

TOWN OF WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
and BUDGET WORKSHOP

April 28, 2009

The following minutes are a record of the Regular Meeting and Budget Workshop of the Wallingford Town Council held in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall on Tuesday, April 21, 2009. The Meeting was Called to Order at 6:37 P.M. Responding present to the Roll Call given by Town Council Secretary Sandra Weekes were Councilors Mike Brodinsky, Nick Economopoulos, Jerry Farrell, Jr., John LeTourneau, Robert F. Parisi, Rosemary Rascati, Michael Spiteri and Vincent F. Testa, Jr. Councilor Vincenzo M. DiNatale arrived at 7:25 P.M. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr., Town attorney Janis Small and Comptroller James Bowes were also present.

The meeting began with a Moment of Silence, the Pledge of Allegiance and the Roll Call.

2. Chairman's Report - Chairman Brodinsky reminded people that tomorrow, April 29, is the Public Hearing for the FY 2009-10 budget.
3. Consent Agenda
 - 3a. Consider and Approve Tax Refunds (#626 - #630) totaling \$2,949.26
Acct. # 001-1000-010-1170 - Tax Collector
 - 3b. Consider and Approve Tax Refunds (#631 - #638) totaling \$436.74
Acct. # 001-1000-010-1170 - Tax Collector
 - 3c. Consider and Approve an Appropriation of Funds in the Amount of \$35,000 to Outside Contractors Acct # 001-2005-101-1800 to Charges for Current Service Acct # 1065-060-6020 – Police Chief
 - 3d. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$15,000 to Unemployment Insurance Acct # 001-1602-600-8290 from Social Security Acct # 001-1601-800-8000 – Personnel Director
 - 3e. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$10,000 to Self-Insurance Deductible Acct # 001-1603-800-8270 from Property-Casualty Education Acct # 001-1603-800-8260 – Personnel Director
 - 3f. Consider and Approve an Appropriation of Funds in the Amount of \$140 Youth and Social Services Fund to Donations Acct # 213-1042-070-7010 and to Expenditures Acct # 213-3070-600-6000 – Youth and Social Services
 - 3g. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$20,000 from Contingency-General Purposes Acct # 001-7060-800-3190 to Office Expenses and Supplies \$10,000 Acct # 001-1320-401-4000 and to Professional Services –Specialists \$10,000 Acct # 001-1320-901-9003 – Town Attorney

- 3h. *Consider and Approve the Appointments of Attorney Kenneth Secol to the Board of Ethics and Reverend Karen Cook, as an Alternate member to the Board of Ethics for three-year terms expiring March 1, 2012 – Mayor*
Removed for discussion under Item 4.
- 3i. Approve Minutes of Special Town Council Meeting and Budget Workshop for April 7, 2009

CONSENT AGENDA ADDENDUM

- 3j. *Consider and Approve a Bid Waiver to allow the Vocational-Agricultural Building Committee's owner's representative, CREC, to hire a Clerk of the Works for the Agricultural Center Building - Chairman, Vocational-Agricultural Building Committee*
Withdrawn

Mr. Testa announced that Item 3h. has been removed from the Consent Agenda. He then made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda Items 3a. to 3g. and 3i. Mr. Farrell seconded. All Councilors present (8) voted Aye. Mr. DiNatale was absent. The motion passed.

4. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

- 3h. Consider and Approve the Appointments of Attorney Kenneth Secol to the Board of Ethics and Reverend Karen Cook, as an Alternate member to the Board of Ethics for three-year terms expiring March 1, 2012 – Mayor

Chairman Brodinsky said that Attorney Kenneth Secol was removed from the Consent Agenda but that the appointment of Reverend Karen Cook may go as part of the Consent Agenda. He asked if this was everyone's understanding.

Mr. Testa made a motion to approve the appointment of Attorney Secol to the Board of Ethics as a regular member. Mr. Farrell seconded. He added that Reverend Cook was appointed as an alternate. As point of information, Mr. Parisi asked if it was Attorney Secol, who was removed and referred to the Vice-Chairman's motion. Chairman Brodinsky reviewed where they were procedurally stating that Reverend Karen Cook is approved to be a member of the Board of Ethics and can be considered as part of the Consent Agenda. He said what has been removed is the appointment of Attorney Secol, which is up for discussion now.

Chairman Brodinsky said that he removed Attorney Secol's from the Consent Agenda stating that the Charter Revision Commission has been meeting and spending time on the Board of Ethics and one of the provisions that the Commission approved unanimously had to do with the membership and the qualifications of the members of the Board of Ethics. He said that the proposal that was approved last night dealing with the Board of Ethics reads as follows:

"No member of the board shall hold any public office now or within the last three years, hold or have held an office in any political party or be a member of a political committee for three years prior to appointment, serve as a member of any municipal agency, board or commission, be an employee, make or have made a contribution to any of the appointing authority for three years prior to the appointment."

He said that the thinking was among all nine of them, although the Board of Ethics in the future may not consist of political outsiders, at least the board should not be comprised of political insiders. He said that there is an effort to de-politicize the composition of the Board of Ethics and the tool that they would use is what he had just read. He said that it is a good provision.

A Board of Ethics is like a jury in a sense in that a complaint is filed and a jury then judges the complaint on the merits, and if the members of the Board of Ethics, in general, are political insiders making contributions consistently, and a respondent in the proceeding is a political insider, there is an appearance that whoever brings the complaint can't get a fair shake. He said that he is talking about the appearance, hence, the language. Mr. Secol has made a contribution over the last three years, so if the proposed Charter Revision passes, he wouldn't really be a member. He said he doesn't want to get into the legalities of what is retroactive or not. He thinks that it is appropriate to apply the standards and find someone who fits the qualifications for members that the Charter Revision approved.

Mr. Farrell said that he thinks it is somewhat dubious to be talking about what the committee approved that has not yet been voted upon by this Council, hasn't been voted upon by the people of Wallingford and try to use that in an effort to smear Attorney Secol. He said that he has no idea who has given a contribution to anyone, and he would not talk of Ken Secol as a political insider in some negative way. He said that he has never seen him at a political function, or at town committee, but now he suddenly has become a political insider in a manner to keep him off the Board of Ethics. Mr. Farrell said that he knows him to be a very ethical person, and he thinks that the Town of Wallingford ought to be pleased to have him on the commission. He said he just doesn't get that we are using something that has not even been decided in an effort to keep him off of the Board of Ethics.

Chairman Brodinsky thanked Mr. Farrell for the opportunity to clear it up and said that he agrees with what the Charter Revision Commission. He said that he agrees that people appointed to the Board of Ethics should not have an appearance that there is an inside track to those against whom complaints might be filed. He said that he is saying that he agrees with the values expressed in the draft. To Mr. Farrell, he said that Mr. Farrell might disagree and that Mr. Farrell might say that it is very, very appropriate that someone on the Board of Ethics be on a town committee, donate heavily to candidates that run or are elected....

Mr. Farrell said that isn't what he said.

Chairman Brodinsky said that he just wanted to clarify his position. He said, "I am saying that I agree and based on merits he thinks that we can find someone else that fits the qualifications."

Mr. Farrell asked if the other candidates that the Council recently appointed to the Board of Ethics were investigated along the same lines. Chairman Brodinsky said that he doesn't think that anyone of them would violate the proposed Charter provision. Mr. Farrell said that he has no way of knowing this because he thinks that drawing something out the air, while it is proposed, it is drawing it out of the air that this Council has not debated the merits of it, and the people of Wallingford have not debated the merits of it. He said that the present moment there is no reason that Ken Secol can't go on to the Board of Ethics. He said that he has known Ken for many years and doesn't understand why we are deciding use something that may not happen as the criteria to reject him today.

Chairman Brodinsky said that he is not saying that what may not happen is the reason. He said that what he is saying is that he agrees with the proposition that someone who donates to an appointing authority, to the Mayor, or to a Councilor, while knowing full-well that it may be the Councilor or the Mayor, who may be the subject of a complaint, that we should appoint people who are not political insiders if we can. He said that it is a coincidence, and a good one, that the Charter Revision agreed with that value. He added that Mr. Secol is involved in two other controversial decisions.

Mr. Farrell said that he thinks that we are going down, for the present moment, a dangerous path. He said that we look at other candidates for other boards that are specifically recommended by town committees, people who most likely have given donations to Council members, Republican and Democrat, to the Mayor, to State Representatives, so that if we start applying this kind of standard without know its parameters that he isn't sure where it will go.

Ms. Rascati said that this is merely a proposal from the Charter Revision Commission, which may never come to pass, as Mr. Farrell has said. She thinks that it is very unfair for the Council to pick on Mr. Secol, who has served us well. She asked, "What is the Council to do, if the Council discovers that someone now serving on the Board has given a donation?" She wanted to know if the Council would ask them to leave the board.

Chairman Brodinsky said no, but that it may be appropriate to ask them to recuse themselves in certain situations just depending on who is the respondent, and who is involved in the complaint if the charter revision passes. He said that he is not picking on anyone. He said that he is expressing his values, and his values are, and you don't have to share them, when we have a Board of Ethics, those people on the Board of Ethics should not have obvious connections, who very well may be the subject of a complaint, that we can find a Board of Ethics whose members do not have these connections. He said that his values say let us find people, who are not on the Democratic or Republican Town Committee. Let's find people who have not made contributions. Let's find people who haven't held a public office, and maybe they haven't become friends with someone who may become subject of a complaint. He said that we can find those people. He said that it's a matter of moving forward, not picking on Mr. Secol, although he does disagree with his two opinions; this is a new chapter, and you can pick the chapter that you like best, and you can come down on Mr. Secol, who has made some contributions and say therefore that is OK. He said that he is saying that we can turn the page and find a Board of Ethics that isn't comprised of people with these questions.

Mrs. Rascati said you trying a new chapter before it happens, and that Chairman Brodinsky is putting the cart before the horse. Chairman Brodinsky said the chapter is tonight. Mrs. Rascati said that the chapter is the Charter Revision and that is when it comes before the voters.

Mr. Farrell said that since this is being used to smear Mr. Secol. It is a smear. Mr. Secol has served many years, and now suddenly out of the blue, he is being described as some kind of political insider.

Mayor Dickinson said he thinks it is a mistake to say that the only ones who can serve are the ones who show no interest in their town government. He said that you have a constitutional right to support candidates, a constitutional right to be a member of a party but we are saying that anyone who does those things no longer has the integrity, or ethical standards, in order to form a conclusion to an ethical complaint. It doesn't say anywhere that you can't be a friend. What if it is just a friend? Does it say anywhere in the proposed rules that you can't be a friend of someone? It's up to a person to say, I recuse myself if I am too close to this person. That is what we depend upon. Judges can serve. And they are supposed to recuse themselves if they have more than just a supporting view of an individual's position or record or whatever.

We are going to render ourselves unable to find anyone who has any real capability because of fears that that person knows someone, even though it is their constitutional right to do so, or supports an individual or party. He said that he just doesn't know what it is that is being hunted down.

Chairman Brodinsky said that what he is trying to do is bring the Board of Ethics in line with a modern-day jury because that is their function, and when a jury is selected, there is a long process to find out if a juror has any connection with or predisposition towards or prejudice against anyone involved and that leads to a fair and impartial jury who can judge the case on the merits. There is nothing wrong with trying to get closer to that system unless you want to stay in the old system where members of ethics boards are selected because of who you know, and he is saying that we can do better than that. He said that he is saying that we can write criteria and follow criteria, like the Charter Revision Commission did.

Mayor Dickinson said that obviously we appoint people that we know, and anyone would have serious question about their judgment, if they appointed someone that they had no knowledge of. He said that this is far different from a jury who has the ability to convict, to award damages. He said that the Ethics Board does not. The Ethics Board renders an opinion but does not have enforcement or penalty capability, so there is a big difference, not only on that level, but on the way juries are selected. For jury duty, you are compelled to show up, so there is no dearth of candidates. You must go, and many people who go don't want to serve on a jury but they have to be there. He asked, "Are we going to have a system that requires people to show up as candidates for the Ethics Board. The analogy with the jury is interesting but inadequate."

Mr. Economopoulos said that the Charter Revision Committee vote of nine (9) was unanimous. He said he thinks that he sees the problem. This gentleman is recommended and is probably competent and fair but we don't get to hear their reasons. He asked if this would be getting this person in under the gun if this is approved in a couple of months.

Mr. Parisi said that we are applying a rule, a concept, that hasn't been voted on yet, and that is premature. If we want enough people on the Board of Ethics, and this gentleman has been nominated that under the present guideline, he qualifies, then that is fine. Put him on. But for reappointment for him, or others, with new rules, if there are new rules, he may not qualify. We don't know where any of the new charter business is going to go. He said that the point about this being premature is a good one. He said he understands that the Chairman is trying to raise the bar and that is very noble effort but not when it is the cart before the horse. Technically, it hasn't been established, or voted upon, or accepted by the public, which is the ultimate test. It isn't logical to apply it now.

Wes Lube, Montowese Trail, said he doesn't know why the council is skirting the issue. He said that the proposed nominee wrote a check for \$200 to the last mayoral campaign. He thinks that \$200 is a significant indication of one's feelings and attitude, and it would be unfortunate if we were to have a set of standards for the other board, which were not higher than we have all the other boards and departments. He said that the criteria that have been suggested as standards for the Ethics Commission are relatively unknown as far as the others are concerned. He said for those of us that have a sense of ethics realize that to have someone sitting on that commission that has an expressed sympathy for one of the potential respondents of the commission just seems a bad way to go. To Mr. Farrell, he asked if he was free to give \$200 to the governor's campaign. Mr. Farrell said that he doesn't think that he is.

Lucille Trzcinski, 25 Turnberry Lane, took the opposite tack stating that she has never been a member of a political committee, or served in a political capacity. She likes to think that she is an ethical person, and that she could arrive at an ethical decision but she doubts that she would ever be appointed to the ethics commission. She said that is the very essence of what is being discussed. She

referred to something Mr. Lube said that you wouldn't want to have someone has positive feelings toward someone they might sit in judgment of, and you also might not want to appoint someone who might be in contention with someone they might be in judging. She said that she has occasionally has contributed to political campaigns but because of who she is and what she has said about her stated positions that she could never be appointed to the ethics commission. She said that she doesn't think that she would be approved. She thinks that Mr. Secol is an ethical person, and she has no reason to doubt that he is not an ethical person, but look at it from her perspective in that if you would appoint her. This is the opposite position from what you are saying about Mr. Secol.

Robert Sheehan, 11 Cooper Avenue, said that he attended the meeting of the Charter Revision Commission last night and was very disappointed. He said that if you take all of the recommendations that the commission suggested, on which they did due diligence, and he gives them a lot credit for going through every sentence, every period, all the punctuation in that document. He said that they proposed about 100 changes to the charter, some as minor as the wording of a sentence, and that if you are going to accept all of their recommendations right now before anybody votes on it, and you are going to impose some of it, then it better appear on the ballot in November. He added that the public really doesn't care. He said that he doesn't think that there are 100 people in town who are in the know about who sits on the ethics committee, and you are singling out one person. He said if you had said, let's get rid of the whole committee, it would be different, but you are not. It looks like a political move, plain and simple. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the people don't care, which is not good for the town. They care only when it involves them personally. He said to do this, and enforce it, before 25,000 people get a chance to vote on it is arrogant, and not what this country is based on.

Mr. Farrell said that he believes vigorously in public service, and he doesn't like to see people cut off from public service. He said it is extremely hard to find people to serve. He said that in looking around the room in the audience, he sees Sam Carmody as someone who is interested in public service, and he sees himself. He said that we are the two youngest in public service in this room, and it is really hard to find people to serve in public office. He said he doesn't like this because if someone like Mr. Secol is willing to serve, it is a matter of public record, apparently, his contributions to the Mayor, so everyone knows about it now, and if he were to make some decision that left him open to criticism, it is part of the record that he made a contribution so you can't just come up with a rule that hasn't even been passed, and now say that this is some right line that should bar people, who are otherwise very well qualified to serve on the Board of Ethics.

Chairman Brodinsky said that apparently he wasn't clear. He continued by saying that he has said that he is not taking this as a rule. He said this is not the rule that he is going by. He said this reflects his personal values which he has to apply tonight. He said his personal values are that if you are going to sit on an ethics board, and you know going in that it is likely that only high profile public officials are going to be involved in ethics board matters, then maybe your best choice for an ethics board is someone who doesn't have such contact or a relationship with those against whom complaints are going to be filed. Maybe we can go out to the community and find people who haven't given contributions or be active on a town committee. He said that those are his values. He

said that it has nothing to do with applying a rule before it has been adopted. He said that it was a happy coincidence that the Charter Revision Commission agreed with him, and that he agreed with them, and that he is not a lone-voice in the woods, and that a bipartisan, nine-member Charter Revision Commission agreed that people on the ethics commission should not make a contribution to the appointing authority. Tonight is the vote and he is applying his values on the subject.

Ms. Rascati said, if we are not attacking the integrity of Mr. Secol, what is to prevent Mr. Secol from being seated, and if something comes up, and he feels he shouldn't vote, he can recuse himself, like Chairman Brodinsky said would happen with those board members already seated.

Chairman Brodinsky said that it is the choice that you are going to make. He said do you agree that members of the Board of Ethics should be not associated with a political candidate, a political cause or a political party because you never know who is going to come before the Board of Ethics.

Mr. LeTourneau said to the Chairman that if you follow that line of thought, then where do you draw the line, and what happens to someone who made a contribution fifteen years ago. He thinks a Pandora's Box is being opened. He said there have been many discussions about ethics and the composition of the board, that Wallingford is a small town and not like a jury pool. He said that we should look at a different approach and talk to other towns about an alliance. He described how this might work. He said that the ethics subject has gotten way out of hand for the number of cases – maybe one per year or two. He was in favor of making things simple. He said that he can't see barring anyone because they gave a political contribution. It's unconstitutional, and there should not be repercussions if they do.

Mr. Testa said that he is disappointed that Chairman Brodinsky focused his rationale the way he did. He said that he knew what Chairman Brodinsky meant because it has led to this discussion, which is devolving to a debate that we are going to have when we talk about the Charter Revision recommendations. Mr. Testa said that not too long ago, the Council failed to appoint all of the Ethics Board members, who were up for reappointment. He said that Mr. Secol would be the final person who was a member of *that* Ethics Board. Mr. Testa said at that time he agreed with the premise that it was a good idea to have a change in the Ethics Board in part because he was uncomfortable with two of the deliberations that the Ethics Board held, not so much the results, but that they did not apply the standards and procedures of the Ethics Code. He said without making it personal against anyone, he feels that tonight's deliberation is about being consistent with what we did in the past in having the change on the Board of Ethics.

Mr. Economopoulos, in referring to education, said that grades and mastery tests are done without student names on the top of the papers. He said that based on the fact that he does not know this gentleman at all and that he hasn't seen what he gave or what he didn't give, that if he were to judge this based on how the Charter Revision Commission unanimously feels about it, that without a name on the paper, he would reject this person just based on the rules. He added that he was the one who was least ready to set the world on fire with charter revision. He remembers the night when he was coerced to vote yes for charter revision, and he said that he didn't want to be here if it turned around to bite us. He said he didn't think it would bite us before it passed but that it basically what is happening here. He said he is letting the Council know that.

Chairman Brodinsky said that the concept of Mr. LeTourneau is not a new one, and that in fact he and Mr. LeTourneau had that conversation for a regional ethics board. He said that idea is out there. It's on the internet in a model code of ethics. He said that when the charter is talked about in the

next month or two that allowing for an inter-town compact may come up. It would take a small change in the charter to allow for this.

Mr. Spiteri said that he agreed with Mr. Testa's statement regarding Mr. Secol's re-appointment. He said that it would be very inconsistent for him to reappoint Mr. Secol for the same reasons that

Mr. Testa mentioned. He said that it is important that the Ethics Board is new and that they conduct themselves a little different than the last group.

Mr. Farrell said this is a weighty question, and we do not have all nine Councilors here. When there were weighty questions in the past, and Mr. Farrell recalled that Mr. Economopoulos was not available at one time, he thought for a Charter Revision question . . .

At this time Mr. DiNatale arrived at the meeting. It was 7:25 P.M. Mr. Farrell said that since all nine (9) Councilors were present *now* that he would not move to table the question.

Chairman Brodinsky asked for a motion for a five-minute recess.

RECESS MOTION

Mr. LeTourneau made a motion for a five-minute motion. Mr. Farrell seconded. All Councilors present voted Aye. The motions passed. The recess commenced at 7:25 P.M.

Chairman Brodinsky reconvened the meeting at 7:30P.M., and he called the question. (*Mr. Testa made a motion to approve the appointment of Attorney Secol to the Board of Ethics as a regular member. Mr. Farrell seconded.*)

ROLL CALL VOTE as follows:

Brodinsky- No; DiNatale - Abstain; Economopoulos- No; Farrell - Yes;
LeTourneau - Yes; Parisi - Yes; Rascati- Yes; Spiteri - No; Testa – No
4-Aye; 4-No; 1-Abstention

The motion failed.

Returning to the withdrawal of Consent Agenda item 3h., Mr. Testa clarified the item 3h. by making a motion to approve the appointment of Reverend Karen Cook to the Board of Ethics as an Alternate member for three-year term expiring March 1, 2012. Mr. Farrell seconded. All nine Councilors voted Aye. The motion passed.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER

Mr. Robert Hogan, Greib Road, Paul Ciardello, 2 Bayberry Drive, Robert Gross, 114 Long Hill Road and Wes Lube, Montowese Trail, contributed to the public question and answer period.

Dave Moran, Meriden Record-Journal reporter, was recognized for his participation in the 26.2 mile Boston Marathon of 3 hours, 19 minutes and 57 seconds.

6. Consider and Approve job description for the position of Assistant Office Manager in the Electric Division – Personnel

Withdrawn

10. Discussion and possible action regarding the matter of the Connecticut Historical Commission v. Town of Wallingford as discussed in Executive Session
– Town Attorney

Attorney Small said that they went to court today and the judge that they had spent time with was not there however they spoke with another judge, and we are going to schedule another trial which will be set shortly. She clarified something she read in the newspaper regarding the disposition of the property and said that there will be no court order to sell the property.

7. BUDGET WORKSHOP

All Matters and Issues Revisited

- Mr. Testa said that prior to the Pubic Hearing on April 29 that he would like to revisit something from a previous meeting to eliminate a lot of discussion.

MOTION

He made a motion to restore \$5,400 to Line 4100 in the Dog Pound budget and \$\$13,200 to Line 9015 in the Dog Pound budget for a total of \$18,600. Mr. Spiteri seconded.

Mr. Testa explained that there has been a lot of comment on the action that was taken was certainly misunderstood if not misrepresented. The reason that he was in favor of it is that this is the worst budget year that we have ever seen, and we were entering into the budget workshops with the idea of seeing where we can make some savings. He said that the thought that he had was that we have an opportunity to make a reduction in this department budget because we are fortunate enough to have that fund and the ability to use what amounted to a portion of the interest earned by the fund, and in his mind, it was a one time only type of thing. It prevented us from having to consider potentially cutting the budget of that department and he thought that the use of those funds was totally in the spirit with the intent of the gift, and he said that he would argue that all day long. He said the thing about which he became concerned was that it could discourage people from making like donations in the future, and he does not think that the risk of that was worth causing people to rethink their wills and their donations.

Mr. Farrell said that he will reluctantly support the motion and explained that he initially voted for this because in the review of the will there were not big restrictions on the money. The Town is the operator of the animal shelter, and there will be times where the town is financially strapped and this is one of the times.

Mr. Economopoulos said that he will support this motion.

Mr. LeTourneau said that he will not support this motion in that this is one of the most misunderstood motions of the Council in years. He referred to the bashing that the Council has taken in the newspaper in the Record-Journal in letters to the editor, and also by the editor himself, including the editor's blog as well as commentary in the paper. He said that there was only one letter to the editor by Mr. Lube, who actually understood the action the Council took that evening. He said this cut was made. It moved funds back without hurting the animal shelter. He said he will stand by his vote.

Mr. Spiteri said reported his research. He said that he concluded that the Council should not have taken the action.

Mr. Parisi said that he did not get any hate mail. Several Council members joshed Mr. Parisi that they would gladly help out with this matter and asked for his address.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Brodinsky - Yes; DiNatale - Yes; Economopoulos - Yes; Farrell - Yes;
LeTourneau - No; Parisi - Yes; Rascati - Yes; Spiteri – Yes; Testa - Yes
8 – Yes
1- No

The motion passed.

It was determined that any other transaction with regard to this motion will be handled administratively.

- Mr. Economopoulos said that he feels strongly about restoring the money for the Wallingford Symphony Orchestra.

MOTION

Mr. Economopoulos made a motion to restore the funds that are still needed to have the symphony event go forward. He thinks that the amount is \$3,500. Mr. Parisi seconded the motion. Mr. Farrell said that the line item for the symphony went beyond just the July 4th concert and that he thinks that the motion that the Council has already made restored the funds necessary for that concert itself but did not go beyond that concert.

Mayor Dickinson said that the Wallingford Symphony indicated that they needed \$8,000 to put on the concert. He said he didn't know if there have been further discussions but that everyone left feeling that there was adequate funding for the orchestra. Mr. Testa said that his recollection is that the symphony suggested that internally they could reduce the costs by using fewer musicians and that they were comfortable with that and that they were going to try some fund raising. Mr. Bowes said that based on Mr. Gawlak's recommendations funds were switched from within his budget, *Parks and Recreation*, by reducing two line items, one for \$2,085 and one for \$3,000, and increasing the symphony line item by \$5,085. Mr. Bowes recalls that the representative from the symphony said that the number of musicians could be reduced.

Mr. LeTourneau concurred with the discussion and said that a balance was struck that evening.

Mr. Parisi said he thought that the symphony needed \$8,000 for the 4th of July concert. On page 46, *Parks and Recreation Budget*, Line 6750, this year they have \$3,000, plus we have added \$5,085 for a total of \$8,085. The Council agreed. Chairman Brodinsky brought up fireworks asking for that line item. Mr. Bowes said that the fireworks event encompass about 6 line items. Mayor Dickinson pointed out the principal amount of \$18,000 is found in the *Public Celebrations Budget*.

Mr. Economopoulos withdrew his motion. Mr. Parisi's second was withdrawn.

Current Financial Status of the Town
Review of Past Operating, Surpluses and Deficits
Projections of Year-End Results
General Fund Analysis
Funds with Grants and Special Revenues
Debt Service

Mayor Dickinson reported two things since the budget was put together, one is we are in the negative \$270,000 on a reimbursement for the Board of Education, Special Education Costs. What had been budgeted in the previous year was in excess of what the state will be sending us. They felt there were ineligible costs so we were anticipating more than what we will receive. They are going to subtract it from out education cost-sharing funds. We are down \$270,000 this year. Secondly, we have yesterday received the money from CRRA of Approximately \$7.2 million as far as their disbursement of funds held by them during the contract and are now being allocated to the towns proportionate to the tonnage. Those are the two primary things.

Chairman Brodinsky asked based on what we know now, on June 30, where will we end up with respect to in the red or in the black? Mayor Dickinson said that we should be in the black barring some unforeseen circumstance. If you look at it the way auditors put the statement together, it will show an amount that will have to be covered by reserves. Chairman Brodinsky asked him about the order of magnitude. Mayor Dickinson said he doesn't have that and that he is hesitant to say exactly anything on it because there is a lot that has to happen but it is expected the revenues beyond the reserves will be inadequate to cover the expenses for the year. He said approximately one million dollars.

Chairman Brodinsky asked Mayor Dickinson about the CRRA distribution. Mayor Dickinson said that there are two major expenditures which have been discussed but have not been dealt with in the budget. Both of them deal with the Fire Department, one of them is the replacement of the aerial truck, which is estimated at \$1 million. He said we need to do something about this in the coming year. He said that the other project is the replacement of the North Farms Fire Station and upgrading to allow emergency medical services to operate out the same new location. We are pursuing a location and it will ultimately require construction. He said that we do not have time to delay either project, and that both projects will absorb all of the funds that will be received. He said that there are unknowns since neither of them have been bid and given the way costs are going, he would be surprised if the funds we have will be adequate.

Types of funds, such as general fund or special revenue fund, and investment and interest advantages were discusses. Discussion covered Anthem money as contrasted with CRRA money Contingency; debt service, the need to replenish out cash, our policy of safety, liquidity, our bond rating and what is used to arrive at our bond rating and what causes us to maintain out rating.

Employee Benefits

Insurance

Personnel, Pensions & Risk Management

(See Appendix I with memo from James Bowes, Comptroller dated April 15, 2009)

Terence Sullivan, Personnel Director

James Hutt, Assistant Personnel Director

Kurt Treiber, Risk Manager

Discussion covered contractual obligations, retirement with regard to sick leave and projecting that kind of pay out; claims experience-number of claims, age of claims, dollar amount of paid out claim, pay out by Anthem, pay out through self-insurance, training and development (workplace violence, sexual harassment, diversity), employee assistance program (EAP), college reimbursement, self insurance fund, internal service fund, TP fees, NW access fee, retention fee, stop loss retention. They discussed unbundling; 1st year language; microfilming-3year contract, law states record retention of 30 years, future law may allow for digital retention. There were questions regarding meetings seminars and dues that cover national dues for labor, risk management and OSHA certification.

Pension Funds were briefly discussed.

Special Funds

Revenues were discussed in regard to federal stimulus funds and their flow, for example, federal transportation funds, flow through the State Department of Transportation. Mr. Farrell suggested that it is wise to keep in mind that these funds are not traditional as we think of it. Mayor Dickinson said that we would end up using for new programs and not to replace a regular item in the budget. Mr. Bowes addressed questions with regard to:

Lines 1065- PILOT – College & Hospital (Gaylord)

Line 1111- State Mfg's Mach & Equip-PILOT

Line 1010- Current Property

Line 9050- Close Out Other Funds

Line 7010- Dog Revenue – Fines and Complaints

Summary/Comments

8. Executive Session pursuant to §1-200 (6)(D) of the Connecticut General Statutes with respect to the purchase, sale and/or leasing of property
– Mayor

Withdrawn

9. Executive Session pursuant to §1-200 (6)(B) of the Connecticut General Statutes regarding strategy and negotiations with respect to the pending matter of the Connecticut Historical Commission Town of Wallingford
– Town Attorney

Withdrawn

Mr. Farrell made a motion, seconded by Mr. Parisi, to adjourn. All nine Councilors Voted Aye by voice. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra R. Weekes
Town Council Secretary

Meeting digitally recorded

Chairman, Mike Brodinsky

Date

Town Clerk, Barbara Kapi

Date