices guide for ESPC for municipal and education markets.

Councilor Drake added that the Energy Committee again is using funds that they’ve collected through their programs over the last year or so and this is a, I guess, you can say the next step to proprietying is what they want to do so I think it is a good plan and we should accept the effort that they’ve put forward and see if we can get this thing going.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Councilor Manousos moved to **“APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR ENVIRONMENTAL TESTING AS PROPOSED BY THE HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$138,905”**, seconded by Councilor Drake.

Manager Bridges stated that as part of the High School Renovation project, environmental testing and remediation must be done of any known or identified areas of concern. The Town has contracted with EnviroMed Services for limited pre-construction testing. At this time PCB’S and underground oil storage tanks have been identified as an area of concern needing further investigation toward remediation. These additional tests determine the extent of any possible contamination and will help refine the budget for remediation. Cost breaks down (to not exceed) \$56,950 for exterior testing and (to not exceed) \$81,955 for interior testing.

Councilor Montinieri commented the he certainly approves of us going forward on this but one of the things he noted in the article in the Courant was a less than satisfying and somewhat uneasy commentary about whether there was any safety issues in the interim for students who were at the high school today so maybe that can be addressed. He stated that I’m certainly going to vote for this but maybe we need to have somebody from eventually the board side to come out

and meet with us but it seemed like it was not a question that was answered with confidence with respect to the day-to-day while students are in there while this is happening.

Mayor Hemmann invited Christine Fortunato and the consultants to address the issue.

Christine Fortunato responded to Councilor Montinieri stating that as soon as it was brought to the superintendent, the town manager and the building committee's attention that there was a high level detected on the fifth floors in an in-cased area, it's not exposed and it was through testing that it was identified. Steps were taken immediately that weekend to take necessary precautions in conformance with EPA standards. That day, the Superintendent sent home a message through the telephone system and through written correspondence to families, children at the school noting the item and also Paul Hutcheon, our Director for Health Services for the District was informed and gave his opinion of this situation and did not see any harm to children and to staff at that time and also provided families with information about PCBs, a fact sheet if you will, so that's where we are and what has necessitated additional testing.

Larry Cannon, President of EnviroMed Services stated that they will be performing air testing for PCBS and will be doing it as a safeguard and we feel that the school is safe, however, it's prudent according to EPA protocol to do the air monitoring and we will do that, that is part of our proposal to actually to do air testing and white testing of those areas in the school.

A discussion ensued with the Councilors regarding PCB testing at the high school.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

MINUTES

Councilor Hurley moved **"TO APPROVE THE AMENDED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2013"** seconded by Councilor Drake.

Councilor Kotkin pointed out that the time was incorrect in the minutes and should be changed to 6:10 p.m.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Deputy Mayor Console moved **"TO APPROVE THE AMENDED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2013"** seconded by Councilor Kotkin.

Councilor Manousos pointed out an error on pg. 3 under Councilor Reports "Physical" should be "Fiscal".

Councilor Kotkin pointed out an error on pg. 3 indicating that "Rosario" is spelled incorrectly and on pg. 9 the word "comprised" should be changed to "compromise".

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 9-0-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Elizabeth Knapp, 71 Highland St., commented that part of the overwhelming open space vote was to halt building of new homes. Putting six houses on the property would be a blight on the attached precious open space and the 10-year lease is a small concession in the overall picture.

Judy Parker, 366 Pine Lane came up to the podium to read two poems.

Eileen Candels, 106 Windmill Hill, commented that she also hopes that somehow we can preserve the space over on Goff Rd. or protect it in more of the context that it is in right now. She then added some clarifying points of the discussion and hopes that the council will consider their vote.

Joel Wagner, 203 Clearfield Rd., commented that all of the buildings are restorable and can be used again and believes that the framing on one certainly is historic. He also asked the councilors to consider separating the three issues and explained his reasoning. He urged the council to sell the farm place, then figure out what to do with the 10 acres, then figure out what to do with the Goff Rd. property, that way things are much more logical and you can figure it out.

Betty Rosania, 88 Desmond Dr., commented thanked all the councilors for their forbearance in listening to the public go into such detail leaving no stone unturned. She then read a couple of inspirational quotes. She also commented that with the Budget Session approaching soon, to put as much money as they possibly can into the open space, or land acquisition fund or farm preservation fund, it's called all three things, but it's the same thing, it's the account where you hold money aside from year to year so that if there are opportunities, you may purchase land. She also requested to know at some point how much money we have in that fund at this time.

Rick Garrey, 35 Harding St., commented that the people of this town said to save the farm and the priority of this was to save the farm and you said it to the Hartford Courant and you said it to us, the public said it at the meeting and you can say anything you want tonight, but that is what the truth is—that it was about saving agriculture in Wethersfield. Mr. Garrey stated that a farmer came forward who is willing to put his own money into saving those buildings and a farm and you talk about restricted access, there is 70 acres of access. He commented that we all want to save agricultural heritage in Wethersfield on that 10 acres. Mr. Garrey also spoke about the Drisdelle proposal and how it benefits Drisdelle.

George Ruhe, 956 Cloverdale Circle, commented that voting on the teacher's contract in a special meeting represents a lack of backbone on somebody's part. Mr. Ruhe was also upset with Deputy Mayor Console's remark about having the right to speak and the fact that he could not

give his time away to someone else to speak and commented that the council has a level of gall that just nauseates him.

Jim Woodworth, 5 River Rd. continued to speak about the condition of the barns and commented that Mr. Nowak is willing to renovate the barn as well as hay the farm. He stated that if you bulldoze the place, there will never be any educational programs and we need to preserve it for the future. He commented that once we award the bid to Nowak, then we can begin to plan thoughtfully about the future of open space and the agricultural preservation. Mr. Woodworth also read a letter from Ron Olson, Marketing Inspection Representative from the Connecticut Dept. of Agriculture.

Gus Colantonio, 16 Morrison Ave., commented about measurements taken at the intersection of Tifton Rd. and stated that the measurements were taken before the construction of the sidewalk so the measurements do not represent the current existing conditions. Mr. Colantonio also commented on the placement of traffic signs on Morrison Ave. stating that they are located on the back of the walk and not on the grass strip.

T. William Knapp, 171 Collier Rd., commented that he was hoping to get a motion to reconsider. He commented that there is something wrong with the wording of the referendum question and stated that it is approved not only by not only the council but by some election body at the State of Connecticut that makes sure that whoever the responsible people are, they can't have it favor one way or the other no matter how they feel about it individually, so I think it's a stress to say that that referendum question was wrong because the town's attorney and state's election attorneys worked on it, everybody approved and that's what went on the machine. He stated there may be some question about whether the voters voted for open space or voted for to preserve the farm, but what they didn't vote for was to spend the town's money on it to then later sell it to a developer to make money to make a swap to develop Goff Rd. He stated that there are a lot of angry people who want to participate in what's going on here tonight and they are not going to go away. He commented that the voter's say that it is worth it to us, whatever we paid for it, to add to our taxes and pay our interest to preserve the farm and prevent it from being developed. He commented that he realizes that it is very difficult that after you take a public position to change your mind and go over to the other side and he complemented the Mayor for her decision. Mr. Knapp asked the council to reconsider their vote.

Paul DiMauro, 40 Hawthorne Way, asked the council to please bring a motion to either reverse or table last week's meeting on their decision.

Robert Garrey, 10 Morrison Ave., commented if this farm were in the historic district, we wouldn't be taking down the buildings because we have commission to protect them. He stated that there is some aspects of those buildings to consider as historic and stated that whether we keep the barns or tear them down, what we can't replace is agricultural activity in a small suburb where farming is a thing of the past. He stated that we have an historic opportunity right now to preserve farming on that property in addition to the buildings and urged the council to not make a

swap that is not in the best interest of the town.

Brenda LaBella, 34 Deerledge Lane, commented on the cost of some property that Drisdelle purchased on the Weth./Rocky property line and stated that she asked Mr. Drisdelle why didn't he purchase the property at Wilkus Farm. She said that Mr. Drisdelle responded that they wanted \$6 million dollars from developers but were willing to give it to the town for \$3 or \$3.5 million. Ms. LaBella said to be glad for the price that we did and commented that she is tired of hearing misinformation, and that is was a good price and it was going to be \$16 or \$20 a year per household.

Shirley Steinmetz, 375 Brimfield Rd., commented that the Wilkus Farm was a bipartisan committee and stated the reason why she is on that committee is because she believes passionately and strongly about open space in Wethersfield and keeping out heritage and having a farmer there to keep that and that is what we need and she asked the council to reconsider and do what the people in this town voted for.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:00 p.m., Councilor Kotkin moved "**TO ADJOURN THE MEETING**" seconded by Councilor Hurley.

All Councilors present, including the Chairperson voted AYE. The motion passed 8-0-0. Councilor Manousos stepped out of the Chamber.

Dolores G. Sassano
Town Clerk

Approved by Vote of Council
February 4, 2013

Minutes were amended to correct spelling and grammatical errors.