

**TOWN OF WALLINGFORD
WALLINGFORD ARPA APPLICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
129 Center Street (HUBCAP)
Wallingford, CT -6492**

**Wednesday, March 22, 2023
6:30 p.m.**

DRAFT UNAPPROVED RECORD OF VOTES AND MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was said. Members in attendance were Carl Bonamico; Mike Brodinsky, Chair; Craig Fishbein; Robert Fritz (remote); Bob Gross; Jacqueline McNamee; Christopher Regan; Jesse Reynolds; and Amy Walsh.

Abstentions: Carl Bonamico for R. Pelton Tools, LLC; Craig Fishbein for Tee It Up, LLC and Parent & Parent, LLP.

Members of the public: LJMM Corporation, Ultracoin Laudramat

Updates

Future meeting dates were agreed upon as March 29th, April 3rd, April 5th, and April 18th.

Mr. Brodinsky stated that based on what is in the portal now, we might be able to finish the non-profits in one more meeting. For the remaining business applications, he estimated that a meeting and a half would be enough to cover them.

Discussion and possible action on the following grant applications:

Mr. Brodinsky explained that a passing average score is 70. If an application passes that threshold this committee sends a message to the government recommending funding.

LJMM Corporation (known as Westbrook Lobster House)

Ms. Walsh outlined the application. They were significantly impacted by COVID. They are proposing to renovate the outdoor dining area which got a lot of use during COVID. Their revenues are not back to pre-pandemic levels. This is the type of documentation we like to see. They included a detailed construction quote. They demonstrate that the project will assist the business in long-term recovery.

Committee comments on this application included:

- They received PPP.
- They did not report any other federal or grant money.
- They may need permitting which could delay the project.
- Negatively affected by COVID.
- Thorough application.
- Concern that this is already under contract and the Town may want multiple quotes.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	73	Gross:	75
Bonamico:	82	McNamee:	90
Fishbein:	80	Regan:	85
Fritz:	90	Reynolds:	85
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	92

The average score is 83.56

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of LMM Corporation in the amount of \$25,000.

**Made by: Mr. Brodinsky
Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein**

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

**Ayes: 9
Nays: 0
Recusals: 0
Absent: 1
Motion carries**

Micromod Automation and Control, LLC

Mr. Gross outlined the application. He noted that based on the criteria they need to be in business in January 2019. This business registered with the State on May 13, 2019, under a different name. It was clarified that the criteria state that the business existed in January 2019 and is presently operational. Their principle location is in Glastonbury but they have a facility in Wallingford. They are looking to buy additional stock. The business is running at a loss, so he’s not sure it’s a sustainable business.

Committee comments on this application included:

- Difficulty matching how they explain the pandemic affected them and what they are using the money for.
- The tax return doesn’t perfectly match the application.
- The tax returns appear to show that the business bounced back.
- They received PPP and EIDL grants.
- The revenues didn’t reflect an adverse effect from COVID.
- It would be a stronger application if they were buying equipment or tools.
- Didn’t see the economic hardship.
- Would have liked more detail on what they want to buy.
- They were impacted by COVID.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	52	Gross:	60
Bonamico:	62	McNamee:	70
Fishbein:	55	Regan:	58
Fritz:	75	Reynolds:	65
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	65

The average score is 63.56

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend no further action in the matter of Micromod Automation and Control, LLC.

**Made by: Mr. Brodinsky
Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein**

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

**Ayes: 9
Nays: 0
Recusals: 0
Absent: 1
Motion carries**

R. Pelton Tools, LLC
Carl Bonamico Recused

Mr. Brodinsky noted that the application is incomplete due to the lack of tax returns. Committee members agreed.

Motion to recommend no further favorable action in the matter of R. Pelton Tools, LLC because the application is incomplete (no tax returns nor CPA-issued P&L).

**Made by: Mr. Brodinsky
Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein**

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Recused	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

**Ayes: 8
Nays: 0
Recusals: 1**

Absent: 1
Motion carries

Quality Used Cars, LLC

Mr. Regan outlined the application. They have been in business for 12 years at this location. They do service and sales of used vehicles. There is no appreciable loss of revenue as far as sales go, but the application is partly ineligible. UHY and the rules state that loan repayments are not allowed with ARPA funds. The total request is \$25,000 of a \$67,000 program which mostly consists of loan repayments. The rent and vendor bills are allowable. That leaves a \$9,000 request. They intend to set aside some money for an emergency which is also not in the spirit of the ARPA funds. They provided thorough documentation. He proposed considering funding them with \$9,000.

Committee comments on this application included:

- Difficult to understand the application
- Okay with the reduced amount.
- Lack of clarity.
- Temporary fix.
- Don't see the financial adversity.
- Substantial growth in the gross in this period.

Consensus to score based on a grant of \$9,000.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	27	Gross:	35
Bonamico:	60	McNamee:	60
Fishbein:	31	Regan:	50
Fritz	70	Reynolds:	50
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	33

The average score is 46.22

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend no further favorable action in the matter of Quality Used Cars, LLC.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Tee It UP, LLC

Craig Fishbein was recused.

Mr. Reynolds outlined the application. They do custom embroidery, screen printing, ASI promotional sales, etc., and have been in Wallingford for 27 years. Business slowed during COVID and they had to lay off staff. After COVID they are unable to get staff back. They had a substantial drop in gross income in 2020 and have recovered almost back to their 2019 level. They are asking for \$25,000 and use it to add staff. This is just part of the total program cost.

Committee comments on this application included:

- Difficult going through all the financial information.
- Impacted by COVID.
- Good company in the community
- The money will be invested in the business
- Received PPP
- They have increased the number of employees
- A significant loss in 2020

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	72	Gross:	65
Bonamico:	79	McNamee:	80
Fishbein:	recused	Regan:	70
Fritz	80	Reynolds:	70
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	75

The average score is 73.88

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of Tee It Up in the amount of \$25,000.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Bonamico

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Recused	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0

Recusals: 1

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Ultracoin Laundromat, LLC #2

Mr. Bonamico outlined the application. This small business started in 2018. These businesses invest in machinery and appliances. They took a significant loss in 2019, and a small loss in 2020, and the business picked up in 2021. There is not a lot of detail but they included the pricing of the equipment they intend to purchase.

Committee comments on this application included:

- No question they were impacted.
- Confused by the taxes and separating this application from the other one.
- If you take out the depreciation the business is growing.
- The application doesn't match the tax return.
- Not a temporary fix.
- Don't see a business in distress

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	56	Gross:	60
Bonamico:	73	McNamee:	70
Fishbein:	65	Regan:	75
Fritz	70	Reynolds:	70
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	77

The average score is 68.44

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend no further favorable action in the matter of Ultracoin Laundromat #2.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Ultracoin Laundromat, LLC #1

Mr. Brodinsky outlined the application. This is a similar business but the financials look different. It has been closed recently. The business largely bounced back since 2019. They are asking for \$25,000. One new machine would cost \$16,705, so he proposed reducing the grant to that amount. They made more in 2021 than they did pre-pandemic.

Committee comments on this application included:

- They received PPP
- Suggest condition the purchase of the machine for this specific facility/address.
- The tax returns for the two applications are mixed up.
- Clarify that there are two businesses at two different locations
- They were impacted by COVID.
- Would score higher with the reduced amount

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	72	Gross:	65
Bonamico:	70	McNamee:	75
Fishbein:	55	Regan:	72
Fritz:	80	Reynolds:	75
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	75

The average score is 71.00

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of Ultracoin Laundromat #1 in the amount of \$25,000.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Bonamico

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Kodiak Athletics, LLC

Mr. Brodinsky outlined the application. The tax returns show growth from 2019 to 2021. Their expenses went up. The fitness industry was hit hard by the pandemic. They are not out of the woods yet. The request is for \$25,000.

Committee comments on this application included:

- One of the industries hit hard.
- Liked the level of detail.
- Appreciate the itemized quotes
- Not clear how the equipment got damaged and needs to be replaced.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	79	Gross:	75
Bonamico:	79	McNamee:	100
Fishbein:	70	Regan:	80
Fritz:	80	Reynolds:	75
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	90

The average score is **80.89**

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of Kodiak Athletics in the amount of \$25,000.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Parent & Parent, LLP

Craig Fishbein was recused.

Mr. Fritz outlined the application. This is a law firm that has been in Wallingford for 15 years that caters to high-value tax resolutions. During COVID they lost a substantial amount of their business due to the issues with the IRS. They went from 18 employees in 2019 to 3 currently. They had a substantial drop in revenue and have not recovered. They are looking to re-establish the business and align in a different direction. They want to convert to a tax advisory firm. They want to put the \$25,000 toward hiring an accountant.

Committee comments on this application included:

- They received PPP loans and an EDL loan

- Not a lot of detail
- Took a hit from COVID
- It's a pivot due to the pandemic
- Not sure they can do it in 12 months
- Extremely affected in 2019 and 2020.
- Concern with the 2020 tax returns

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	76	Gross:	80
Bonamico:	87	McNamee:	85
Fishbein:	recused	Regan:	65
Fritz:	90	Reynolds:	75
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	78

The average score is 79.5

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of Parent & Parent, LLP in the amount of \$25,000.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Bonamico

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Recused	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0

Recusals: 1

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Showstopper Entertainment

Mr. Brodinsky stated that the application is incomplete because it lacks a 2019 tax return. Committee members agreed. There was a question on the difference between a transcript and a tax return. Mr. Brodinsky explained that due to the Council's action last night, the consultant would be instructed to go get the tax return in these cases. It was also noted that the tax returns that were included were redacted too much.

Motion to recommend no further action in the matter of Showstoppers Entertainment because the application is incomplete (neither a 2019 tax return nor a CPA-issued P&L).

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Robert James Salon, LLC

Mr. Gross outlined the application. This is a hair salon that was impacted by COVID. They received some PPP. They moved in 2021. They are asking for \$25,000, but according to UHY, \$5,000 of that is not eligible. Advertising is not an allowable use of ARPA funds. There was a discussion on reducing the grant. The consensus was to score it at the full amount.

Committee comments on this application included:

- No backup for what the money will be used for.
- Not sure what the funds will be paying for.
- This business was close to the edge in 2019
- Particularly hit by COVID
- Hasn't come back all the way yet.
- Would have liked more detail on the use

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	78	Gross:	75
Bonamico:	80	McNamee:	85
Fishbein:	70	Regan:	73
Fritz:	80	Reynolds:	70
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	80

The average score is 76.78

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend further favorable action in the matter of Robert James Salon, LLC in the amount of \$25,000.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
-------------------	------------	---------------	------------

Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	Yes
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 9
Nays: 0
Recusals: 0
Absent: 1
Motion carries

Rental Housing Property, LLC

Ms. McNamee outlined the application. During COVID his renter was unable to pay the rent and did damage to the apartment. He is requesting \$6,000 to make repairs and upgrades so he can rent it out. The financials show a significant loss between 2019 and 2021. He did receive a grant covering 10 months of lost rent and an EIDL grant. There was a discussion on whether this is truly a business or just a rental property. Sole proprietors are allowed by the criteria.

Committee comments on this application included:

- Not sure a landlord with one apartment is a business in the way the Town Council intended.
- Modest ask.
- Not sure it's a long-term recovery
- Would have liked more detail on the expenses.
- Landlords took a huge financial hit.
- He was trying to remove the tenant before COVID, so it wasn't COVID related.
- It looks like the repairs have already been done.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky:	58	Gross:	50
Bonamico:	80	McNamee:	75
Fishbein:	55	Regan:	65
Fritz:	75	Reynolds:	70
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	65

The average score is 65.89

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend no further favorable action in the matter of Rental Housing Property.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Bonamico

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	Yes
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes

Fritz: Yes Reynolds: Yes
Glidden: absent Walsh: Yes

Ayes: 9
Nays: 0
Recusals: 0
Absent: 1
Motion carries

Posh Coiffure Salon, LLC

Mr. Regan outlined the application. They are asking for \$14,897 for a list of improvements, training, and inventory. They took a hit during COVID and were shut down by the State for 3.5 months. They received PPP loans. They were doing better financially in 2021.

Committee comments on this application included:

- Reasonable ask helping them grow.
- A detailed list of what they would spend the money on.
- They seem to have fully recovered.
- Don't see the current financial adversity.

Score sheets were handed in.

Total Scores:

Brodinsky: 69	Gross: 50
Bonamico: 75	McNamee: 80
Fishbein: 40	Regan: 73
Fritz: 75	Reynolds: 75
Glidden: absent	Walsh: 75

The average score is 69.11

Motion, based on the average score, to recommend no further favorable action in the matter of Posh Coiffure Salon.

Made by: Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by: Mr. Fishbein

Vote:

Brodinsky: Yes	Gross: Yes
Bonamico: Yes	McNamee: Yes
Fishbein: Yes	Regan: Yes
Fritz: Yes	Reynolds: Yes
Glidden: absent	Walsh: Yes

Ayes: 9
Nays: 0
Recusals: 0
Absent: 1
Motion carries

Discussion and possible action on procedural and administrative matters.

Mr. Brodinsky noted that after March 29 there will be 14 non-profit applications left to do. He read the list. He asked if any committee members had questions on the actions of the Council at last night's meeting. He suggested that we transfer four non-profit applications to the Council for their consideration, meaning we don't review them. (Gaylord for \$1M, United Way for \$230,000, Community Health Center for \$317,000, and SCOW for \$226,000) First, these are big-ticket items, and a couple might be problematic. Then we may be able to complete the remaining non-profits in one meeting, possibly on April 3rd. If we can do that, we should be able to finish the business applications during the April 5 and April 18th meetings. We will have completed our work as of the April 18th meeting. Mr. Brodinsky replied that the Council is not bashful to look over these applications, which in some sense signals that what we do isn't very important anyway. He asked for input on passing the four applications on to Council.

Mr. Gross asked how the standard deviation rule they passed last night, will affect these applications we passed tonight and in the future. He recalled that Council stated that 11 for profits would pass based on this standard deviation. So they are going back to look at the others including the ones we reviewed tonight. If Council is going to review everything, why don't we just give them all the remaining non--profits. He noted that none of the Council members have logged into the system and they passed 14 applications last night without looking at them. So what are we doing here?

Mr. Brodinsky noted that the agenda for the March 29th meeting has already been published. He proposed two additional meetings to finish the applications. He asked for input on this suggestion.

Mr. Bonamico asked why expend the effort when it is inevitable that it will go to the Council. He stated that he is in favor of passing the four to the Council.

Ms. McNamee stated that she would rather review the four applications and then make a decision. Mr. Brodinsky noted that the advantage of making the decision tonight is that the Council can address these applications sooner. Ms. McNamee stated that she will go along with the committee if the decision is to move them forward.

Mr. Brodinsky stated that we can hold off on a decision until we meet on March 29th.

Mr. Regan stated that we should send all the non-profit applications directly to the Council. Not limit it to just those four. The non-profits are a politically charged piece. There is a high likelihood that the Council will overturn anything we choose not to recommend. He supports sending the four applications to Council but suggests expanding it to send all non-profit applications.

Mr. Brodinsky clarified that there are now two proposals. 1) Send only the four mentioned applications to Council, and 2) send all remaining non-profit applications to Council. He asked the Committee to comment on those proposals.

Mr. Reynolds suggested asking Council if they want to review the applications. He stated that he was asked to act on behalf of the Council. He's okay with voting to send the four or all of them, but from a decorum standpoint, feels that we should ask what Council wants to do. He is more in favor of asking why we are doing this at all. He would prefer to fulfill his obligation, but that doesn't seem to be possible. He is in favor of reducing our workload, particularly if our decisions will be overturned anyway.

Ms. Walsh liked the idea of passing the four applications forward because they are very large asks. If our recommendations are not going to be followed, why are we here? The March 29th agenda is all non-profits, do we do them? Mr. Brodinsky stated that we would review them since it's scheduled.

Mr. Gross stated that he volunteered to be on this committee and all of us have been conscientious with the tasks. This group has not been political. Everyone came in with an open mind. Each application was reviewed on its merits. After what happened at last night's Council meeting, the majority of the applications we have declined will be passed by the Council. They will pass all the non-profit applications because it is political. That is their prerogative. What are we doing here? He is fine with asking the Council if they want to take the rest of the non-profit applications.

Mr. Fritz stated that he is honored to have served on this committee. It's the timing of the decisions that the Council has made. Circumstances have changed since we were originally charged. He believes that some of the Council members have been dishonest. He doesn't appreciate being a patsy and has much better things to do with his time. Based on what happened last night, he suggests that we give all the non-profit applications to the Council and not hold the review meeting on the 29th. He will honor his commitment to the business that applied but might choose not to participate on the 29th for the non-profit applications because he sees it as a waste of time. He stated that he will support whatever the group decides.

Mr. Fishbein stated that we all recognize the issue with the non-profits, but it doesn't end there. The standard deviation rule will be applied to all the reviewed applications. Business applicants will be encouraged to go directly to the Council. So we will end up in the same place. He agreed that what happened last night was arbitrary since they didn't look at the applications. That was disrespectful to our deliberations and efforts. He supports finishing up the remaining non-profits on the 29th. He stated that after that everything should go to the Council.

Ms. McNamee suggested just approving all the non-profits as the funds are there. They do great work in our town.

Mr. Bonamico stated that the actions of the Council have challenged the integrity of our process. He suggested sending all remaining applications to Council.

Mr. Brodinsky noted that there seems to be a consensus to transfer all the non-profits to Council, including those on the agenda for March 29th.

Mr. Regan stated that if we turn down a non-profit application on the 29th, it will be overturned by Council. If we approve everything they will be rubber-stamped. He suggested just approving those applications and taking no further action on the remaining non-profit applications. Or just approve them all.

Mr. Fishbein stated that would give the impression that we did our due diligence as we have the others. We can give the applications to Council but don't say that we approved them.

Ms. Walsh stated that those scheduled for the March 29th agenda are eager for movement on their applications. She feels bad for them because this has taken a while already. If we say we aren't reviewing anymore and just handing them over to Council, the general public will feel slighted. She would like people to feel that we are actually looking out for their interests.

Mr. Fritz stated that it doesn't matter whether we review applications on the 29th or not. Whether we vote or not, it will sit in a folder until the Town Council reviews it. They will review and take whatever action they choose. Our action doesn't get the money to the applicants any sooner. He stated that he will support what the committee decides to do.

Mr. Brodinsky stated that he favors doing the scheduled schedule of reviews on the 29th because they have already been rescheduled and are getting frustrated. Canceling the review would result in disappointment because they don't understand the context. He proposed going forward with the schedule on the 29th and giving the balance to the Council. He prefers agreeing to send the balance of the non-profit applications to the Council tonight. He asked for any dissenters to this proposal.

Mr. Gross noted that it is not our call. The Council took the wind out of the sails last night. We understood that they can override our recommendations but they said they don't care about what we do. Council members have not looked at any of the applications and yet they approved them.

Mr. Fishbein stated that during the Council meeting, he went through some of the applications and explained why they didn't meet the muster. And that was disregarded.

Mr. Brodinsky acknowledged that no one is happy. He went around the table and the consensus was to proceed with the published agenda for March 29th. He asked if the committee is ready to vote to transfer the remaining 14 non-profit applications to Council.

Ms. McNamee is against transferring more than the 4 big ticket applications directly to Council without review. Mr. Fishbein stated that Council would have to have a special meeting to deal with these applications.

Motion to continue with the March 29th meeting as scheduled and vote to refer the balance of the non-profit applications to the Town Council for their action.

Made By Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded: Mr. Gross

Vote:

Brodinsky:	Yes	Gross:	Yes
Bonamico:	Yes	McNamee:	No
Fishbein:	Yes	Regan:	Yes
Fritz:	Yes	Reynolds:	No
Glidden:	absent	Walsh:	Yes

Ayes: 7

Nays: 2

Recusals: 0

Absent: 1

Motion carries

Mr. Brodinsky suggested deferring a decision on the business applications until the meeting on the 29th. Mr. Gross suggested reaching out to Council to let them know we are struggling with what to do about

the business applications. Mr. Fishbein noted that any business can come to Council and ask for the money and the Council only needs 5 votes to approve it, no matter what it was scored. Mr. Fritz reminded everyone that we are responsible citizens doing volunteer work in a very competent and responsible way for our community. We are not lackeys of a Town Council. We agreed to this task based on the information that was given to us. If they are going to change the rules, then he feels no responsibility or guilt for us also changing the rules.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 9:25 pm

Made by Mr. Brodinsky

Seconded by Mr. Fishbein