

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

JULY 28, 1992

SUMMARY

| <u>Agenda Item</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| Consent Agenda - Items #2a, 2b, 2d & 2e | 2 |
| Items Removed From the Consent Agenda | |
| 2c. Approve Waiving the \$750 Lease Payment for S.C.O.W. for 1992-93 | 3 |
| 3. Approve Minutes of the 6/9/92; 6/10/92; 6/23/92 and 7/7/92 Town Council Meetings | 3 |
| 4. Discussion on the Town Attorney's Opinion of Mr. Killen's Motion to Transfer \$3 million into the Capital and Non-Recurring Account | 4 - 6 |
| 5a. PUBLIC HEARING to Amend the 1992-93 General Fund Revenue and Expenditure Budget in the Amount of \$7,800 to Appropriate Funds to an Account for the Federal Highway Safety Program - 7:15 P.M. - Approved | 2 |
| 5b. Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$7,800 to Federal Grants - Highway Safety Program Account and to Police Department Highway Work Zone Safety Program Acct. | 2 |
| 6. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD - 7:30 P.M. - Sewer Connection Ordinance Enforcement; Benefit Package Audit Request; Martin Avenue Resident Complaint Regarding Traffic Volume | 3 - 4 |
| 7. Discussion on the Elderly Tax Relief Committee Report | 6 - 9 |
| 8. Remove From the Table Naming the Simpson School Study Committee | 9 - 10 |
| 9. Discussion on the Park and Recreation Commission's Need for New and Expanded Recreation Facilities | 10 - 13 |
| 10. Presentation on the Board of Education's Master Plan | 16 - 17 |
| 11. Report Out by the 88 S. Main Street Building Committee | 17 - 22 |
| 12. Approve an Agreement Between the Board of Education and Board of Education Nurses for a Period of Three Years | 23 - 25 |
| 13. Discussion Pertaining to the P&ZC's Ruling on the Bristol Meyers Helipad Application | 13 - 16 |

| <u>Agenda Item</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| 14. Withdrawn | |
| 15. SET A PUBLIC HEARING for August 11, 1992 at 7:45 P.M. to Amend the Board of Education Special Funds Section of the Town Budget in the Amount of \$19,577. | 26 |
| 16. SET A PUBLIC HEARING for August 11, 1992 at 8:00 P.M. to Amend the Board of Education Special Funds Section of the Town Budget in the Amount of \$41,820. | 26 |

Waiver of Rule V

To Honor the Wallingford Girl's Softball Team in their Victory in the "Field of Dreams" Tournament in New Hampshire

1 - 2

To Discuss the Purchase of an Electric Car for the Electric Division

25 - 26

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

JULY 28, 1992

7:00 P.M.

A meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Tuesday, July 28, 1992 in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall and called to Order at 7:05 P.M. by Chairperson Iris F. Papale. All Councilors answered present to the Roll called by Town Clerk Kathryn J. Wall with the exception of Mr. Holmes who was on vacation. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers were also present. Town Attorney Janis M. Small arrived at 7:12 P.M.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

A moment of silence was observed for Dr. Richard Otto, Lyman Hall High School Music Teacher; Charles Kingsland, Former Chairman of the Wallingford Board of Education and Quentin Goodrich, former employee of the Electric Division and Former Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Lufbery Post #591 in Wallingford.

Correspondence was read into the record from the Government Finance Officers Association reporting that the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting has been awarded to the Town of Wallingford and an award of Financial Reporting Achievement has been awarded to Thomas A. Myers, Comptroller.

The Certificate of Achievement is the highest form of recognition in the area of governmental accounting and financial reporting, and its attainment represents a significant accomplishment by a government and its management.

Mr. Myers acknowledged the fact that this achievement could not be possible without the cooperation and dedication from the staff of the Finance Department.

Waive Rule V Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Waive Rule V of the Town Council Meeting Procedures to Honor the Wallingford Girl's Softball Team, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

VOTE: Holmes was absent; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

The team was being honored for winning the "Field of Dreams Tournament" Twelve and Under Division in Manchester, New Hampshire. The team may travel on to compete in Georgia this season.

Stephen Hoag, Head Coach for the team personally introduced and congratulated each of the players in the following order; Jessica Stalmach; Karen Viglione; Jilian Hatch; Alexia Mantzaris; Catherine Mattei; April Guidone; Renee Stanton; Kim Civitillo; Jennifer (JL) Lindsley; Amanda Simjian; Maureen Hoag; Cynthia Papallo; Kathleen Hoag, and Alda Viglione. Each team member received a certificate of recognition signed by both the Mayor and Town Council Chairperson. Each was personally congratulated by the Mayor and Chairperson. The same honor and recognition was bestowed upon the Head Coach, Stephen Hoag; Assistant Coaches Rick Scott, Richard Papallo; Lisa Gawlak; Steve Sacco and Jackie Scott.

ITEM #5a & 5b Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Move Agenda Items #5a & #5b Up to the Next Order of Business, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

ITEM #5a PUBLIC HEARING to Amend the 1992-93 General Revenue Fund and Expenditure Budget in the Amount of \$7,800 to Appropriate Funds to an Account for the Federal Highway Safety Program - 7:15 P.M.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

The only question raised on this issue was by Mr. Killen who asked the Town Attorney why Public Hearings are not scheduled, published and held on transfers as well as budget amendments?

Attorney Small responded that transfers do not change or effect the "bottom line" of the budget as budget amendments do.

Mr. Killen argued the point with Attorney Small.

Atty. Small stated that she has been asked to look at this issue again very closely by the Chairperson Iris Papale. Doing so may not necessarily generate a different opinion on the subject.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #5b Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$7,800 to Federal Grants - Highway Safety Program Acct. #001-1050-050-5883 and to Police Department Highway Work Zone Safety Program Account #001-2003-400-4241 - Mayor's Office

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #2 Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Place the Following Items on the Consent Agenda to be Voted Upon by One Unanimous Affirmative Vote of the Council, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

#2a Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$1,011.00 from Small Equipment Acct. #2036-400-4850 to Partner K-1200 Saw, Acct. #2036-999-9909 - Dept. of Fire Services

#2b Consider and Approve Amending the Personnel Pages of the Water and Sewer Divisions to Reflect an Increase of One Pay Grade for the Position of Laboratory Technician in the Water and Sewer Divisions

#2d Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Apply for Grant Funds for a Community Service Grant Which Supports the S.C.O.W. Organization - Program Planner

#2e Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Application for the Social Services Block Grant Program - Program Planner

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #2c Consider and Approve Waiving the \$750 Lease Payment for the S.C.O.W. 1992-93 Program - Program Planner

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

Mr. Zandri stated that he would vote in opposition of this item because he could not justify charging the Electric Division and Credit Union rent while waiving the lease payment for S.C.O.W.

VOTE: Killen and Zandri, no; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #3 Consider and Approve Minutes of the 6/9/92; 6/10/92; 6/23/92 and 7/7/92 Town Council Meetings.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Approve the Minutes of the 6/9/92 and 6/10/92 Town Council Meetings, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

Mr. Doherty and Mrs. Duryea were on vacation when the 6/23/92 and 7/7/92 Town Council Meetings were held and therefore abstained from voting on them. This explains the reason for breaking the motion into two separate motions.

VOTE: Killen passed; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Parisi to Approve the 6/23/92 and 7/7/92 Town Council Meeting Minutes, seconded by Mr. McDermott.

VOTE: Doherty and Duryea abstained; Killen passed; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Romeo Dorsey, 122 S. Orchard Street felt that \$2 million of the \$16 million Electric Division surplus should be used to restore Community Lake.

He also questioned why the Town has an ordinance on the books which states that a homeowner must connect into the sewer system one year after building a new home and does not enforce it (the ordinance)? He stated that many residents have gone a number of years without connecting into it and nothing is done about it.

His third question was directed to the Mayor. He asked when he would receive reimbursement due him by the Town after he had to hire someone to disperse a berm of dirt that was placed on his property by the Town?

Mayor Dickinson responded that he would research the sewer connection ordinance and get back to Mr. Dorsey on that issue. In regards to Mr. Dorsey's question about his reimbursement the Mayor explained that the Town is hesitant to reimburse Mr. Dorsey due to the fact that the dirt was dispersed on Mr. Dorsey's property and is still located there. How can Mr. Dorsey seek reimbursement for something that he is in possession of and is benefiting from?

Mr. Dorsey insisted that he is entitled to his \$200 spent removing the berm.

Ms. Papale asked that the Mayor and Mr. Dorsey meet privately on this issue to try and resolve it.

Edward Bradley, 2 Hampton Trail requested during the budget sessions that the Mayor have an audit performed of the Town's benefit system. He has yet to see any information on this issue. Was the audit performed?

Mayor Dickinson responded that he is currently awaiting a computer-generated history of claims paid to see if duplicate payments have been made. This will set the groundwork for the audit.

Mr. Bradley will continue to ask for the update at future meetings. He reminded everyone that healthcare benefits are one of the larger expenses to the Town. He pointed out that \$1.4 million has been set aside of the next budget to offset revaluation. That translates to starting off the new fiscal year 1 mill in the hole. He wanted everyone to keep that information in mind. Cutting back on the cost of healthcare to the Town could help reduce the effect.

Ed Gervasi, 22 Martin Avenue stated that a petition has been signed by the residents of Martin Avenue and presented to the Mayor, Chief of Police, Traffic Officer and Housing Authority Director regarding the traffic problems they are experiencing on their street. There has been no response other than a letter acknowledging the petition. There has been no contact from anyone in the Town. There are a lot of children living on the street that are in danger with the traffic flow. He wanted an answer in the near future.

ITEM #4 Discussion on the Town Attorney's Opinion of Mr. Killen's Motion to Transfer \$3 million into the Capital and Non-recurring Account as Requested by Councilor Albert E. Killen.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Begin the Discussion, seconded by Mrs. Duryea.

Mr. Killen made a motion a few months back to transfer \$3 million into the Capital and Non-recurring Fund from surplus accounts within the Town budget. The Mayor requested an opinion from the Town Attorney on the authority of the Town Council to transfer surplus funds to the Capital and Non-recurring Fund. The Town Attorney rendered an opinion on June 23, 1992. In short, in her opinion the State Statutes say that the budget making authority, which is spelled out to be the Mayor, has some input into the implementation of the appropriation. The problem is, according to Mr. Killen, that the Town is governed by an ordinance to put funds into the Capital and Non-recurring Fund. The ordinance itself is not being followed and was found to be invalid a few years back. If we no longer adhere to the 55% contribution from the Electric Division stated in the ordinance, do we decide on this particular ordinance which sections we like and dislike about it?, he asked the Town Attorney.

July 28, 1992

Attorney Small stated that she was not asked to examine the ordinance. She does not have the history around it. She was willing to look at the ordinance and if it impacts on her opinion of the Council's authority, or lack of it, to transfer funds into the Capital and Non-recurring Fund she will inform the Council.

Mr. Killen accused Atty. Small of not researching the issue thoroughly enough. He felt that she should have consulted the Town Charter, applicable ordinances, CT. General Statutes, case law, etc. She should certainly have studied the ordinance pertaining to Capital and Non-recurring Funds, in his opinion, before rendering an opinion in the matter.

The debate continued for quite some time with Atty. Small defending the integrity of her opinion pointing out that she was not requested to review the ordinance pertaining to this issue. Had that request been made to her, she would have done so. She will review it and report back if the ordinance impacts her opinion.

Mr. Zandri asked why the Council cannot vote to approve this transfer and then ask the Mayor to sign it? In other words does the transfer have to be initiated by the Mayor, why can't it be initiated by the Council?

Atty. Small responded that the Council can request the Mayor to make a recommendation to transfer the \$3 million into the Capital and Non-recurring Fund, you can ask him to do anything.

Mr. Zandri felt that is what the Council did when they voted in favor of the transfer.

Atty. Small interpreted the motion as a transfer, not a request for the Mayor to recommend it. Also, no accounts were specified that evening and no paperwork (transfer form) accompanied the action.

Mr. Zandri interprets the Charter to read that the transfer can be initiated by the Council.

Mr. Killen pointed out that that is where the defect is.

Mr. Zandri asked, if a new motion is made stating the purpose of the request along with the source and destination of the transfer of funds clearly stated, and the Council formally requests the Mayor to make a recommendation to transfer the \$3 million, that would be acceptable? The Mayor will either approve or disapprove it?

Mayor Dickinson responded, ordinarily if I don't approve a transfer then it will not go ahead to a meeting. However, being that this is the legislative group, certainly you can discuss it and vote on it lacking a recommendation. It will not go further unless it was signed by him.

Mr. Zandri asked, wouldn't there have to be some sort of response from your office (Mayor) if you decided not to do anything with it? Would you just let it sit there?

Mayor Dickinson answered: I would probably indicate to you that I didn't agree with it. Assuming that it would come to an agenda meeting, it would be discussed there and you would then become aware whether or not I was in agreement or disagreement on the item.

Mr. Zandri: Would you extend the courtesy of giving us your reasons why you would be in disagreement with it?

Mayor Dickinson: Yes, I normally do give reasons. They may not be acceptable, but I do give them.

Mr. Killen argued with Atty. Small over the fact that she is now stating that the Council can make a request to the Mayor for his recommendation on this transfer when, in fact, State Statute clearly states that the recommendation is initiated by the Mayor and the Council votes on it.

Mr. Zandri added, if the only way this transfer can be initiated is by way of the Mayor then the Charter is wrong.

Mr. Killen agreed.

Mayor Dickinson felt that the Council was hung up on semantics. The transfer cannot be effective without a recommendation from the Mayor. Can there be a request from the Council that there be a transfer?, yes, there can be. You are inter-changing request and recommendation as words. It cannot be effective without the Mayor and the Council. The Council, by itself, can request something, as can the Mayor. It requires the other party to make it effective.

Mr. Zandri will make a motion on this issue at the next meeting.

Frank Wasilewski, 57 N. Orchard Street asked, could the Council override the Mayor's decision by a vote of 7-2, similar to the Budget? In other words, the Mayor has the last, or the first word? He felt that suggestion should be researched.

Atty. Small recommended that the Council clearly identify the accounts effected by the transfer.

Since this item was for discussion only no action was taken.

ITEM #7 Discussion on the Elderly Tax Relief Committee Report as Requested by Vice-Chairman David J. Doherty.

Mr. Jonathan Gilchrist stated for the record that he is not the Chairman of the committee, nor was he elected to come before the Council. He just happened to be present this evening.

Mr. Doherty requested Mr. Gilchrist's presence at the meeting since the minutes of the committee reflect that Mr. Gilchrist compiled the final draft of the report.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Gilchrist to explain how the committee came to the conclusion that there was not an outstanding need for this type of program.

July 28, 1992

Mr. Gilchrist stated that the committee did not come to that specific conclusion. They did conclude that there was not a good way or mechanism in place to determine the need. They reviewed information obtained from residents of the Town and, from that information, the committee was unable to justify action on this. The majority of their information was obtained from monitoring the property tax delinquency list.

Mr. Doherty felt that there should be a better mechanism to measure the need for this program. One measurement tool is the statistics showing the number of residents using the State programs. The latest figures reflect that there are 471 people in 1991 who have taken advantage of the "Circuit Breaker" program offered by the State. In addition to this the Assessor, Mr. Barta, indicated that there was a separate program for renters as well. That program had approximately 500-600 renters qualify for the program, in addition to the 471 homeowners. That amounts to more than 1,000 people who qualify for the program which is a good indication of the need for an additional local program. Other towns have the State and local programs. In looking at that information he found that, in some instances, there were more people who were receiving assistance on the local level vs. the State level, i.e., Stratford lists 1,145 on the State program and 1,200 on the local program; Glastonbury has 169 on the State program and 168 on the local credit program; Milford, 848 on the State program and 848 on the local program. That indicates that many of the people who qualify for the State program also are in need of the local program as well. The State statistics are a good measuring tool of the need for the program. The delinquency lists are not. As two committee members noted the elderly will pay their tax bills even at the risk of not eating. There is a strong desire to pay those particular property tax bills than to lose the property. The committee distributed a survey from the Committee on Aging which generated a response from 1,300+-. According to the 1990 census there are 5,769 residents in Wallingford sixty-five years of age and over. The response to the survey was less than half of the number of those residents in that age group. We need to solicit a larger response from that group. Out of the 1,300 responses only 36% was aware of the tax relief programs. The committee recommended that the population needs education on this subject. Mr. Doherty agreed.

Mr. Gilchrist stated that the committee was exposed to all of the statistical information Mr. Doherty referred to and could still not justify the need for a program. The committee feels that they need a better method of collecting needs information. The concern of the committee was, without really good, strong justification for this program, by putting something like this in place, once it is done the horse is out of the barn. We cannot turn the program back off. It is something that this town will live with from now on. Without good, strong justification the committee was hesitant to commit the Town to something that could go on for years and years.

Mr. Doherty explained that the goal of the program would be to keep the elderly in their homes as long as possible. Perhaps a deferral program should be piloted first. It would prove as a "wash" to the Town because we would re-capture those tax dollars at a later date one way or another. In checking with the other towns that offer this type of program it was determined that the participation is very low, in the single digit numbers.

The biggest hang-up is the lien. In order for the town to protect itself under the referral program and re-capture the taxes later on it must place a lien on the land records. To many people in that age group this is a frightening experience.

Mr. Gilchrist stated that the committee did not disagree with that philosophy, there clearly just was not enough information to make that justification to go ahead. We did discuss tax forgiveness and tax deferral programs. The consensus within the committee was that the deferral program made a lot more sense, however, the number of participants would not necessarily justify the implementation of such a program. There are administrative costs associated with the program as well. The committee felt that it was prudent to try and identify the need better and the educate the population on the State programs available.

Mr. Zandri was sympathetic to the fact that the elderly population is living on a fixed income but he did not support a tax break, rather a deferral plan instead. It gives them the break at a time that they need it the most and transfers the burden to the heirs.

Mr. Doherty referred to CT. General Statute #12-129n, Optional municipal property tax relief program for certain homeowners age sixty-five or over or permanently and totally disabled. The Statute enables the Council to provide property tax relief by a majority vote. Prior to approval by the fiscal body, a committee shall be appointed by the executive authority of the municipality to undertake and complete within a period of not in excess of sixty days following their appointment, a study and investigation with respect to such property tax relief and prepare a report to be presented to the fiscal body. He asked, if the committee comes forth with a recommendation against such program, is the fiscal body bound by the report or not?

Mayor Dickinson responded, his guess is yes. If the committee does not recommend anything, how is there anything on the table for the Council to act on? This issue was looked at twice and the recommendations are the same both times. The committee was comprised of the following members; Johanna Fishbein; Madeline Erskine; Frank Wasilewski; Jonathan Gilchrist and Frank Francesconi, all of whom are concerned, active citizens in town. The finding of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. Parisi felt that the committee did not state that they do not want to continue to investigate the need for a tax relief program. He thought that their recommendation that the Assessor send out requests for those interested citizens, along with educational information was viable. The door is still open to pursue this matter. The committee did not close it in any way. The Assessor was investigating the cost of the mailing.

Mr. Wasilewski pointed out that the committee's charge was to take care of the property owners, not renters. There are many local programs for the elderly, i.e., meals on wheels; food pantry, etc. The "Circuit Breaker" program is going to be discontinued in a year or two by the State. The \$300 flat fee State program is going to be changed to a tax deferral program. He noted that none of the elderly were out in force at this meeting to fight for their cause.

July 28, 1992

He recommended spending more money on the VNA and Sr. Citizen Center. The program would cost the Town approximately \$700,000 to make it work.

Peter Gouveia, 39 Lincoln Drive Ext. reminded everyone that he, too, requested this option be reviewed in May of 1990. At that time it took eleven (11) months for the Mayor to appoint the committee and a mere three (3) weeks for the final report. That report showed that four hundred and sixty-three people were in need of the program, thirteen (13) were in arrears. The committee concluded that there was no need for a tax break at that time. He does not advocate a tax break, rather a deferral program.

He went on to say that one of the duties of the committee under State Statute was to study and report out on the impact that the program would have on the municipality. The committee did not do so because they determined there was no need for such a program.

Mr. Zandri felt that the committee should have determined whether or not a need existed for the program.

Mr. Gilchrist did not feel that was the charge to the committee. He feels that the Town should not become partners in the real estate business due to tax deferrals. The banks offer reverse mortgages.

Mr. Zandri felt that the banks should not be responsible for taking care of the elderly.

Mr. Parisi commended Mr. Wasilewski for a thorough, professional report.

The Assessor will mail out letters to the senior citizens indicating the availability of programs offered by the State to help them with their taxes.

There was no action taken.

ITEM #8 Remove From the Table the Naming of the Simpson School Study Committee as Requested by Vice-Chairman David J. Doherty

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. McDermott.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

The following is a list of names of the individuals who have come forward to volunteer their time for the committee:

| | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Susan Duryea | Johanna Fishbein |
| Ed Gervasi | Charles Johnson |
| Bernadette D. Renda | Ilene Valintas |
| Jon Walworth | |

The Chair declared a five minute recess at this time.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to appoint these individuals to the Simpson School Study Committee, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

The Temporary Chairman will be Mr. Charles Johnson until the committee elects one.

Mr. Doherty suggested that part of the charge of this committee could be to investigate other possible sites for the recreation department.

Mr. Zandri felt that it should be determined whether or not the recreation department can stay where they are first. If it is proven that they can't then the committee can begin to look at other possible sites. The charge of this committee should be to find out whether or not the recreation department can stay where they are and what costs are associated with the renovation of that building to accommodate that department.

Edward Gervasi, 22 Martin Ave., asked why waste money on a committee when we already know that we don't have money for the recreation department? We are ahead of ourselves, we have not yet discussed the problems on agenda this evening. He felt that the committee was biased by having four individuals from the Park and Recreation Department and only two from Martin Avenue, but he will deal with it. The fact of the matter is that we should not be wasting the time and energy on a discussion if it is a known fact that we do not have the money to go ahead with what needs to be done.

Mr. Zandri disagreed that there is not money available. There is money in this town, in reserves alone, that could handle the problem and straighten out Simpson School. That should not be a deterrent from keeping this committee from going forward.

Ms. Papale explained that the sole purpose of the Simpson School Study Committee is not for the Recreation Department's space problem but to see if there is a use for the school or renovate it all together. Mr. Doherty made a motion to Table the Charge of the Committee, seconded by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Parisi and Solinsky, no; all others aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #9 Discussion on the Park and Recreation Commission's Need for New and Expanded Recreation Facilities - Town Council

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mrs. Duryea.

Mr. Charles Johnson, 10 Holly Lane, Chairman of the Parks & Recreation Commission stated that he was instructed by the commissioners to write a letter to the Council regarding their needs and the following problems were identified:

- there can be no expansion of programs because of lack of space;
- a parking problem exists with up to four hundred (400) cars per day using a small parking lot, with the situation made worse by the fact that the entry street is very short and has ten homes on it. This parking problem is not caused solely by the Parks and Recreation Department, but also by other agencies using the building;

- there is a problem with much noise created by all the activities and dances; and
- the building is in poor condition and will require major renovations in the near future even to keep the present programs going.

The Wallingford Parks and Recreation Commission, therefore, recommends that, because of the condition of the building and the parking problems, as well as the negative effects of being in a residential area, the Recreation Department be moved to a vacant school building or that a new recreational center be built.

The Council had requested a report from Steven Deak on Simpson School which should be forthcoming shortly. Mr. Deak and the report will be placed on the next agenda.

Mr. Zandri felt that we not only have to look at the needs of the Recreation Department but the needs of the other departments using the building to see if they are better off situated somewhere else so that the building would be sufficient for the Parks & Recreation Department.

Mr. Johnson stated that there would be enough space for the Recreation Department if the entire building was vacated. It would not be the ideal layout as far as floor plan but it would be much better with the extra space.

Mr. Zandri asked if all the organizations using the space at the school are Town departments?

Mayor Dickinson responded that VNA and Big Brother/Sisters are not a Town department. Day Care is not a Town Department, however moving them would present difficulties because they must operate in a licensed area. Their new facilities will not be ready for quite some time.

Mr. Zandri suggested that we review the terms of any leases we may have with anyone in the school because we may want to break the leases or change the terms to suit the needs of the Recreation Department if that is the way the Town wants to go.

Mr. Parisi asked what the hours of operation of the Day Care Center is?

Ms. Valintas responded that the children arrive just after 8:00 a.m. and are picked up approximately 5:10 p.m. She asked how the State can license a building that is reportedly in such bad shape?

Mr. Gervasi made the statement that he feels the Town is living by a double standard. If the building is not livable then how can the VNA and Day Care Center be licensed by the State to operate in the facility? He felt that nothing would be done about the condition of the school if not for four of the families on Martin Avenue rallying the other neighbors to get together and bring it before the Town. The residents of the area have only asked that the Recreation Department as well as the Town, itself, work with them. They are holding school dances there until 10:00 P.M. at night with loud music. The square dances are quite, why can't the others be.

Mayor Dickinson stated that the Town has begun to work with the residents by moving the departure location of the bus trips to the Town Hall. He asked if that has seemed to help at all?

Mr. Gervasi responded very little. A census was taken of the number of cars that traveled this short street in one week. The total was nine thousand (9,000). How could the Town have allowed that in the first place? Now we hear that there is going to be congregate housing in there? How much more can we take?

Mr. Zandri asked if there is any other facility in town that can accommodate these dances instead of having it at the Simpson School? There are plenty of halls in town where the dance can be held without disturbing the neighbors, i.e., the K of C; Hungarian Club, etc. The neighbors want to work with the Recreation Department. There are certain functions held on site that are disturbing to the neighborhood and what they would like to see is not to have them but to maybe orga them in another facility in town that better accommodates everyone.

Mr. Johnson explained that the last dance of the season was a graduation dance for the eight graders from Dag Hammarskjold School. It was held there because the principal of Dag Hammarskjold School did not want the responsibility of having it at his own school.

Mr. Killen asked what promises were made by the Boys & Girls Club in sharing their facilities with the Town?

Mr. Johnson responded, he was not sure but he heard rumors that the club was not very happy to share the building because they are afraid the Parks & Recreation Department will take over.

Mr. Killen stated that that was part of their selling point to this Council that it would be open to the Town to share. They are not home free yet. We should investigate their timeframe when they might be in business and also when the Day Care Center may be in business, we are talking about big dollars now and we have to decide if these other buildings are going to be able to accommodate some of the things we need, what hours are they going to be available to us and so forth.

Mayor Dickinson clarified that there are two construction projects. They are not Town of Wallingford projects, Day Care and Boys & Girls Club. They are two separate organizations and have their own construction. Secondly, the Boys & Girls Club...the agreement that we have on the site provides that certain time is available to the Recreation Department but it is also true that we would be paying for that time. He does not anticipate any issue there, they are hopeful to be working with the Town. As far as he is aware, the Mayor stated that the application for congregate housing has not been approved by the State as of yet. The housing will located at the existing parcel of land where Savage Commons is now located.

Mr. Killen asked if the parking spaces assigned to the school meet the Planning & Zoning regulations for a building that size?

Mr. Johnson was not certain how many parking spaces were assigned to the school and whether or not they met the regulations.

Mr. Gervasi pointed out that half of the parking has been taken away from the school by the construction firm building the congregate housing. That housing complex will contain thirty-five (35) units. How much more parking will be needed when the construction is finished? How much more will they take from the school?

Mr. Dorsey was against moving the Recreation Department out of Simpson School. He would rather see the building repaired. He feels that the department should stop expanding. They managed with one room at the old town hall, they continue to expand and cause their own problems.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to Remove From the Table Charging the Simpson School Building Committee, seconded by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Parisi was absent; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

It was decided that the charge will be assigned at the next Town Council Meeting. In the meantime copies of the report on the school compiled by Mr. Steven Deak, Director of Public Works will be obtained for all Councilors as well as committee members to review.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Move Agenda Item #13 Up to the Next Order of Business, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #13 Discussion Pertaining to the Planning & Zoning Commission's Ruling on the Bristol Meyers Helipad Application as Requested by Councilor Brian M. McDermott

Motion was made by Mr. McDermott to Begin the Discussion, seconded by Mr. Doherty.

Mr. Pat Piscitelli, Chairman of the Planning & Zoning Commission; Peter Wasilewski and Attorney Vincent McManus were present for this item.

Mr. Wasilewski, 164 High Hill Road, read correspondence into the record (attached).

Mr. Piscitelli asked what the purpose of having this item on the agenda is? If this is going to be dealing strictly with Bristol Meyers helipad and only the helipad.....

Ms. Papale: Yes, it will only deal with the helipad.

Mr. Piscitelli: Then I want the letter read only referring to the that issue and only that issue, nothing else. If you intend to go beyond that I would suggest that you go to executive session.

Mr. Wasilewski: I would like to know why the intention to go to executive session? This is a letter that was written to the Town Council. What is

in it is public. Why would he object to something that I wrote that each Council Member has?

The Town Attorney did not feel that it was necessary to go into executive session. It was Mr. Wasilewski's letter to the Council he has the right to read it into the record.

Mr. Wasilewski proceeded to do so.

Attorney Small gave the Council a chronological history of events in the matter.

Mr. Wasilewski referred to Atty. Small's correspondence to Linda Bush, Town Planner dated August 1, 1991 and asked, if a jurisdictional defect was found to have occurred, why didn't the Town at that time discontinue its defense in the case and concede to Mr. Wasilewski? Instead they continued to fight his case causing him to incur additional attorney fees.

Atty. Small argued that she was in communication with Atty. McManus (Mr. Wasilewski's lawyer) very early on in the case alerting him to he defect. Atty. McManus, however, had already filed the case and immediately began working on his legal brief. This is not the usual scenario for an attorney, however there is nothing to prevent him from doing so.

It is noted for clarification that the Planning and Zoning Commission complied with the Statutory notice. It is the responsibility of the applicant to send all neighboring properties within 500' notice of application, according to Town regulations. Bristol Meyers failed to do so with regards to Northeast Utilities. The State Statutes only require that the Town publish the notice of application for permit in the form of a legal notice. The P&ZC complied with the Statutes. The Town took that permitting process one step further in adopting into its own regulations the requirement that the applicant notify all property owners within 500 feet. It is also noted that the PZ&C can remove this regulation if it so desires. This is where the defect occurred. Bristol Meyers was willing to re-apply for the permit and the outcome most likely would have been that the permit would have been granted. Bristol-Meyers's attorney at this time informed Atty. Small that they were not willing to concede, that they were going to argue that they could, in fact, use the conceptual subdivision argument. He did indicate to Atty. Small that they were willing to re-apply and give notice if the plaintiff agreed to stay the appeal. If the appeal was put on hold then Bristol-Meyers would re-apply provide all the notices and basically this case would sit while that was taking place and then either this case would fall by the wayside because it would become moot or the two would be joined and argued at the same time. Bristol-Meyers also offered to sit down with the plaintiffs and answer any questions they had regarding their proposal. The plaintiffs were not willing to do that. The discussions began almost immediately, most certainly prior to the October 1991 date.

Mr. Wasilewski did admit for the record that the PZ&C did publish the legal notice and he did, in fact, receive notice at his place.

of residence of the application for permit. He argued the point that the discussions did not start until the beginning of October of 1991.

Atty. Small disagreed. She reiterated that the discussions began long before that time.

Atty. McManus argued the theory that this was the typical case of a corporate giant trying to muscle the little guy into conceding the case by intimidating him.

The discussion ensued at great length.

Mr. Killen was disappointed with the fact that the conceptual subdivision is selectively applied to situations as the PZ&C sees fit and then the taxpayers money is spent to defend ourselves in court based on theories that will not hold up in a court of law.

Mr. Doherty argued that the helicopters are not simply flying in a remote area of the property, they are entering it from all angles and traveling over many neighboring residences.

Mr. Parisi consulted Edward Polanski for his expertise in the art of piloting a helicopter and Mr. Polanski assured Mr. Parisi that the craft would not have to "fish hook" its way into the helipad. The only traffic that is being held up is on Bristol-Meyers property. He felt that a situation exists where there was an error on the part of the Town commission and the bottom line is that some people spent some money. It is a very simple decision we have to make.

Mr. Zandri stated that the access road is the traffic that they stop when the helicopter enters the area. He is of the opinion that the bottom line is that Bristol-Meyers has the right to re-apply for the permit and, upon meeting all the requirements necessary, will most likely be approved for the permit. This case will not change that fact.

Mr. McDermott requested that an item be placed on the next Town Council Agenda relating to the issue of offering some sort of compensation to the plaintiffs of the case.

Mr. Parisi suggested that Mr. Wasilewski receive a copy of that agenda.

Edward Bradley, 2 Hampton Trail feels that the residents do deserve compensation. He felt it was odd that the Town Planner, Linda Bush, was not present for this item. It is time that we look carefully into the issues that are coming up in the Planning Department. These people were deprived of the right to a free and open public hearing. He went on to say that he has been dealing with this company since they moved into town. He warned that you do have to read, "as we concurred conceptual subdivision". There was a concurrence between Bristol-Meyers and the Planning Department in the Town of Wallingford. He urged the Council to "add a little bit of emphasis that we better start looking into the Planning Department and comments coming back to me based on my comments from the April 28th meeting, and I stand by those comments. And that

- 16 - July 28, 1992

is that if I keep speaking like this that I am going to be sued for liable and slander. And I can assure you that those threats will not deter me from speaking out in going to bat for the people of Wallingford. Again, I ask you as I did at the last meeting, you have investigatory powers to take a look into this....and to stop this. How many times have we seen it happen to where the rights of the people are trampled. These boards and commissions are supposed to protect us....government is supposed to be working for the people, thank you."

Mr. Parisi stated that the Council will be prepared in the near future to act, one way or another. I think that government in this case is working for people. Maybe not as fast as some of us would like but I am hopeful that the end result will be.

Ms. Papale stated that Mr. Wasilewski will be notified when the item is back on the agenda.

ITEM #10 Presentation by the Board of Education's Master Plan as Requested by Dr. Joseph Cirasuolo, Superintendent of Schools

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Hear the Presentation, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

Dr. Cirasuolo explained that the plan is the result of the needs assessment that was conducted by 260 parents, teachers, administrators at the high school levels, students, etc. and it embodies the vision that those 260 representatives of the school community have for the Wallingford Public Schools. A copy of the report is on file in the Town Clerk's Office as well as the Public Library. Dr. Cirasuolo gave an overview of the improvements proposed in the plan by the following categories; system-wide and level by level items; individual schools, compensatory education, adult education, pupil personnel services and cost estimates. Effective February 1st of 1992 and into perpetuity the administrators are required on all days of normal length when there are no special functions, to spend at least thirty (30) minutes per day involved in the instructional process. That will entail visiting classrooms, discussing those visits with teachers before or after the visits... making it very clear that our most important role, as administrators, is the role of instructional leadership.

Bernadette Renda, 753 N. Main Street Ext. asked when will the child care program be implemented and how much will it cost the taxpayers?

Dr. Cirasuolo stated that two schools were brought on line this year and two more will go on next year. It costs approximately \$3,000 per school one-time set up costs. The parents pay per child, the "Y" charges a sliding fee based on the income of the parents.

Edward Bradley, 2 Hampton Trail commended the Board for their plan. He referred to component #9 of the vision listed on page #2 of the plan. He asked how will the role of those whom the school system serves expand in making the decisions that will govern the system?

Dr. Cirasuolo responded that the major vehicle will be the parent/teacher advisory council. They will be elected by the parents and teachers themselves, they will have an advisory role to the principal of every school. The principal, before making major decisions, will run them by the council for their input and the council will bring to the principal those issues that parents and teachers need to be addressed and most of all a collaborative relationship between the administration/parents/teachers on the council so that there is joint ownership of problems and solutions.

Frank Renda, 753 N. Main Street, Ext. asked what effect will this have on the taxpayer?

Dr. Cirasuolo responded, assuming that the cost of the five year plan was \$4 million over five years, that would translate to 4/10ths of a mill increase per year for a two mill increase at the end of five years.

Mr. Renda asked the Board of Education to consider taking the taxpayers of Wallingford into consideration when they come before the Council.

Mr. Doherty thanked Dr. Cirasuolo for his time.

No action was taken.

ITEM #11 Report Out by the 88 South Main Street Building Committee on the Progress Made to Date on the 88 South Main Street Project as Requested by Councilor Albert E. Killen

Mr. Killen asked Robert Avery, Chairman of the Committee, where the project currently stands and does the committee expect the project will move along any further?

Mr. Avery responded that the parking lot should be in place tomorrow. The committee cannot do anything with the building until there is clear direction from the Council as to what purpose the building will be used for.

Mr. Killen reminded Mr. Avery that the Council reached a decision that the Department would be one of the occupants of the building.

Mr. Avery stated that he heard only last week that the Department of Law had decided against moving across the street to the building. All the architectural work was performed in conjunction with that department's move.

Mr. Killen asked the Mayor why the Department of Law was not moving?

Mayor Dickinson responded that he received a letter from them stating that they have reconsidered and are no longer interested in moving from their present location. He asked the Council if there is interest on the part of the Council in letting the Credit Union move into it as originally planned?

Mr. Killen did not recall putting the decision to move the Department of Law in the form of an invitation for them to accept or decline as they saw fit.

Mayor Dickinson stated originally the suggestion was made that they move over to that location and everyone agreed with that. Since then they have reviewed their function and the efficiency of their operation and have come to the conclusion that it would not enhance their ability to perform work for the Town departments by relocation. Originally he was not in favor of moving them there because of the same concerns.

Mr. Killen's opinion was the same at that time. He suggested back then the the Program Planner's Office move across the street since they do not have the same rapport with other departments that the Law Department does.

Mayor Dickinson stated that the Program Planner's Office has more contact with the Mayor's Office than does the Law Department. He asked the Council is anyone, at this time, had any problem with the Credit Union moving across the street.

There seemed to be no objections.

Mr. Zandri asked if the building has been designed in such a way that most of the area is open and can be set up with small partitions for offices?

Mr. Avery stated that it is all set up for offices. That was the plan that the Law Department wanted. There were special considerations made specifically for their needs in designing the building.

Mayor Dickinson stated that the Town Attorney has informed him that there was not much in the way of change in the original wall structure.

Mr. Zandri felt that since the funds were already spent on the architectural work can't we get someone to utilize the current design?

Mayor Dickinson will check into it.

Mr. Zandri asked if the exterior of the building will change depending on who utilizes the interior of the building?

Mr. Avery responded, it could. If a separate entrance is needed, it may have to be changed.

Mr. Zandri wanted to see at least the outside of the building complete, as far as he is concerned it is an eyesore as it currently exists. That area needs to be cleaned up, let's finish the exterior of the building and landscape it.

Mr. Avery wanted to know why his committee was never notified that the Law Department changed its mind?

This happened twice, we were never notified that the Credit Union was no longer moving over there also.

Mr. Zandri asked if the plans were complete for the Credit Union?

Mr. Avery answered, partially and he convinced the architect to "swallow" the costs.

Mayor Dickinson stated that if it is a major expense then perhaps the Law Department may have to go over to the building. No decision has been made. The Town Attorney indicated that they had come to the conclusion not to move. There has been no final decision.

Mr. Killen felt that the committee is not being consulted on issues, nothing should occur without their o.k. They should be kept apprised of any action, decision, changes, etc.

Mayor Dickinson reiterated that there has been no decision that the Law Department is not going there. There is only a request on their behalf that they not go.

Mr. Killen asked, how soon will the committee be notified of what step will be taken next?

Mayor Dickinson responded, tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. Killen asked, how are the dollars holding up?

Mr. Avery stated that the cost of the parking lot is substantially more than what was estimated. There will be three (3) inches of blacktop vs. two (2) inches as was originally planned. That just about doubled the cost. There has been a lot of other costs involved in the parking lot that were more than what was estimated.

Mr. Killen asked, what happened to the fill that was taken from the new foundation?

Mr. Avery stated, its gone.

Mr. Killen asked the Mayor if he was aware of that saga? When the new foundation was dug the fill was taken off the site. When asked why it was being taken off the site the committee was told not to worry there was plenty of fill and they could have it later on. When it came time to fill in the hole that remained from the original foundation there was no fill to be found and it had to be purchased at a cost of \$2,700.

Mayor Dickinson stated all the contracts on this are waive bid issues so he is not aware of what written contracts are out there.

Mr. Killen informed the Mayor that it was our own Public Works Dept. that removed the fill.

Mayor Dickinson was not aware of it. He asked who did the excavation?

Mr. Killen and Mr. Avery responded, Public Works.

Mayor Dickinson did not know this. He thought we hired a contractor to do the job. He asked if Public Works was notified to bring the fill back?

Mr. Avery explained when he witnessed Public Works loading the trucks and removing the fill he asked Mr. Deak, "where are you going with the dirt because we will need to put it back"? Mr. Deak responded, "don't worry about it we have plenty of dirt in this town we are just taking it to the other side of town and dumping it." Then in asking John Costello, Town Engineer, how much money he spent on the job to date, I see an invoice for 336 cubic yards of fill for \$2,770.

Mayor Dickinson asked if the committee approved that?

Mr. Avery responded, the committee does not approve what John Costello spends, he spends what he wants to spend.

Mayor Dickinson added that the committee should be making the decisions about what is to be done on the job.

Mr. Avery answered, that is not the case here, the committee only makes a decision on what it wants to spend. What John Costello wants to spend, he spends.

Mayor Dickinson stated that he would speak with John Costello and Steven Deak on this issue.

Mr. Avery added that he now calls on a weekly basis to ask Mr. Costello what he has spent this week.

Mayor Dickinson responded that he will speak with Mr. Deak, it is not customary for him to disappear with fill.

Ms. Papale asked, why is this committee any different from any other one? She has been on the Vo-Ag Committee for four years and this has never happened. Not a penny was spent unless it went through the committee and architect. Nothing was spent without the committee's o.k.

Mayor Dickinson responded that there is a significant difference here and that is that we are not borrowing this money. This money is already in a town department's province. The department is overseeing the expenditures.

Mr. Killen asked, when was this put in the department of Engineering's province?

Mayor Dickinson stated that the funds are in the Capital and Non-Recurring Fund. They issue the purchase orders on that account.

Mr. Killen responded that the Council did not establish this as a line item in our Capital & Non-recurring Account.

Mayor Dickinson answered that the funds are being paid out of the funds left over from the Town Hall parking and associated improvements that was part of the appropriation for the move here.

Mr. Killen asked, that left it open-ended that it stay in the province of the Engineering Department?

Mayor Dickinson answered that \$150,000 was available for improvements to that site. Parking and the building became part of it. I can get answers on the fill issue.

Ms. Papale asked why Mr. Avery doesn't inform the Council immediately when he discovers what is happening?

Mr. Avery finds out about them months afterwards.

Mayor Dickinson stated that, to his knowledge, the committee was approving anything that was approved by the Engineering Department. He said this is the first time he is hearing that there is a discrepancy between the two. It can easily be straightened out. We will set up a meeting between all parties involved and try to work it out.

Mr. Zandri agreed with Ms. Papale, this committee should work no different than the Vo-Ag Committee. The committee should have the authority to run that operation even though the dollars happen to be in someone else's department, they should not be spent without the committee's o.k. on the expenditure. That is the only way to keep a handle on what is going on.

Mr. Solinsky asked if fill was brought in and by whom?

Mr. Avery stated fill (dirt) was brought in by Kelly.

Mr. Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street was upset that the dollars were coming out of the taxpayers pockets and he hoped that a lot of people were watching tonight. From day one, the purchase of 88 S. Main Street was stonewalled, we would not accept the fact that we had a real problem on the parking regulations, we owned the building and could have had parking over there months ago. We are still playing a game with such a simple problem. Mr. Avery has been thwarted in every effort that he has tried to make and to justify that since the money was already appropriated and did not have to be accounted for from borrowed money, that justifies it! This is ridiculous! It is coming out of the taxpayers money and we have this kind of inefficiency? Boy, I would be questioning every decision and action that has been taken! Something as simple as this to go awry to this point is pathetic!

Edward Bradley, 2 Hampton Trail, it is very simple he (Mr. Avery) is the project manager as is the committee. Everything should be going through them. Who has the say to determine who moves to the building?

- 22 - July 28, 1992

Mr. Killen responded, the Mayor when it is in respect to a department. If it involves an outside agency the Council has the say.

Mr. Bradley asked Mr. Avery to explain why three inches of blacktop will be used for the parking lot?

Mr. Avery began to explain how there had been confusion on the issue of how much paving should be placed for the parking lot surface. The building committee questioned Mr. Costello's request to pave the lot with three inches of bituminous. Mr. Costello's response to Mr. Avery was, "I just asked Tilcon Tomasso to make a recommendation and I do understand that they're selling blacktop so that's why we had three inches". Mr. Avery proceeded to ask if two inches was adequate. Mr. Costello's response to that question was, "yes it is". Mr. Avery then asked, "suppose the committee recommends one inch, what would you say?" Mr. Costello, "that is not thick enough, two inches is adequate". Mr. Avery then asked, "what did you do up here at Doolittle Park?" Mr. Costello, "I don't remember". Mr. Avery then approached Mr. Deak and asked him, "what do you do at Doolittle?" Mr. Deak responded, "three inches". Mr. Avery asked, "why?". Mr. Deak explained that the snow plows used to plow the lots are very heavy and would crack the pavement if the thickness is less than three inches. The committee decided three inches would be best.

Mr. Zandri found it hard to believe that the Public Works Department would be plowing that size parking lot with the large trucks, they are going to be difficult to maneuver around the lot.

Mr. Avery asked the same question of Mr. Deak and his response was, "no problem".

Mr. Zandri stated that they will be replacing the curbing, of course.

Mr. Avery went on to explain that when Public Works dug the foundation for the new location of the house, they dug it two feet too deep. Whether that is Public Work's error or Engineering's remains to be seen. However it cost the committee an additional \$600 for the cement.

Mayor Dickinson stated that he had a letter from John Costello explaining the issue of paving the parking lot and that it was not his recommendation to pave it with three inches of blacktop.

Ms. Papale began reading it into the record when she was interrupted by Mr. Avery who stated for the record that the letter is not true. That is why he (Mr. Avery) wrote a letter to the Mayor informing him.

Mr. Avery went on to say that John Costello has done nothing but fight the committee and cause more trouble.....

Ms. Papale suggested that the next time this item is on the agenda that Mr. Costello be present.

No Action Taken.

ITEM #12 Consider and Approve an Agreement Between the Town of Wallingford Board of Education and the Wallingford Connecticut Health Service Professional Association (Board of Education Nurses)

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mrs. Duryea.

Mr. Thomas Sharkey, Assistant Director of Personnel was present as was Atty. Dennis Ciccarillo.

Atty. Ciccarillo explained that they were present to recommend the ratification of a contract between the Board of Ed and nurses. A summary of the pertinent changes for the proposed contract was given to the Council. The wages are essentially 3%, 2% and 3%, respectively with a single step increase in the middle of the second year, that being February of 1994. There is a co-pay provision on the health insurance of 3 1/2% effective this September with caps in the following two contract years. There is a provision allowing the Town, in conjunction with the health insurance provider, to institute some cost-containment measures which are planned and outlined by Blue Cross/Blue Shield including second opinions, pre-admission reviews, etc. There is also a provision which would allow a unit member to elect to not be covered through the Town health insurance and receive in lieu of that a payment, in each year of the waiver of that insurance, 40% of the amount that the insurance would have cost. There are some minor changes regarding sick pay in terms of "capping" the final payment upon retirement of those individuals who have accumulated 90 days of sick time. There is also an advance notification provision that would allow the Board of Education to have a little bit more time to plan budget-wise for that kind of payment, whatever that payment might be.

Mr. Parisi asked Atty. Ciccarillo to explain what the single step advancement was listed on page 18.

Atty. Ciccarillo explained that there are quite a few people at this moment on step three who are presently making \$20,800 per year. The 3% in September of 1992 brings it up to \$21,471. In September of 1993 they would receive a total of \$21,900 and then in February of 1994 they would move up a step to step four so that they would be earning \$23,424 per year.

Mr. Parisi asked what the hourly rate was of the twelve members?

Mr. Sharkey responded that he did not know what the hourly rate was but the yearly pay is \$22,600 (a quick calculation using the method of dividing the number of days, 182, into the yearly salary and dividing that number by the number of hours worked per day, 8, gives the hourly rate of approximately \$15.62)

Mr. Parisi noted that to be equal to the top of step three. He pointed out that there is a clothing allowance given as well. These are not luxuries in the private sector. This contract is a little expensive for the times.

Mr. Sharkey stated that the pay is comparable to registered nurses in hospitals in the area.

Mr. Zandri asked why this contract specifies step increases when, for the most part, all other contracts include them as a given?

Atty. Ciccarillo pointed out that this is the only contract that is unique in the sense that if the steps are not written in they will not be given.

Mr. Zandri asked why these steps were added to the contract?

Atty. Ciccarillo stated that it was the only way to come up with a fair deal. Given the fact that there is only 3% at either end of this contract which are at the low end of what is being awarded and agreed to in a lot of public sector units, it is clearly low Town-wide.... (there was a one step increase in the prior three year contract).

At the outset of the prior contract there were no steps. It ended up in fact finding in that contract. The problem was, as Atty. Ciccarillo recalled, was that the nurses had been hired at many different wages. There was no way of differentiating and/or correlating years of service with wages. The only way to make sense out of it and, at the same time, bring uniformity to it was to come up with a plan to try and "slot" everyone with divergent wages into some sort of system, hence the start of the eight step system. We are currently in a system that we do not step up each year. That does not mean that the worker stays exactly where they are each year.

Mr. Zandri was not in favor of this proposed contract. He felt that the contract proposed last time around was agreed upon by both parties. Now, they are getting increases over a three year period with this proposed contract. He could not understand why a step would be added as well.

Atty. Ciccarillo argued that the first and third year increases are modest by public sector standards.

Mr. Zandri was not of the opinion that the percentages offered in this contract as increases were not modest. He could not believe that the general population was getting larger than 3% increases in their pay during these times.

Atty. Ciccarillo quoted figures from the CCM (CT. Conference of Municipalities) Monthly Report arbitration results. New Fairfield Police were given 4% and 5%; New Haven Town Hall, 5%, 5%, 5%, 4 1/2%.....

Mr. Zandri asked what industry is handing out in the way of increases?

Mr. McDermott stated that he heard on the radio today that the national figure is 3.6% and that was termed a "slight increase" in the private sector. He felt that the total of this contract equals less than 4% per year.

Mr. Parisi and Mr. Zandri disagreed.

Mayor Dickinson checked with the Personnel Dept. regarding the private

sector and the latest figures (Feb. 1992) show that the average private sector increase was 2% to 4%.

Mr. Solinsky referred to Item #19.1 - Sick Pay and asked what the original language was on that?

Atty. Ciccarillo stated that the dollar caps were added in the proposed contract.

Mr. Solinsky asked if dollar value or days are accumulated with regards to sick time?

Atty. Ciccarillo: Days and they are paid at their rate at the time of retirement.

Mr. Solinsky figured the rate of increase over three years to calculate to 10.3%. Divide that by three and it equals just over 3% per year.

Mr. Doherty felt it was a unique contract because the percentage was low, co-pay has been negotiated.....from management point of view this is what you want to achieve. He felt it was a great contract.

Mr. McDermott was of the opinion that the roll-up of the percentages added up to approximately 12%.

Mr. Sharkey agreed.

Mr. Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street feels that somewhere along the line the Town has to stop giving multi-year contracts. It is neither fair to the employees of the Town.

VOTE: Holmes was absent; Duryea, Parisi and Zandri, no; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

Waiver of Rule V Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Waive Rule V of the Town Council Meeting Procedures to Discuss the Purchase of an Electric Car for the Electric Division, seconded by Mr. Parisi.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

Consider and Approve a Request by the P.U.C. to Purchase an Electric Utility Vehicle for the Electric Division, seconded by Mr. Solinsky.

On Tuesday, 21 July 1992, the P.U.C. approved a request to move forward with the purchase of an electric vehicle and, in addition, to request that the Town Council waive the bid requirements.

The Electric Division has an opportunity to purchase an electric utility vehicle from the Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Co-Op (CMEEC) for the total cost of \$5,200. The vehicle is a completely restored 1987 GMC pickup truck model S-15. Said vehicle will be powered by a 28 horsepower motor and contain batteries and associated equipment to operate the vehicle on electric power.

The Division's intention is to purchase the electric utility vehicle

for the purpose of improving the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of their operation.

The motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was restated by Mr. Doherty to Approve the Request of the P.U.C. that the Town Council Waive the Bid Requirements so that the Electric Division Could Purchase an Electric Utility Vehicle from CMEEC for \$5,200, seconded by Mr. Solinsky.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #15 SET A PUBLIC HEARING for August 11, 1992 at 7:45 P.M. to Amend the 1992-93 Board of Education Special Funds Section of the Town Budget. The Purpose is to Accept a Computer Assisted Employability Grant in the Amount of \$19,577.00

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Solinsky.

VOTE: Parisi passed; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #16 SET A PUBLIC HEARING for August 11, 1992 at 8:00 P.M. to Amend the 1992-93 Board of Education Special Fund Section of the Town Budget. The Purpose is to Accept a Family Literacy Extended Education Program in the Amount of \$41,820.00.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Solinsky.

VOTE: Parisi was absent; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Doherty to Adjourn the Meeting, seconded by Mr. McDermott.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:34 A.M.

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:

Kathryn F. Milano

Kathryn F. Milano, Town Council Secretary

Approved by:

Iris F. Papale

Iris F. Papale, Chairperson

9/8/92

Date

Kathryn J. Wall

Kathryn J. Wall, Town Clerk

9/8/92

Date