



NORWICH BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES' COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING

May 22, 2012

The Regular May Meeting of the Norwich Board of Public Utilities' Commissioners was held on Tuesday, May 22, 2012 in the 2nd Floor Board Room of Norwich Public Utilities (NPU) located at 16 South Golden Street, Norwich.

Item 1. The Meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Chairman James Sullivan.

Present: Chairman James Sullivan, Vice Chairman Diana Boisclair, Secretary Alan Remondi, Commissioner Larry Goldman and Commissioner Robert Groner. Also in attendance were: General Manager John Bilda; NPU Staff Members Chris LaRose, Steve Sinko, Kerri Kemp, Jeff Brining, Mike Hughes and Michele Addabbo.

Chairman Sullivan welcomed Commissioner Robert Groner to the Board.

Item 2. Fifteen-Minute Public Comment Period. Chairman Sullivan asked for public comment. The following members of the public addressed the Board:
Cathy Osten, First Selectwoman, Town of Sprague. Ms. Osten spoke in opposition of the rate increase. She asked that the letter below from Fusion Paperboard be entered into the public record.

*****The rest of this page is left intentionally blank*****



May 22, 2012

John F Bilda, P.E.
General Manager
Norwich Public Utilities
16 South Golden Street
Norwich, CT 06360

Dear Mr Bilda,

I wanted to reiterate in writing what I testified to on April 24, 2012 at the public hearing against the proposed rate increases for sewer customers of NPU. Over the past 5 years we have seen an increase in sewer rates of 49.12%. The Mandatory Upgrade Charge implemented less than 2 years ago represents 40.11% amounting to an average monthly increase of \$24,764 or \$297,167 annually for Fusion Paperboard. The proposed 2012 rate increase would bump up our monthly cost by an extra \$7,736 or \$92,837 annually, for a total financial impact to Fusion Paperboard of \$390,004 annually. This is since 2009 only. These figures do not include the 9.01% rate increase from 2007.

These constantly increasing rates and the uncertainty of what the increases will be in the future make running a business very difficult. Needless to say these increases have a very serious impact on the budget and the financial performance of an already financially challenged business. We do not have any other increases that are even close to this with any of our other suppliers.

Over the past few years, if we consider the performance of the mill with the stability in both the flow and the quality of the waste water discharge to NPU, I would venture to say that this strong performance greatly improved NPU's overall stability and performance. The fact that our TSS and BOD levels have constantly been significantly below their limits, and that our waste water is nitrogen deficient puts NPU in a favorable position.

We have reviewed Mr. Carberry's letter and believe that it offers an approach to find a better solution to these budget increases. We would also offer to be part of any type of working group to explore if there are other ways to reduce these increases.

As you know, we have developed a much better working relationship and lines of communication over the past couple of years. I hope that we can continue to do so. I remain available to discuss this project at your convenience.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ghislain Levesque", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Ghislain Levesque
Chief Operating Officer
Fusion Paperboard

Attorney Glenn Carberry, Representing ACLS. Attorney Carberry spoke in opposition of the rate increase. The following letter from Attorney Carberry was presented to the Board.

TCORS

Tobin • Carberry • O'Malley • Riley • Selinger, P.C.

• Attorneys •

43 Broad Street 330 Main Street
P.O. Box 58 Third Floor
New London, CT Hartford, CT
06320-0058 06106-1825

860-447-0335
Fax: 860-442-3469
www.tcors.com

May 18, 2012

Mr. James Sullivan
Chairman
Board of Public Utility
Commissioners and Sewer Authority
Norwich Public Utilities
16 South Golden Street
Norwich, CT 06360

Re: Legal and Policy Concerns about Proposed
Water and Sewer Rate Increases
Our File #5023.141087

Dear Mr. Sullivan and Fellow Commissioners:

As you know, we are representing ACLS New England, Inc. ("ACLS") and several other Norwich businesses which are concerned about the proposal made by Norwich Public Utilities ("DPU") to increase water and sewer rates to its customers. In that capacity, we have attended several presentations by DPU concerning the proposal and participated in the public hearings held by the Board of Public Utility Commissioners and Sewer Authority (the "Board") on April 24, 2012. We have also reviewed the information provided by DPU in support of its proposal and analyzed the applicable provisions of the Connecticut General Statutes, Norwich City Charter, and Code of Ordinances in order to determine whether appropriate procedures and legal standards have been applied during the ratemaking process.

ACLS continues to have serious concerns about the detrimental impact which a 37% increase in water rates and 11% in sewer rates would have on families, seniors and the business community. As described in this letter, we believe the proposed rates are unjust and unreasonable. Equally important, the Norwich City Charter and Code of Ordinances require any water rate increase to be approved by the Norwich City Council before it can be implemented. For these reasons, we respectfully request that you review the arguments set forth in this letter and consider withdrawing or modifying the proposed rate increases as part of your deliberations at the next meeting of the Board.

I. The Proposed Water Rate Increase Cannot Be Implemented Without the Approval of the Norwich City Council.

The Board was established by the City as part of the comprehensive charter revision and city reorganization that took place in 1951. Chapter XII, §2 of the Charter establishes a Board of Public Utility Commissioners consisting of five members to be appointed by the Norwich City Council. The Board assumed all of the rights and responsibilities previously granted to the Board of Water Commissioners over water issues. Chapter XII, §5 of the Charter provides that the Board "shall have all rights to provide, purchase, sell and distribute water heretofore possessed by the Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Norwich." Chapter XII, §10 of the Charter imposes upon the Board the obligation to "fix rates to be charged for gas, electricity and water sold and services rendered by the Department."

In exercising its oversight duties over the DPU and the Board, the City Council has from time to time adopted ordinances regarding sewer and water matters including an ordinance as to the manner in which the Board should establish rates and prices for water. Section 21-108 of the Norwich Code of Ordinances requires that "such Board shall with the assent of the council, establish scales of prices or terms upon which water shall be furnished, and regulate the time or time of payment, and collect all water rents, and shall faithfully account for the same. Such prices or rents, when so established, shall not be reduced below a fair and reasonable compensation for the use of said water."

The language in Section 21-108 which specifies the "assent of the Council" means that the City Council must pass an ordinance pursuant to Chapter V, §8 of the Charter endorsing the proposed 37% increase in water rates in order for those rates to be valid. Without such assent, the DPU lacks the power to implement any rate increases for water.

There are several compelling reasons why this provision is binding on the Board and the Council. First, Chapter XVIII, §3 of the Charter provides that all ordinances in force on the effective date of the Charter and not inconsistent with it, remain in full force until amended, repealed or superseded. This validation section of the Norwich Charter was included in the 1951 special act adopted by the Connecticut State Legislature. That special act established consolidated government for the city and town of Norwich, and ratified the proposed Charter provisions including those establishing the Board. The ordinance requiring City Council assent to Board water rate increases has not been subsequently repealed. It supplements and compliments the Board's rate making authority. Consequently, it meets the requirements for continued validation under the Charter itself.

Second, the editor's note to the Norwich Code of Ordinances confirms that the Board was assigned by Charter the same rights as to water distribution previously held by the former Board of Water Commissioners. The Code states that applicable provisions pertaining to the former board were included deliberately in the Code of Ordinances in their amended form. See Norwich Code of Ordinances, §21-108.

Third, the approval of the "legislative body" for proposed water rate increases is established practice for other municipal utilities in Connecticut. Section 7-239 of the Connecticut General Statutes which governs the activities of most of the State's other water authorities, provides that the legislative body "shall establish just and equitable rates or charges for the use of the waterworks system...." Similarly, local municipalities such as the City of Groton have interpreted their Charter as requiring city council approval of water rates approved by the utility board. City of Groton Charter, Article VIII, Section 5.

It is regrettable that prior boards and councils have apparently ignored the requirement of council assent to changes in the water rates. Nevertheless, compliance with this provision is not discretionary. The DPU may not proceed to implement any change in the water rates of customers without it. If the Board fails to do so, ACLS and other adversely affected customers may be forced to consider other actions to enforce their legal right to further proceedings on this proposal in front of the Norwich City Council, and the assent of the Council by ordinance to any changes in water rates.

II. The Proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases are Unjust and Unreasonable.

The Board has been charged with the difficult duty of evaluating the proposal made by the DPU to increase water and sewer rates. In exercising its authority to review water rates, the Board is subject to certain legal standards set forth in Chapter XII, §10 of the Norwich City Charter. That provisions states that "such rate shall be just, reasonable, and compensatory and shall be uniform for all consumers in the same class, but different rate schedules may be applied to different classes of consumers as determined by the Board." When the Board acts in its capacity as the sewer authority in reviewing sewer rates, it is governed by Section 7-255(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes. That provision grants water pollution control authorities the power to "establish and revise fair and reasonable charges for connection with and for the use of a sewage system." The statute further specifies that a water pollution control authority may "classify the property connected or to be connected with the sewer system and the uses of such system, including categories of industrial users," and authorizes the Board to give consideration to "any factors relating to the kind, quality or extent of use of any such property or classification of property or users...."

As a result of these provisions, it is clear that the Board and the City Council in their respective roles have an obligation to determine that proposed rate increases have been justified by the DPU and will not be unreasonable in their impact on customers. ACLS does not believe that the information provided by the DPU fulfills these requirements.

A. The Proposed Water and Sewer Rates Will Have An Unreasonable Impact on the Business Community.

At the public hearing held on April 24, 2012, the Board received public comment or correspondence from close to two dozen businesses expressing their serious concerns about the financial impact and unreasonable nature of the water and sewer increases. This proposal is not taking place in a vacuum. All over the country, state and local utility

boards are being asked to balance the needs of public utilities to improve operations and maintain facilities against the limited resources of their customers in a difficult economy.

These concerns are particularly important here in Southeastern Connecticut. This winter, it was reported that the Norwich-New London region is one of nine metropolitan areas in the nation most devastated by the recession. A study which was conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors reported that more than 10,000 jobs had been lost here during the recession and this area is not expected to recover those lost jobs until after 2018. The state reported that this area lost an additional 1,100 jobs in March alone, so the downturn continues to affect businesses and residents served by the DPU.

ACLS is symbolic of the business customers of the DPU who are being asked to bear the brunt of these increases. ACLS business operations could be seriously harmed by these rate increases. The company employs 200 workers at its plant in the Stanley Israelite Business Park and provides laundry services to casinos, hotels and other institutions throughout the northeast. It is one of the City's largest employers and also one of the largest water and sewer customers of the DPU.

At the public hearing, company officials reported that the rates proposed by the DPU would result in ACLS paying an additional \$110,000 next year in increased water and sewer charges. This \$110,000 increase would be almost 4% of the total amount of \$3,175,000 which the DPU projects it would raise in additional annual revenue from these changes. When coupled with the prior DPU sewer upgrade fee imposed several years ago, ACLS is being asked to pay around \$650,000 next year for the exact same amount of water and sewer it purchased for \$435,000 in 2010. That is about a 50% increase in a fixed expense in a little more than two years.

ACLS is joined by many other concerned businesses. At the hearing, one Norwich property owner which is struggling to provide workforce housing for area residents described to the Board the difficulties it would have absorbing these rate increases or passing them along to tenants. He described the rate increase as "unconscionable". Similarly, a leading area manufacturer and employer in Sprague informed the Board that it faced well over \$100,000 in sewer rate increases alone if the proposal went through. Other Norwich businesses like car washes, restaurants, athletic facilities and shopping centers face increases of 5, 10 or \$20,000 based on a review of the new rates and their existing water and sewer uses. Finally, family owned businesses and entrepreneurs face increases that could make the difference between success and failure, and could force price increases on Norwich customers.

At a time when the City is exploring new ways to support existing businesses and improve the business climate, the Norwich DPU is sending the wrong message to employers. We strongly doubt that Flint, Michigan or Reno, Nevada, two cities that join Norwich-New London on the list of the nation's struggling communities, are supporting utility rate increases as part of their economic development recovery strategy. In view of these considerations, it is clear that the proposed increases are not reasonable as required

by the Norwich City Charter for water rates and as required by the Connecticut General Statutes for sewer rates.

B. The DPU Has Failed to Justify the Rate Increase or Demonstrate that Such a Large Rate Increase is Necessary.

The proposal before the Board and also the City Council would require rate payers to pay an additional \$63,000,000 for water and sewer usage over the next 20 years if approved. That is a lot of money. The Board and the City Council are required by the applicable legal provisions to establish "just" rates. Just rates need to be justified. Water rates are also required by the Charter to be "compensatory" or in other words, to provide sufficient funds to compensate the DPU for reasonable operating expenses, capital costs and a rate of return, but not to provide excess funds.

Independent and thorough scrutiny of rate proposals is particularly important for municipal utilities, which are not required to submit a formal rate application and cost studies to the Public Utility Regulatory Authority like the many private water, gas and electric companies regulated by the state. In addition, there is no independent body like the Office of Consumer Counsel to make sure that the interests of residential and business customers are aggressively represented at rate proceedings. There should be, therefore, clear proof not supposition that these rate increases are necessary.

In support of its proposal, the DPU has presented two arguments for consideration by the Board and the City Council. The first argument is that the rate increases are necessary to pay for a lengthy list of required capital improvement projects to the water infrastructure, repay some internal loans, establish financial reserves required by state lenders, and complete certain technology upgrades to the sewer system. The second argument made by the DPU is that the resulting water and sewer rates would be comparable to those charged by some other local utilities in the area for residential customers. We believe that the information provided in support of these arguments is incomplete and does not support the DPU's conclusions proposed.

At the workshop which the Board held with the City Council on May 1, 2012, the DPU presented lists of recently completed capital projects, major projects to be funded in fiscal year 2013 capital budget, and projects already approved by the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. These three categories of projects, which have already been completed or are fully ready to proceed, will cost the DPU approximately \$10.5 Million (exclusive of any grants received). See DPU Presentation dated May 1, 2012, ("Presentation"), Slides 7-9. The DPU also identified in its Presentation five additional capital improvement projects to the water system totaling \$9.6 Million. See Presentation, Slide 10. However, the DPU told the Council that these additional \$9.6 Million in capital improvements are still awaiting the approval of the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. More important, it was noted that the proposed water rate increases do not include any funding or debt service for these additional five projects. The council was informed that another water rate increase might be needed in a year or two if these other 9.6 Million in projects proceed as anticipated.

Based on this information, the DPU has still not explained how it is going to use most of the \$63 million it is going to raise over the next 20 years through the planned water and sewer increases. So far, the DPU has only stated that it needs the money to:

- (1) Cover the cost of debt service on a twenty year state loan at 2% interest for the \$10.6 Million of approved water infrastructure projects, which should require about \$14 or \$15 million of expenditures over the next 20 years;
- (2) Make \$820,000 of internal financial adjustments including repaying an internal loan from the electric division to the water division, repaying an operating deficit incurred by the water division in prior years, and establishing a drinking water reserve fund; and
- (3) Spend an unspecified amount to complete technology upgrades to the sewer system and improve sewer maintenance.

There is a large gap, therefore, between the \$63 Million of revenue to be raised over the next 20 years from these rate increases and the established financial needs of the DPU. One possible explanation is that the Department intends to accumulate a large amount of cash through these rate increases to use for the wastewater improvement project or for other purposes which have not yet been disclosed. The 5 year financial forecast for the water division provided to the City Council shows that the cash balance of the water division (after funding necessary reserves) will grow over the next 5 years from \$149,041 in 2013 to an estimated \$4.5 Million in 2017. It is not clear from that forecast how much additional money will accumulate in the 15 years after that, but based on the projected annual operating income of the water division, the accumulated cash could grow to \$10 Million, \$20 Million or more within this time period. See Presentation, Slide 14.

We believe that the business community and citizens, who are being asked to pay higher rates, need to know what the entire \$63 Million of new water and sewer revenue is going to be used for. The DPU should not unilaterally accumulate funds for future, unannounced and unapproved projects or expenditures.

It is also unfortunate that the DPU chose to provide such little notice of these projects and rate increases to the public and key accounts. This is difficult to understand since all of these water and sewer projects have been planned for years. Instead of communicating with customers over the past few years about its plans and working with the City Council to identify alternative approaches to funding, the DPU's timetable was to announce, discuss, vote and implement the rate increases in about 80 days. There still has been no notice provided to individual customers in their monthly bills. This lack of communication, planning, transparency, and the absence of demonstrable financial need creates an unstable business environment and establishes that the proposed rate increases should be rejected.

A second argument made by the DPU to justify the proposed rate increases is that the monthly residential water bill for an average DPU customer will be \$43.08, which is in between the low charge of \$30.99 and the high charge of \$59.84 established by some other local water companies. See Presentation, Slide 16. The DPU also pointed out that the monthly residential sewer bill resulting from the proposed rate increase (including the upgrade fee from several years ago) will cost the average residential rate payer approximately \$52 a month. This is higher than nine of the other ten area sewer authorities surveyed by the DPU. See Presentation, Slide 21.

We do not believe these comparisons justify the proposed rates for a very important reason. No information has been provided as to how the DPU's rates for various classes of commercial and industrial customers will compare with other utilities. From its own experience, ACLS knows that its water and sewer costs in New Jersey are substantially less than what they would be in Norwich under this proposal. In New Jersey, ACLS pays \$2.74 per 100 Cubic Feet for sewerage, while the DPU's proposal would require it to pay a combined usage and upgrade charge of \$6.03 per 100 Cubic Feet. Similarly, ACLS pays \$2.26 per 100 Cubic Feet in New Jersey for water, while the DPU is proposing \$3.20 here.

The failure of the DPU to present the Board or the Council with any comparable information on how much businesses in other nearby communities are charged for water and sewer services is a glaring omission.

In summary, the proposed rates are not "just" and have not been justified or explained.

III. Conclusion.

ACLS believes it is unfortunate that businesses in this community have been forced to take such a strong position in opposition to the proposals made by the DPU. We recognize that the close relationship between the utility and the City is very helpful in numerous respects including providing significant support for the City budget and ensuring local leadership. There is a real advantage to the community to have a group of dedicated volunteers to serve on the Board who are charged with performing the role of independent oversight for the DPU.

In times like these, however, it is more important than ever that appropriate procedures be followed and that rate increases that will have a significant impact on the business community and residents are closely scrutinized. We urge the Board to comply with the applicable provisions of the Norwich City Charter and the Code of Ordinances by referring any proposed water rate increase to the Norwich City Council for consideration and possible assent. We further urge you to reject the proposed water and sewer rate increases on the grounds that they would have an unreasonable impact on customers, they have not been shown to be financially necessary or required for the operation of the DPU, and they would undermine the business climate in the community.

Thank you for your consideration of this information and arguments.

Sincerely,



Glenn T. Carberry
Counsel for ACLS New England, Inc.

cc: Board of Utility Commissioners
Norwich City Council

*****end of letter*****

Chairman Sullivan asked three times for any additional comment from the public. Hearing none, he declared the public comment period closed at 6:13 p.m.

Item 3. Minutes of the Regular April Meeting held on Tuesday, April 24, 2012. Vice Chairman Boisclair, seconded by Commissioner Goldman moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular April Meeting held on Tuesday, April 24, 2012, as written. 4 approved, 1 abstention (Groner).

Chairman Sullivan added that Commissioner Groner had the option of voting or abstaining from voting on the action items for the meeting, based on his status as a new Board member.

Item 4. Action Items.

a) Organization of the Board. Secretary Remondi, seconded by Vice Chairman Boisclair moved to keep the current organization of the Board the same. 4 approved, 1 abstention (Groner).

b) Approval of Water Rates. Chairman Sullivan, seconded by Vice Chairman Boisclair moved to approve the water rates. Chairman Sullivan then asked if there was any discussion. Discussion followed. Chairman Sullivan then asked for a motion.

Commissioner Goldman, seconded by Secretary Remondi moved to amend the motion by changing the effective dates and rate percentages to reflect an 18% increase to water rates effective July 1, 2012 and a 16% increase to water rates effective January 1, 2013.

Chairman Sullivan stated that it has been proposed to amend the motion by changing the water rate schedule to reflect an 18% increase to water rates effective July 1, 2012 and a 16% increase to water rates effective January 1, 2013.

Chairman Sullivan then called for further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the amended water rates. The voting was as follows: 4 approved, 1 abstention (Groner).

**NORWICH PUBLIC UTILITIES
WATER RATE**

(effective for all bills rendered on or after July 1, 2012)

Available to all metered customers, whether Residential, Commercial or Industrial.

Applicable to the following rates: WRES, WCOM, WIND, WNPU, WPUB

RATE:

Customer Charge: The monthly customer charge shall be determined by the size of the customer's meter installation as follows:

<u>Size of Meter</u>	<u>Charge per Month</u>
5/8 inch	\$14.89
3/4 inch	\$17.86
1 inch	\$27.28
1 1/4 inch	\$66.81
1 1/2 inch	\$66.81
2 inch	\$117.12
3 inch	\$217.51
4 inch	\$360.81
6 inch	\$586.94
8 inch & over	\$864.02

Water Usage Charge (All meter sizes): \$2.79 per 100 Cubic Feet (CCF)

Private Fire Line Charge: Billed monthly based on the size of the unmetered fire connection(s) to NPU water mains:

<u>Connection Size</u>	<u>Charge per Month</u>
2, 3 or 4" connection 1 st connection	\$19.39
Each additional connection	\$13.48
6" connection 1 st connection	\$40.42
Each additional connection	\$22.69
8" connection 1 st connection	\$67.74
Each additional connection	\$45.05
10" connection 1 st connection	\$71.59
Each additional connection	\$47.54
12" connection 1 st connection	\$103.17
Each additional connection	\$68.51
Private Hydrants:	\$13.48

MINIMUM CHARGE: The minimum charge is the Customer Charge. All active water accounts having no water use charges will be billed a minimum charge. This minimum charge covers costs associated with service requirements, including metering, maintenance and infrastructure costs.

LATE CHARGE FEE: A penalty charge equal to 1.5% of the unpaid balance compounded monthly is added to all bills not paid within 25 days of the billing date.

EFFECTIVE: For bills rendered on or after July 1, 2012

**NORWICH PUBLIC UTILITIES
WATER RATE**

(effective for all bills rendered on or after January 1, 2013)

Available to all metered customers, whether Residential, Commercial or Industrial.
Applicable to the following rates: WRES, WCOM, WIND, WNPU, WPUB

RATE:

Customer Charge: The monthly customer charge shall be determined by the size of the customer's meter installation as follows:

<u>Size of Meter</u>	<u>Charge per Month</u>
5/8 inch	\$17.48
3/4 inch	\$22.79
1 inch	\$32.49
1 1/4 inch	\$79.48
1 1/2 inch	\$79.48
2 inch	\$139.62
3 inch	\$263.08
4 inch	\$470.23
6 inch	\$930.53
8 inch & over	\$1,375.98

Water Usage Charge (All meter sizes): \$3.20 per 100 Cubic Feet (CCF)

Private Fire Line Charge: Billed monthly based on the size of the unmetered fire connection(s) to NPU water mains:

<u>Connection Size</u>	<u>Charge per Month</u>
2, 3 or 4" connection 1 st connection	\$22.48
Each additional connection	\$15.62
6" connection 1 st connection	\$46.85
Each additional connection	\$26.31
8" connection 1 st connection	\$78.54
Each additional connection	\$52.23
10" connection 1 st connection	\$83.00
Each additional connection	\$55.12
12" connection 1 st connection	\$119.60
Each additional connection	\$79.43
Private Hydrants:	\$15.62

MINIMUM CHARGE: The minimum charge is the Customer Charge. All active water accounts having no water use charges will be billed a minimum charge. This minimum charge covers costs associated with service requirements, including metering, maintenance and infrastructure costs.

LATE CHARGE FEE: A penalty charge equal to 1.5% of the unpaid balance compounded monthly is added to all bills not paid within 25 days of the billing date.

EFFECTIVE: For bills rendered on or after January 1, 2013.

c) Approval of FY13 Budget. Secretary Remondi, seconded by Commissioner Goldman moved to approve the FY13 Budget. Chairman Sullivan then asked if there was any discussion. Secretary Remondi, seconded by Commissioner Goldman moved to amend the budget to reflect the approved water rate increase. Chairman Sullivan, seconded by Vice Chairman Boisclair moved to approve the amended FY13 Budget. 4 approved, 1 abstention (Groner).

d) Approval of Gas Expansion Bond Ordinance. Commissioner Sullivan, seconded by Secretary Remondi moved to approve the Gas Expansion Bond Ordinance. Discussion followed. Chairman Sullivan stated that he believed his vote on this ordinance was not a conflict of interest given that his street is on the list as a potential project. Chairman Sullivan then called for a vote. Unanimously approved.

Item 5. Financial Report. Informative.

Item 6. Strategic Presentations. Gas Bond Expansion Presentation. Mike Hughes presented the Board with information on the Gas Bond Expansion Program. Informative.

Item 7. General Business. None.

Vice Chairman Boisclair, seconded by Secretary Remondi moved to recess the Board Meeting at 7:34 p.m. and enter into the Sewer Authority meeting. Unanimously approved.

The meeting resumed at 8:01 p.m.

Item 8. Executive Session. Secretary Remondi, seconded by Commissioner Goldman moved to enter into Executive Session at 8:02 p.m. to Discuss Confidential Trade Secret & Commercially Valuable Confidential or Proprietary Information Not Subject to Inspection or Public Disclosure Pursuant to Section 1-210[5] and 7-232a of the CT General Statutes. Unanimously approved. General Manager Bilda was asked by the Board to stay for the purpose of providing proprietary information.

The Board arose from Executive Session at 8:25 p.m.

There were no votes taken during Executive Session.

Item 9. Other Business.

- a) General Manager Bilda provided a summary of the changes to the bargaining unit agreement for the IBEW Local 457 union representing NPU employees. Vice Chairman Boisclair, seconded by Commissioner Goldman moved to approve the changes to the bargaining unit agreement as presented. Unanimously approved.
- b) General Manager Bilda provided a summary of the changes to the bargaining unit agreement for the United Steelworkers union representing NPU employees. Commissioner Goldman, seconded by Vice Chairman Boisclair, moved to approve the changes to the bargaining unit agreement as presented. Unanimously approved.

Item 10. The next Regular Meeting is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, June 26, 2012.

Secretary Remondi, seconded by Vice Chairman Boisclair moved to adjourn the Meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Attest:

Alan Remondi
Secretary