

Summary/Town Council Meeting

April 23, 1985

Roll call and pledge of allegiance to flag. Invocation:  
The Reverend Craig Spooner, Advent Christian Church. 1

QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD 1

SET PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR MAY 14, 1985 on following:

9:00 p.m. - AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$780,000  
VARIOUS MUNICIPAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, 1985-  
1986, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS  
AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. 1

9:30 p.m. - AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$480,000  
FOR THE COSTS TO BE INCURRED IN CONNECTION  
WITH THE CLOSING OF THE WALLINGFORD LANDFILL,  
1985-1986, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF  
BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. 2

Approval of Tip Fee for Wallingford Landfill 2-9

Resolution concerning HOURS OF OPERATION and official  
days closed for Wallingford Landfill. 9-11

Approved transfer of \$2,500.00 for Resource Recovery  
Project negotiations by Part Time Planner/Mr. Hamel 11

Resolution authorizing application for summer work  
experience program, requested by Mayor William W.  
Dickinson. 11

Consideration of Parker Farms School facility to Board  
of Education, requested by Frank Solden. 11-13

Approved appropriation of \$150,000.00 from 203R-Capital  
for a GPM Pump, requested by Fire Chief McElfish. 13-14

Approved transfer of \$1,000.00 from 145-130, requested  
by Mr. Dunleavy. 14

Approved transfer of \$6,000.00 from 1-601-418 to cover  
postage for new system of mail canvass/Martha Moriarty,  
Vivienne Goodrich. 14-15

Approved following items for Public Works:

Transfer of \$2,500.00 from 503-300 for PWD-CENTRAL GARAGE  
MAINT. OF VEHICLES; transfer of \$1,500.00 from 520-201  
for PWD-LANDFILL VEHICLE EXPENSE; transfer of \$500.00  
from 515-524 for PWD-LANDFILL UTILITIES; transfer of  
\$600.00 from 521-524 for TREE PLANT. TREE REMOVAL CONTR.;  
transfer of \$280.00 from 521-510 for PWD-NORTH MAIN ST.  
MAINT. OF BUILDING; transfer of \$260.00 from 521-540  
for PWD- 9 & 21 NORTH MAIN ST. MAINT. OF BOILER. 15-16

Approved transfer of \$11,500.00 from 805-319 for equip-  
ment. 16

Approved transfer of \$6,200.00 from 201T-131 and \$3,800.00  
from 201P-300 for unexpected arrest and hospitalization. 16-17

Waiver of bid for Quartermaster System Contract 17

Correspondence: Cancellation of Insurance by Aetna 17

Noted for record financial statements of the Town of  
Wallingford for month ending March 31, 1985. (dis-  
tributed ant meeting of April 9, 1985) 18

Note for record Ordinance Committee Meeting minutes of  
March 26, -1985. 18

Accept Town Council meeting minutes dated April 9, 1985. 18

249

Attachments:

- AGENDA ITEMS: 5
- 5a
- 5b
- 6
- 7
- 14
- 8
- 10
- 11 a thru f
- PWD-INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM
- 12
- 13
- 15
- 16
- 18
- 19

(Attached in the above listed order)

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

April 23, 1985

Council Chambers

Meeting called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Roll call by Rosemary Rascati. Those present were Mrs. Bergamini, Mr. Diana, Chairman Gessert, Mr. Killen, Mrs. Papale, Mr. Polanski, Mr. Rys, and also present was Mayor Dickinson.

A pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Invocation: The Reverend Craig Spooner gave prayer to the Council.

QUESTION and ANSWER PERIOD. NO QUESTIONS.

PUBLIC HEARING DATES:

Mr. Krupp suggested that we set the hearing date for the ordinance for VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS after we approve the budget. This number may be subject to change depending on what happens at the budget meeting.

Tom Myers: If you set a public hearing for May 14, 1985, you may amend the ordinance downward, not increase it, so the maximum would be \$780,000.00. The reason we put this on now is because in the past, the projects have not been able to be started, due to the appropriation procedure through ordinance. As you know, after the ordinance is heard, it must be advertized, a 21 day referendum period must lapse prior to any construction starting or the availability for those funds to be used for those projects in which they were intended. In talking with Mr. Deak and Mr. Costello, they would like to have that ordinance take effect as soon as possible so that during the good weather they're able to begin those road and drainage projects. However, if at the most, if you did it at the second meeting in the month of May, we would be talking about the ordinance taking effect somewhere around the 1st to the 10th of July. If it were to be done on the 14th, the ordinance would take effect around the 10th to the 15th of June.

Mr. Krupp questions if the time for the 14th of May should be set after we approve the budget? The reply: Yes.

Mrs. Bergamini moved to set a Public Hearing on May 14, 1985 at 9:00 p.m. on AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF SEVEN HUNDRED EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$780,000) FOR VARIOUS MUNICIPAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, 1985-86, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. Mr. Rys seconded. 25

VOTE: All ayes and the motion was passed.

Mrs. Bergamini moved to set a public hearing on May 14, 1985 at 9:30 p.m. on AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$480,000) FOR COSTS TO BE INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE CLOSING OF THE WALLINGFORD LANDFILL, 1985-86, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. Mr. Rys seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 5: Consider and approve two items for Wallingford Landfill, requested by Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr.

Mr. Gessert read a letter dated April 17, 1985 addressed to Council Members and signed by Mayor Dickinson. (see Attached marked Agenda Item 5)

ITEM 5A: Increase tip fee to \$16.00 per ton.  
(read by Marie Bergamini: see attached marked Agenda Item 5A)

Moved acceptance by Mr. Krupp and seconded by Mr. Rys.

#### PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD:

Walter Hahnel, 3 Parkview Road: The proposal is to charge \$150.00 per ton for disposal above the \$16.00 normal fee. The average passenger car tire weighs about 25 pounds, it takes about 80 tires to equal one ton. This means a charge of somewhere around \$2.00 per tire.

Big truck tires weigh 100 to 150 pounds: \$14.00 per tire to dispose of a big truck tire. I think this is discriminatory. This consideration is for tires only and no other form of rubbish. Tires do not create methane gas, rats, seagulls. We deal in three to four thousand (3,000 to 4,000) tires a year. At the rate of \$2.00 per tire for disposal fee, that amounts to quite a few dollars. Most of our tires are sold through cooperative ads with GOOD-YEAR. Why should people come to me and pay \$2.00 per tire to have it disposed of when they can go to a neighboring town and not have to pay this fee?

The other option is, if they take the tires with them, I'm sure they are going to wind up on the highways and that will create an added expense to cleaning up the highways.

No other type of disposal has this problem. Just tires.

Jim Hahnel, representing his company: AUTO ARTISANS. Also representing the CONNECTICUT TIRE DEALERS AND RETREAD ASSOCIATION?

This is a Wallingford problem, a Connecticut problem, and a Nation-wide problem. This problem is being dealt with in other states by the Tire and Retread Associations in other ways than just taxing the tire dealers. The National

(Jim Hahnel, CONT)

Tire Dealers are working with the Federal Government and the State and Local Governments and there is cooperative effort being made on a major recycling program for used tires. Part of it shredding, part of it breaking down, and basically using the rubber to rebuild the highways. To do this is of no basic additional cost to the consumer or the local tax payer or the local businesses. If the town can be patient, I don't believe it will be long before our town can participate in this program to clean up this

Mr. Gessert: it is to my understanding that the proposal states \$16.00 for refuse and \$150.00 for Tires. They would not be combined, to total \$166.00.

251

Mr. Krupp comments that there seems to be a discrepancy between 3b and 3d.

Mr. Krupp makes the motion to add the following words to statement 3b. "except as exempted below" after the words 2½ tons so that the statement would read:

- b. Registration fee for each vehical with a rated capacity of less than 2 ½ tons, except as exempted below, hauling refuse, demolition or construction material.

Mr. Krupp moves the revision because he feels that cars, pick-ups, vans, and trailers seem to fit into those vehicals rated less than 2½ tons.

Mr. Krupp's revision was seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Krupp also moves to add a sub-section "d" to Item 5. This is to read: NO MATERIAL CALSSIFIED AS "HAZARDOUS WASTE" BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT SHALL BE ACCEPTED IN THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AREA.

Mayor Dickinson: This can be added but it is unnecessary. State-law indicated that we cannot take anything of that kind in. You have to have special handling, etc... and we don't have the facility to do so.

Mr. Krupp comments that he wishes it to be defined that these materials are not allowed to be mixed with the rubbish that is allowed.

Marie Bergamini seconds Mr. Krupp's Motion.

Mr. Diana questions if there should be something added regarding clean-up at the owner's expense? Because other than just dropping it off, that's where the liability ends.

Mr. Gessert explains that the town has requirements that already take care of this.

Ray Rys: What happens if the old tires are not accepted? If I buy four (4) new tires and they won't accept the old ones, what happens when I go to the dump?

Jim Hahnel: At this time, those tires are considered part of the "every-day" trash. It's easier to handle four tires at a time than to handle four hundred (400).

Don Roe explains that the individual handling that a dealer has to do doesn't stop there. When it gets to our landfill, there's a tire by tire tip. The proposal and the amount was set based on two factors:

- 1). The cost to shred a single tire
- 2). We have over accumulated a mass of tires (at times) to be disposed off and shredded. Where's the money going to come from to do that?

What we thought we were proposing was a balanced approach. Most of those tires came from commercial haulers/tire dealers in the past. We're trying to provide a source of funds or a revenue stream to accomplish the shredding of new imports of tires as well as the old that are already there.

To ahve somebody come in and shred would cost us \$1.00 per tire. If the town wanted at some future time to appropriate to establish a line item for tire shredding.

Iris Papale: (questioning Don Roe) How many commercial tire dealers to we have in the Town of Wallingford? (truck commercial tire dealers)

Answer: Maybe one or two.

Ray Rys: If we're going to charge \$150.00 per ton, to the business, if it costs one dollar (1.00) to shred a tire, then when a town resident comes into the dump to leave a tire, then he should pay one dollar (\$1.00) for that tire. 252

Mr. Rys makes a motion to remove sub-section 4b until, at some later date, the council can come up with a better system.

Mr. Gessert recommends to change the fee for tires either \$16.00 a ton or \$20.00 to \$25.00 per ton, or something more realistic.

Mr. Rys changes his motion to: I would like to eliminate 4b and strike the words "except tires" from 4a.

Mr. Roe points out that tires are a special waste and require special handling.

Mr. Krupp states that we're talking about 25 pounds per tire and that makes it roughly 80 tires per ton, at \$1.00 each to shred. It seems that what we're doing is we're hitting the equal tires not just for what they're bringing in, but for everybody else's mistakes in the past. While at the same time, we're handling standard refuse at \$16.00 per ton which is costing us \$23.00 per ton, so it seems that there is some degree of discrimination involved here. I can't see \$150.00 per ton, but I can't see \$16.00 per ton. It's got to be more accurate somehow.

Don Roe: Most commercial tire dealers go to FERRACELLI'S in our region.

In our region, the average is a little over \$15.00 for landfill fee, and the median is \$18.00. Taht includes zero (0) in Branford, which has tried to get a tip fee in place, but has been unsuccessful. The problem with the National Survey is that it includes a lot of mid-west landfills. The garbage situation is much different there than in New England. We have a crisis here. We've been here longer than the mid-west.

Marie Bergamini asks Don why he raised his price to \$150.00 if the estimated cost he received from Ferracelli's was \$100.00?

Mr. Krupp was not inaccurate in his analysis. The tires that we're living with have been brought there by commercial dealers and it was not inappropriate to consider the current "hang for the sins of the Fathers".

Mrs. Bergamini points out that if she could go to the next town and pay \$100.00, then why stay in Wallingford and pay \$150.00.

Ed Diana questions Don Roe: On the metal hydroxide site, what have we done up until this point on that?

Don: We've submitted our Permit "B" application. We've received favorable review back from the state on that. That had included an instruction time table, beginning July 1, 1985. That's tied into the ordinance resolution that I believe was scheduled for public hearing.

Ed Diana: This council had agreed to refuse any state mandate and not to handle the sludge problem. (referring to the Bulk Transport Case)

Mr. Roe: Last summer we came before the Council. That concerned us and created the need for #5. We felt the need for procedure and specifications to be defined in cases of handling special waste. They are wastes that are different from that of what you throw in your garbage can at home. This includes tar among other things. The result of that action was that in the process of cleaning up and taking to another landfill they experienced some problems. They are suspecting that the material has contributed to some other problems. I don't know if there has been confirmation of that yet.

253

Mr. Diana: Any increase that we bid is going to get passed along to the tax payer. What ever we increase at some point in time, somebody is going to have to pay for it. I think we have to try to find a happy medium here and come up with some sort of compromise. I so feel that the \$150.00 is excessive. The fee of \$16.00 is very excessive. It's an unfair raise, there we should take more of a graduated step up to the \$16.00, or whatever is proposed in the future vs. a sudden \$16.00 increase and this would cause an increase in garbage costs and possibly make people go to other towns to buy their tires. I feel that we should wait a few weeks and not rush into this. There are a lot of questions concerning this topic that we don't have the answers to.

Mr. Roe: We researched many communities, and they don't know how to handle this problem. We are striking out in a new direction. We are trying a new idea to solve this problem. It is a lot of money, but it is a way to handle these tires in a sensible way. I think what we are doing would not be "sticking our heads in the sand". It would be providing an option. This option is realistic to the town and the operation of the landfill, and realistic to the tire dealers. The one dollar per tire covers the shredder cost, but there are other costs of ours that it does not cover, that the tax payer or other sources would be paying for to dispose of those tires.

The way we arrived at the \$150.00 was basically trying to accomplish two goals with one fee. Taking care of the current flow, and the stuff that's already down there. Maybe this is not appropriate. Maybe what we need to do is address the current inventory of tires that we have at our waste site separately, through some type of separate appropriation. We could do an estimated inventory and figure out what it would cost for us to dispose of those tires, and then come back later.

Mr. Gessert points out that the council is not avoiding the problem, but he questions how hard this will penalize a particular business man who is caught in this trap, through no fault of his own.

Bert Killen: We are faced tonight with whether or not we are going to adopt the philosophy for the Mayor's cover letter, which seems to be that we have to pay the cost of operating the dump. If we're going to adopt that philosophy, then we cannot be substituting figures everywhere. If we reject that philosophy, then we have to reject the entire thing and tell the gentlemen that are involved in this thing what we expect of them and they'll have to come back again. Everybody isn't a tax payer. On the tipping fee, if you do get some of it back, you do get some of it back from the renters. If you want to make a zero (0) tipping fee, then you'll have the tax payers pick it up, and it'll be just home owners, or the people who own businesses: They'll pick it up 100%. This is an attempt to get some of it back from some of the people who use it and do not pay taxes.

Mr. Rys: Does resource recovery take tires?  
Reply: NO.

Mr. Krupp: The Mayor's letter does bring out the point of recovering some of the costs, but this in no way even comes close to making x equal x. We know our cost is over \$23.00 per ton. We're not charging the home owners anything to dispose of their personal refuse. We're still paying \$23.00 per ton for that. I'm not saying that the fee for tires should be different, but I think there should be a different fee structure there. This all seems discriminatory.

Mayor Dickinson: I don't see that the program would be jeopardized by compromising \$150.00 per ton. Unfortunately we are faced with a crisis and as you know, the report indicates two to three million dollars (\$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000) over the next five to seven years. That money is not going to be totally recovered through this fee schedule. We're hoping to get money to pay the notes on

the bond issue just to close the dump. I don't think that compromising the \$150.00 per ton on the tires will jeopardize/any increase that we receive is going to assist in this area. Either it's funded in part through a different fee schedule, or it's funded in total through the tax structure. We are looking for partial funding that would be termed a "use" fee.

254

? : The new fee would generate 1.5 million dollars over the period of time identified in the report.

If the tires were cut up when thrown into the trucks, it would eliminate the problem and the fee.

Mr. Diana talks with Mr. Myers, about outsiders using the dump. Outside haulers could be using the dump, but haulers are supposed to have permits.

Mr. Gessert: By raising the fee by \$8.00, it would discourage people other than Wallingford residents from using the Wallingford dump.

Mr. Killen: Don, you keep recording the \$23.00 per ton cost to the town. What are the components of that cost? How do you arrive at that figure?

Don: That includes our projection of what the cost will be associated with closing of the landfill. The current costs do not include the cost for fill, and fill recovery, the cost of trucking, and personnel costs associated with that, we were unable to factor out our insurance cost associated with the landfill, it does not include any kind of factor for future liabilities.

Don was questioned: What's the number for the 84-85 budget for landfill operation?

The current year was approximately \$228,000.00.

Jim Pagnam: Most of the customers that I've talked to in town can understand why there's a need for a rate increase. What they have a tough time understanding is why individuals are allowed to go to the dump freely. I would like to see a sticker or permit issued to each car that goes into the dump because this way, they will be paying also, and at this time, they are not paying to use the dump. I am talking household and not commercial garbage.

Marie Bergamini: It's very true that we allow free entry for residents and I feel very strongly that we should not be forcing a fee on some residents because they cannot afford it. They can go to the dump on Saturday and dump their trash if they want to. Perhaps we should have some type of a sticker system where they pay a small fee.

Jim Pagnam: But you're saying that the main reason for this increase is so that the cost of closing the dump can be covered. I think that everybody then has to put something towards the closing of the dump.

Mr. Gessert: The last amendment made was to eliminate the \$150.00 fee.

VOTE: Mr. Gessert, Mr. Rys, and Mrs. Papale voted aye and the rest of the council voted no. The motion was not passed.

Mr. Krupp made the motion to decrease the \$150.00 fee to \$80.00. The motion was seconded by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Council voted yes with the exception of Mr. Gessert, Mr. Diana, and Mr. Rys.

The second amendment was concerning solid waste in 5d. Motion was made by Mr. Krupp and seconded by Mr. Bergamini.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Next amendment: Changing of words in 3b.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

255

Discussion through the council about a sticker for the dump.

( not audible )

Discussion dealing with fishing and a stream.

( not audible )

Mr. Diana made the motion to change the \$16.00 fee in 4a to \$12.00. Motion was seconded by Iris Papale.

VOTE: Mr. Diana, Mrs. Papale, and Mr. Krupp voted yes and the rest of the council members voted No, and the motion did not pass.

Motion made to accept RESOLUTION RESCINDING PREVIOUS FEE SCHEDULE AND ESTABLISHING NEW FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE TOWN OF WALLINGFORD SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AREA as ammended.

VOTE: All voted aye with the exception of Mr. Diana, Mr. Rys, and Mrs. Papale. Motion passed.

Marie Bergamini read the RESOLUTION for HOURS OF OPERATION under Item 5 on the agenda.  
( see attached marked Agenda Item 5B)

Mrs. Bergamini moved acceptance of resolution and Mr. Polanski seconded.

J. Pagnam: When a holiday falls on a Monday, there's no pick-up that day, so Thursday becomes a double pick-up. We need an extra hour to do so. During the Christmas period, with the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., there will definitely be garbage left on the roads.

Mr. Krupp would like to see the hours stay the same.

Mayor Dickinson: The reason for longer hours is because of the need to cover the garbage. State regulations require it. As it stands now, we cannot cover the garbage when it's coming in right to the last hour and then our people end their day. There's no time for closing the cells, preparing the cells. It's been a constant battle to cover the garbage as required by state. It can't be done if it's being dumped right up to the last hour, unless overtime is paid everyday in order to prepare the cells to have full necessary to cover it over.

Mr. Killen: Could the Mayor tell me how the commercial haulers are dumping during the last half hour of the day? There are more residents dumping during the last hour, aren't there?

Mike Cassella: The last hour is not prime time, but it is concerning operating the landfill properly, because it allows us to close out the day, the cells, and prepare for the next day.

Jim Pagnam: With the time being 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., there will be garbage left on the streets after holidays with the double pick-ups. If it were to open at 7:00 a.m. we could well be done by 3:00 p.m. 90% of the customers have pick-up twice a week. If a holiday falls on a Tuesday, (the pick-ups are Tuesday and Friday), so with no pick-up on Tuesday because of the holiday, the dump should be open at 7:00 a.m. on Friday so teh work will get done completely.

? : How many people work at the dump through the course of a day?

(answer inaudible)

J. Pagnam: Our union contract states that the hours are 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Krupp: I think we're going too far by cutting back an hour for the services per day, and tacking on another five days per year.



Mrs. Papale: How many people would be getting double-time on those holidays?

256

Marie Bergamini points out that double-time and one half would have to be paid to workers on holidays.

Mr. Gessert: It doesn't look like we can resolve this satisfactorily because we were no able to come up with exact dates after holidays because of Saturday closings etc.... We have two ways we could go.

1. Table this until we can come up with the exact dates, and then they would have to be pin-pointed again as soon as the new calender year came out.
2. We could add an ammendment to the end of this stating that the Mayor or the Public Works Director may add one hour of dump opening time to facilitate trash pick-up following holidays, and such additional openings could be published in the newspaper.

Mayor Dickinson reads a statement before him:

The hours will be 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on the double-pick-up day following a holiday and the two weeks following Christmas in accordance with the schedule to be established by the Public Works Director on a yearly basis.

The reason why we don't have specific dates in there is because the dates change on a yearly basis, so you'd have to amend this resolution evert time the year changes. If this language was agreeable, it would allow the Public Works Director to establish those days when we would be open for double pick-up and also the two weeks after Christmas.

Marie Bergamini moves to accept the ammendment proposed by Mayor Dickinson, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mrs. Bergamini moves to have the past motion made effective June 1, 1985. Seconded by Mr. Polanski.

VOTE: All voted aye with the acception of Mr. Krupp and the motion passed.  
(Ed Diana changed vote to NO, but the motion still passed)

Motion made to move ITEM 14 up on the agenda and seconded.

Mr. Krupp read ITEM 6: Letter dated April 16, 1985 and addressed to Council Members, signed by Philip Hamel, Jr. Part Time Planner.

(see attached marked Agenda Item 6)

Mr. Krupp moved acceptance of: CONSIDER AND APPROVE A TRANSFER OF \$2,500.00 FROM A/C 3-845-110-43 TO A/C 3-845-145-35, requested by DONALD ROE for Resource Recovery Project negotiations by Part Time Planner, Mr. Hamel. Motion seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mr. Krupp moves to pass to Item 7; seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

Mr. Gessert reads a letter dated April 16, 1985 addressed to Council Members adn signed by Mayor William W Dickinson. (see attached marked Agenda Item 7)

Mr. Krupp moves to APPROVE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR SUMMER WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM, requested by Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. Seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Motion made to move Item 14 up on the agenda by Mr. Diana, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

257

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Letter read dated April 23, 1985 addressed to Mayor Dickinson and signed by Frank Solden, Superintendent of Schools. (see attached marked Agenda Item 14)

Mr. Diana: The only reservation would be that the Town would be maintaining the property. 14 months ago we asked the Engineering Department to submit a division of the property. I understand that it was given to the Planning & Zoning Commission. It hasn't been accepted yet.

(Mr. Diana continued speaking, but was inaudible)

Mr. Gessert: The time has to come when we have to get an estimate of the cost to put this building back into working condition. We've seen estimates from  $\frac{1}{2}$  million to  $\frac{1}{2}$  million. From a financial standpoint, we would like to get a relatively accurate estimate. Then we can plan to finance that and then look at the potential sale of other properties.

Roger Rivers: Board of Education: One of the recommendations that came from the state dept. of ed. was to put a price tag/estimated cost of reopening the closed school. A cost estimate and project analysis should be prepared by a professional consultant. Numbers are required by the state to be put on their form to make the state aware of what kind of dollars are going to be involved in the request for grant. We are talking about June 30 because this is something that goes before the legislature on an annual basis and in order for it to get considered for the next legislative session, it has to be in before the end of June. I would suggest that the situation that Mr. Diana brought up about the ballfield, that area has been a source of problems over the years.

We have been given an estimate between two thousand to twentyfive hundred dollars to come up with this cost estimate project analysis. That would be up to the Town Council to decide whether or not we should go up and bid on that type of project or if we should give it to people that have been handling these type of projects for us for years.

Mayor Dickinson: I think the financial planning aspect is very important and in regards to the grant terms, it would be good to know what those grant terms are. I think we have to know over what period of time there would be reimbursement. If it's a piece of new legislature, it wouldn't have to be in by June 30 to be taken up by the next legislature. If it has to be voted on by the next legislature, we'd go in on the next legislature. If it's a bonding issue, it would have to be included within the project in this year's legislature. I believe their bonding sub-committee is meeting now.

The other aspect is, what other revenue would be available? The reason this is important is not only the school, but we're also talking about asbestos removal and handicapped access. We're probably looking at several hundred thousand dollars if not a  $\frac{1}{2}$  million. Not that this is part of this project, but for financial planning, it's going to be necessary to know what totals we are talking about.

Mr. Rivers: The form that I'm talking about is the regular school construction priority listing. Based on information that we got at the state dept. of ed., it's a listing that has to be submitted by the local Board of Ed. by July 1. The form is notice of proposed school building projects. The percent of reimbursement is approx. 62%, it may vary a little up or down. The items eligible for the building's renovation: Building renovations, handicapped renovations, asbestos removal, fire code safety corrections, site work,

energy conservation, roof replacement (over 20 years old) etc...

258

Mrs. Bergamini moves that the council requests the Board of Education to get a formalized estimate of renovation costs. Seconded by Mr. Krupp.  
Mr. Rivers: Currently there is no intention of abandoning Yalesville as a school until Parker Farms is open.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mr. Krupp read Item 8. Letter dated April 17, 1985 and addressed to Mayor Dickinson and signed by Jack McElfish, Fire Chief.  
(see attached marked Agenda Item 8)

Jack McElfish explains repairs being done to fire houses. Also that an order takes usually 30 days and then approx. 3 months. He also lists some of the needs of equipment that is needed.

Mr. Gessert points out that if this item is approved, we will have an engine for backup that is in the 70's and not 3 decades old.

Marie Bergamini points out that the Chief did not come to the council. The council initiated this, after we toured the fire houses.

This was on the agenda in January but it was asked to be held off until the budget figures were put together because with the size of this type of expenditure, they wanted to be able to "plug" this in when you start adding your contemplating surplus, etc... and the Comptroller requested that we wait about 60 days so that they could plug in these numbers so when you did the budget, it wouldn't get thrown off by an expenditure of this size.

Mayor Dickinson: In that period of time, we paid out \$250,000.00 on a negligence case and we lost \$400,000.00 in revenue sharing.

Mr. Killen: For technical reasons, this recommendation, Mr. Mayor, that this be done. This is an appropriation over and above the budget, that calls for your recommendation.

Mayor Dickinson: As a member of the Executive Branch, the chief has had the truck in earlier. The condition of the vehicle warrants it. It's a matter of the priorities and how much you have to spend. We're in a position where we are able to purchase a truck now. We could wait until July, but that just puts off what we can do now. If we buy the truck now, I think we should. It is needed.

Discussion concernin where the certain fire trucks are going to go and how many calls the different stations respond to each year.

Mr. Krupp moved to change the word "TRANSFERED" to "APPROPRIATED". (over and above) (In letter marked Item 8)  
Seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Motion made to APPROVE AN APPROPRIATION OF \$150,000.00 FROM THE UNAPPROPRIATED CASH BALANCE TO A/C 203R-CAPITAL FOR A \$1,500.00 GPM PUMPER, requested by Fire Chief Jack McElfish. Seconded.

VOTE: Ayes; motion duly carried.

Mr. Krupp moves to accept Item 9: APPROVE A TRANSFER OF \$1,000.00 FROM A/C 145-130 TO A/C 145-410, requested by Donald T Dunleavy, Pruchasing Agent. Mr. Rys seconds.

VOTE: All voted aye except Mrs. Bergamini who was not present at the time. Motion duly carried.

ITEM 10: Mr. Gessert read a letter dated April 1, 1985 addressed to Mayor Dickinson and signed by Martha Moriarty

and Vivienne Goodrich.  
(See attached marked Agenda Item 10)

Mr. Krupp moved to remove this item from the table and  
Mr. Rys seconded.

259

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mr. Killen moved for the acceptance of: APPROVE A TRANSFER OF \$6,000.00 FROM A/C 1-601-418 TO A/C 1-601-408, requested by Registrars of Voters to cover postage for new system of mail canvass.

Mrs. Moriarty spoke of not being able to get into places to speak with people because they won't let you in, they have dogs, they are at work, some apartment complexes won't let you in, etc....She feels that this new way will be much more efficient.

Mrs. Goodrich: Some of the Registrars do an excellent job, some do a rotten job. People do have to go to their mailbox, so they will get these cards that we mail out. In other towns that have tried this, they have been very successful.

There are 28 registrars, each got \$600.00 and with this system, they will each get \$100.00 for an 11 day period.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 11: TRANSFERS REQUESTED BY PUBLIC WORKS.  
(see attached marked Agenda Item 11a through Agenda Item 11f)

Mr. Krupp moved to have Item 11, A thru F, motioned and voted on all together. Seconded by Marie Bergamini.

ITEM 11A:

Mr. Killen: The entire amount of A/C 503-300 didn't come to \$2,500.00. It was only \$2,480.00, because the entire balance of 1580 had over \$20,000.00 in it, but he encumbered.

Mr. Myers wrote letters stating that everybodys' encumbrances had to be factual. All these people are department heads; they are all responsible.

Mr. Killen: Encumbered was the amount of \$18,568.00, which left a balance of \$2,480.00.

ITEM 11D:

Do you know the date of the contract and the amount it was originally put out for?

Mr. Dunleavy: Once before we made a transfer in this particular line item.

Once a contract is awarded, no more should be added. It should be it. Why do we need \$600.00 more?

Mike Cassella: We had two or three emergencies that came up. They were supplemental in addition to the other contract.

Mr. Diana: It says that we have a savings of \$600.00 in acct. number 521-524, MAINT. FIRE & EMERG. LIGHTS. The school has been closed down. I take it that it's still protected, it's just somehow we had a savings because it's just not open for so many hours or do we no longer have protection in that school?

Answered by Mike that there is no longer protection.

It was pointed out that this account is titled "MAINTENANCE..."

ITEM 11: Consider and approve the following transfers, requested by Steven L Deak, Director of Public Works:

- (a) Transfer of \$2,500 from A/C 503-300 to A/C 505-500.
- (b) Transfer of \$1,500 from A/C 520-201 to A/C 506-330.
- (c) Transfer of \$ 500 from A/C 515-524 to A/C 506-201.
- (d) Transfer of \$ 600 from A/C 521-524 to A/C 507-642.
- (e) Transfer of \$ 280 from A/C 521-510 to A/C 510-510.

- ITEM 11:
- a. Transfer \$2,500 from: PWD-GENERAL GAS & OIL Account # 503-300 to PWD-CENTRAL GARAGE MAINT. OF VEHICLES Account # 505-500
  - b. Transfer \$1,500.00 from: PWD-ROBERT EARLY SCHOOL Account # 520-201 to PWD-LANDFILL VEHICLE EXPENSE Account # 506-330.
  - c. Transfer \$500.00 from: PWD-CITIZENS CTR. MAINT. FIRE ALARM & EMERG. LIGHT Account # 515-524 to PWD-LANDFILL UTILITIES Account # 506-201.
  - d. Transfer \$600.00 from: PWD-P.F. SCHOOL MAINT. FIRE ALARM & EMERG. LIGHTS Account # 521-524 to TREE PLANT. TREE REMOVAL CONTR. Account # 507-642.
  - e. Transfer \$280.00 from: PWD-PARKER FARMS SCHOOL MAINT. OF BUILDING Account # 521-510 to PWD-NORTH MAIN ST. MAINT. OF BUILDING Account # 510-510.
  - f. Transfer of \$260.00 from PWD-PARKER FARMS SCHOOL MAINT. OF BOILER Account # 521-540 to PWD-9 & 21 NORTH MAIN ST. MAINT. OF BOILER Account # 510-540.

VOTE: (Items A thru F) All voted aye except for Mr. Killen; motion duly carried.

Mr. Krupp: Motion to waive rule 5 three items requested for public works. Seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mr. Krupp motioned and Mrs. Bergamini seconded. (letters) Letter from Chem-Tek. 800 gallons accepted.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes.

Mr. Krupp motions the transfer of \$11,500.00 from RESERVE FOR EMERGENCY Account # 805-319 to PWD-CENTRAL GARAGE MAINT. OF VEHICLES Account # 505-500. Mr. Rys Seconded the motion. ( See attached Letter: PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM )

Mr. Krupp questions the disposal of a backhoe. There was none disposed of. A jackhammer was disposed of.

Mike Cassella: We need a Backhoe-Loader. It has a digger in the back and a loader in the front. We have sidewalks and trails that need to be fixed, a soccer field that needs excavating, drainage problems, etc... We've got a work force that's in trouble without a backhoe.

Mr. Killen: When did it become apparent that you would need this kind of money?

Mike: Last week the problems started.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 12: REQUEST AND TRANSFER FO \$6,200.00 FROM ACCOUNT # 201T-131 AND \$3,800.00 FROM ACCOUNT # 201P-300 FOR A TOTAL OF \$10,000.00 TO BE PUT IN ACCOUNT # 201P-140, requested by Joseph Bevan, Chief of Police.

(CONT): see attached marked Agenda Item 12

Moved by Mr. Rys and seconded by Mr. Krupp.

Police Chief Bevan was questioned if he will need all \$10,000.00.

Chief Bevan: It is running around \$750.00 to \$850.00 per week. So that would be around \$7,500.00. I decided to go with \$10,000.00 in case something unexpected happens.

VOTE: All voted aye with the exception of Mr. Gessert who was not present. Motion duly carried.

ITEM 13: Mr. Rys moved and Mr. Krupp seconded for the acceptance of WAIVER OF BID FOR QUARTERMASTER SYSTEM CONTRACT, requested by Chief of Plice, Joseph Bevan.

Mrs. Bergamini read a letter dated April 16, 1985 addressed to mayor Dickinson and signed by Chief Bevan. (See attached marked Agenda Item 13)

Mr. Krupp: I'm looking at last year's listing and between Maximum Security Uniform of last year, 26 to 53 items

security is lower on. Without knowing the annual volume of these items that they were bidding on, I have no idea which one in the long run was in fact cheaper.

261

Chief Bevan: Security Uniform was cheaper. However, Security Uniform could not deliver. Originally, we had to drop them for non-compliance to the contract.

Discussion of different uniforms and costs and bids. Security Uniform was the lowest bidder but they did not comply.

We, the Town Council, were asked to waive a bid, and we have nothing to base our decision on except that you were not satisfied.

Tom Myers: The chief had awarded that bid to the lowest bidder and then he had to terminate the contract.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 15: A letter from Charlotte Collins regarding cancellation of insurance coverage by Aetna Insurance Co. to include Contractors Equipment, Auto Liability, and General Liability as of June 30, 1985.

(see attached letter: Agenda Item 15)

ITEM 16: NOTE FOR THE RECORD financial statements of the Town of Wallingford for the month ending March 31, 1985 (Please note that these statements were distributed at the meeting of April 9, 1985)

(see attached marked Agenda Item 16)

Motion by Mr. Krupp and seconded by Marie Bergamini..

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 17: NOTE FOR THE RECORD: Minutes of the Ordinance Committee Meeting date April 3, 1985, requested by Councilman James A.G. Krupp.

Moved by Mr. Diana, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM 18: ACCEPT MOTIONS OF TOWN COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 26, 1985.

(see attached marked Agenda Item 18)

VOTE: Unanimous ayes.

ITEM 19: ACCEPT MINUTES OF TOWN COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 9, 1985.

(see attached marked Agenda Item 19)

Motion made to note the minutes for the record, but have them redone, Made by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes.

Mr. Krupp made motion to establish account # 132-126.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes.

It is a transfer of \$3,124.80.

Seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: All voted yes with the exception of Mrs. Bergamini who passed.

Mr. Krupp moves the transfer of \$3,125.00 Account # 804-828 to Account # 132-126. Seconded by Mr. Rys.

Vince McManus explains that Diane Hobs is getting through because she is with child, so we had to hire another girl. She has her vacation time coming, her sick time coming, and etc.... She is staying on with the new girl for three weeks for training.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

262

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

*135th Street*  
*5-14-85*  
*Rosemary Pascale*  
*5-15-85*