

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 23, 2000

6:30 P.M.

AGENDA

Blessing – Eugene Riotte, Deacon at The Most Holy Trinity Church

1. Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call
2. Correspondence
3. Presentation of Jackets to the Sheehan High School Boys' Indoor Track Team In Recognition of Winning the Class S State Championship/Mayor
4. Consent Agenda
 - a. Consider and Approve Tax Refunds (#389-392) Totaling \$3,493.28
 - b. Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$700 from Regular Salaries & Wages Account #001-5010-101-1000 to Overtime Account #001-5010-101-1400/Engineering
 - c. Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$1,400 Increasing Other Revenue Account #012-1040-700-7010 and Increasing Youth Projects Account #012-9000-600-6600/Youth & Social Services
 - d. Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Execute and File An Application to the State of CT Department of Education for Funding of Operating the Administrative Unit and Service Program of the Wallingford Youth Service Bureau for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 In An Amount Not to Exceed \$60,000/Youth & Social Services
 - e. Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to File Application with the State Department of Social Services for a Social Services Block Grant/Program Planner
 - f. Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to File Application with the State Department of Social Services for a Community Service Grant/Program Planner

- g. Consider and Approve an Agreement between the Town of Wallingford and Comunidad Hispana de Wallingford, Inc. "SCOW" (Spanish Community of Wallingford) for a Term of One(1) Year from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 Binding S.C.O.W. to the Town's Contract with the State for Social Service Block Grant/Program Planner
 - h. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$900 from Maintenance of Equipment Account #001-6030-570-5200 to Codification of Ordinances Account #001-6030-999-9902/Town Clerk
 - i. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$500 from Telephone Account #001-7010-201-2000 to Office Expenses & Supplies Account #001-7010-401-4000/Town Planner
 - j. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$3,000 from Overtime Account #001-1401-101-1400 to Purchase Service Accounting & Clerical Account #001-1401-901-9007/Comptroller
 - k. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$495 from Purchase Professional Services-Lead Account #3010-901-9001 to Purchase Professional Service-Computer Technical Support Account #3010-901-9005/Health Director
 - l. Approve and Accept the Minutes of the April 25, 2000 Town Council Meeting
 - m. Approve and Accept the Minutes of the May 9, 2000 Town Council Meeting
- 5. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda
 - 6. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD
 - 7. PUBLIC HEARING 7:45 P.M. Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider and Approve a List of Municipal Projects and Corresponding Resolution to be Submitted to the State of CT. Under the Neighborhood Assistance Program
 - 8. Revaluation Update/Finance Department
 - 9. Consider and Approve a Revised Assistant Youth Officer Job Description/Personnel

10. Report Out From the Town Engineer Regarding the Construction Status of Phase I of the Quinnipiac River Linear Trail, Including Percent of Completion by Grand Opening/Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on June 3rd/Councilor Centner
11. Report Out From the Town Engineer Regarding the Status of Plans To Repair Those Bridges Heretofore Designated as Needing Work; and Plans and Goals for the Repair of Each of Said Bridges, Respectively/Councilors Brodinsky, Papale, Vumbaco and Zappala
12. Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Sign An Agreement Between the State of Connecticut and the Town of Wallingford Under the Local Bridge Program For Pond Hill Road Over Wharton Brook, Bridge No. 03733/Engineering
13. Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$50,000 Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt West Side Tankage Account #800-427-012 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank/Water Division
14. Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$4,700 Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Seiter Hill Road Account #800-427-015 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank/Water Division
15. Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$1,000 Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Fox Run Drive Account #800-427-016 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank/Water Division
16. Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$13,000 Increasing Power Purchase for Pumping Account #800-623 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the West Side Project by \$4,700; Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the Seiter Hill Area Project by \$6,900; and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the Fox Run Drive Project by \$1,400/Water Division
17. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$6,000 to Chemical Expense Account #800-641 from Outside Services Employed Account #800-923 In the Amount of \$3,000 and from Employee Pension and Benefits Account #800-926 In the Amount of \$3,000/Water Division

18. Remove from the Table for Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Motion Authorizing the Waiving of Bidding Provisions of Chapter VII, Section 4, Sub-Paragraph 8 of the Town Charter in the Selection and Hiring of Levitsky and Berney as the Town Auditor for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2000
19. Consider and Approve a Transfer in the Amount of \$10,000 from Public Works Regular Salaries And Wages Account #001-5015-101-1000 to Professional Services/Lawyers Account #001-1320-901-9002/Town Attorney
20. Executive Session pursuant to Section 1-200(6)(D) of the CT General Statutes Pertaining to the Purchase, Sale and/or Leasing of Real Estate/Mayor
21. Executive Session pursuant to Section 1-200(6)(D)(B) of the CT General Statutes to Discuss Pending Litigation Involving the Matters of ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wallingford and Bristol Myers v. Town of Wallingford/Town Attorney
22. Motion to Consider and Approve the Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wallingford/Town Attorney
23. Motion to Consider and Approve the Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving Bristol Myers v. Town of Wallingford/Town Attorney

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 23, 2000

6:30 P.M.

ADDENDUM TO AGENDA *

24. Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$22,000 from Gen. Purpose Contingency Acct. #001-8050-800-3190 to Registrar of Voters Computer System and Accessories Acct. #001-6010-999-9906 – Mayor's Office

25. Consider and Approve Waiving the Bidding Process for the Purpose of Awarding a Contract to Kidd & Kidd, LLC for Computer Software and Hardware Equipment to Implement a Voter Registration Computer System for the Town

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 23, 2000

6:30 P.M.

SUMMARY

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
2. Correspondence - No items presented.	
3. Presentation of Jackets to the Sheehan High School Boys' Indoor Track Team in Recognition of Winning the Class S State Championship	32-33
4. Consent Agenda – Items #4a - m	1-3
5. Withdraw	
6. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD – Electric Division Deficit; Capital Budget Questions; Status Report on new Computer System; Tree on Wallace Dam; Wooding/Caplan Property Question	3-9
7. Conduct a Public Hearing, Approve the Summary List of Municipal Projects and Corresponding Resolution to be Submitted to the State Of CT. Under the Neighborhood Assistance Program	17-18
8. Revaluation Update	10-13
9. Approve a Revised Assistant Youth Officer Job Description – Personnel	13-17
10. Report Out from the Town Engineer Regarding the Construction Status of Phase I of the Quinnipiac River Linear Trail	18
11. Report Out from the Town Engineer Regarding the Status of Plans to Repair those Bridges Heretofore Designated as Needing Work; and Plans and Goals for the Repair of Each of Said Bridges as Requested By Councilors Brodinsky, Papale, Vumbaco & Zappala	19-31

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
12. Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Agreement Between the State of CT. and the Town of Wallingford Under the Local Bridge Program for Pond Hill Road over Wharton Brook, Bridge No. 03733 – Engineering	31-32
13. Approve a \$50,000 Budget Amendment Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt West Side Tankage Acct. and Decreasing Use of Funds Section Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank – Water Division	33
14. Approve a \$4,700 Budget Amendment Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Seiter Hill Rd. Acct. and Decreasing Use of Funds Section Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank – Water Division	33-34
15. Approve a \$1,000 Budget Amendment Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Fox Run Drive Acct. and Decreasing Use of Funds Section Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank – Water Division	34
16. Approve a \$13,000 Budget Amendment Increasing Power Purchase for Pumping Acct. and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the West Side Project by \$4,700; Seiter Hill Area Project by \$6,900; Fox Run Drive Project by \$1,400 - Water Division	34
17. Approve a Transfer Totaling \$6,000 to Chemical Expense Acct. - Water Division	34
18. Remove from the Table to Approve a Motion Authorizing the Waiving of Bidding Provisions of Chapter VII, Section 4, Sub-Paragraph 8 of the Town Charter in the Selection and Hiring of Levitsky & Berney as the Town Auditor for the F.Y. Beginning 7/1/2000	34-46
19. Approve a Transfer of \$10,000 to Professional Services – Lawyers Acct. – Law Dept.	46-47
20. Executive Session – 1-200(6)(D) – Purchase, Sale or Leasing of Real Estate	52
21. Executive Session – 1-200(6)(B) – Pending Litigation – ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wlfd. and Bristol Myers v. Town of Wlfd.	52

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
22. Approve Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wlfd.	52-53
23. Approve the Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving Bristol Myers v. Town of Wlfd.	52-53
<u>Addendum Items</u>	
24. Approve a \$22,000 Transfer of Funds to Registrar of Voters Computer System and Accessories Acct. – Mayor	47-51
25. Approve Waiving the Bidding Process to Award Contract to Kidd & Kidd, LLC for Computer Software and Implementation of A Voter Registration Program - Mayor	52

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 23, 2000

6:30 P.M.

A regular meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Tuesday, May 23, 2000 in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall and called to Order by Chairman Robert F. Parisi at 6:34 P.M. Councilors Brodinsky, Farrell, Knight, Papale, Parisi, Rys, Vumbaco and Zappala answered present to the Roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary A. Rascati. Councilor Centner was absent due to the death of his grandfather, John Centner. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers were present; Town Attorney Janis M. Small arrived at 6:41 P.M.

A blessing was bestowed upon the Council by Eugene Riotte, Deacon, Holy Trinity Church.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

A moment of silence was observed for Councilor Centner's grandfather, John Centner, who was also a former Town Councilmember.

ITEM #2 Correspondence – No items presented.

ITEM #4 Consent Agenda

ITEM #4a Consider and Approve Tax Refunds (#389-392) Totaling \$3,493.28

ITEM #4b Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$700 from Regular Salaries & Wages Acct. #001-5010-101-1000 to Overtime Acct. #001-5010-101-1400 – Engineering

ITEM #4c Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$1,400 Increasing Other Revenue Acct. #012-1040-700-7010 and Increasing Youth Projects Acct. #012-9000-600-6600 – Youth & Social Services

ITEM #4d Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Execute and File an Application to the State of CT. Dept. of Education for Funding of Operating the Administrative Unit and Service Program of the Wallingford Youth Service Bureau for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 in an Amount Not to Exceed \$60,000 – Youth & Social Services

ITEM #4e Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to File Application with the State Dept. of Social Services for a Social Services Block Grant – Program Planner

ITEM #4f Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to File Application with the State Dept. of Social Services for a Community Service Grant – Program Planner

ITEM #4g Consider and Approve an Agreement between the Town of Wallingford and Comunidad Hispana de Wallingford, Inc. "SCOW" (Spanish Community of Wallingford) for a Term of One (1) Year from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 Binding SCOW to the Town's Contract with the State for a Social Service Block Grant – Program Planner

ITEM #4h Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$900 from Maintenance of Equipment Acct. #001-6030-570-5200 to Codification of Ordinances Acct. #001-6030-999-9902 – Town Clerk

ITEM #4i Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$500 From Telephone Acct. #001-7010-201-2000 to Office Expenses & Supplies Acct. #001-7010-401-4000 – Town Planner

ITEM #4j Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$3,000 from Overtime Acct. #001-1401-101-1400 to Purchase Service Accounting & Clerical Acct. #001-1401-901-9007 – Comptroller

ITEM #4k Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$495 From Purchase Professional Services – Lead Account #3010-901-9001 to Purchase Professional Service – Computer Technical Support Acct. #3010-901-9005 – Health Director

ITEM #4l Approve and Accept the Minutes of the April 25, 2000 Town Council Meeting

ITEM #4m Approve and Accept the Minutes of the May 9, 2000 Town Council Meeting

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Approve the Consent Agenda as Presented, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

ITEM #5 Withdrawn

ITEM #6 Public Question and Answer Period

Frank Wasilewski, 57 N. Orchard Street stated that he was recently speaking with someone from the Town about the Electric Division's \$100,000 deficit. That person stated that the deficit was "only on paper". He asked the Mayor, "what does that person mean that it's only on paper?"

Mayor Dickinson answered, because it is enterprise fund accounting, you can have very successful business operation yet show a net loss for a given year because of your overall cash asset condition. Even though the budget would show a deficit, the overall financial operation can be healthy. It is an accounting issue. It is the way the business condition is disclosed according to universally applied accounting standards. IN fact, that loss for the year was subsidized, as approved by the budget, with money coming in from Retained Earnings or other sources. If we have plenty of cash, the fact that we show a net loss is not the problem. The budget is not as significant a document as the balance sheet.

Mr. Wasilewski asked, only the public utilities could have something like that in their budget? No other department in Wallingford could have that minus, correct? Because they have revenue coming in. They are a business; water, sewer and electric. Only three departments can have a budget like that?

Mayor Dickinson answered, we cannot budget general government to show a loss. They are part of general government but it is a different accounting standard; it is enterprise fund accounting versus the general government.

Mr. Wasilewski stated, as of April 1st our electric rates went down but when they budgeted for F.Y. 1999-2000, they estimated they would get revenues of \$39 million. However, from April to the end of June, their revenue is going down, correct?

Mayor Dickinson answered, correct.

Mr. Wasilewski asked, how will they make up that deficit?

Mayor Dickinson answered, the difference might be that they had sales of electricity in excess of what they expected and they could have expenses less than what they anticipated when they created the budget, which would result in a different condition at the end of the year than what was expected or anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Mr. Wasilewski stated, it is a little too much to be figuring out. They will be losing that money from April to June and somewhere along the line I don't think their sales went up that much. If they went up this coming year, they are predicting their sales will go up but not for F.Y. 1999-2000. Somewhere along the line they have to make up the loss for those three months.

Mayor Dickinson stated that Raymond Smith (Director of Public Utilities) would be the person who would be able to respond with more specifics as to what they are experience has been.

Mr. Wasilewski pointed out that the Mayor presented the budget to the Council who approved it. This must have been brought up when the workshops were held last year. He stated that he would have questioned it at the time the budget was presented but he did not know that the rates were going to be lowered as of April 1.

Mayor Dickinson replied, we did not know that the rates were going to be lowered when the budget was put together.

Mr. Wasilewski asked if he could get an opinion from the other Councilors as to how they felt about the matter? He stated, through the Chair, could I ask Mr. Vumbaco, seeing how he is an accountant; could he explain this to me?

Chairman Parisi answered, no, I don't think it is necessary. There was an explanation.

Mr. Wasilewski stated, the utility is losing three months of income. It has to be made up somewhere. The rates are going down between 8-10% and they budgeted that they were getting \$39 million. They are not getting that money now. Does it come from Retained Earnings?

Mr. Parisi answered, yes, doesn't it?

Mayor Dickinson stated, the difference may be in the fact that there is more revenue collected this year than what was anticipated. In addition, there could be lower expenses

than what was anticipated, both of which would result in more money being in the utility than what was anticipated which probably covers the three months' loss in revenue due to the rate reduction. Mr. Smith would have those details. Without the director of utilities here, I am not going to say what the case is. If you anticipate that you are going to spend \$100 and the bill comes it at \$75 and you anticipated your revenue, that you would collect \$100, and you collect \$125, you have \$50 total that then is not spent and is shown as collected and available in that budget without going to any new revenue sources.

Jack Agosta, 505 Church Street, Yalesville questioned the capital budget stating that the bottom line figure has a bracket following it with the number 10 in it. In reading that reference it states that \$850,000 is closed in the F.Y. 1999 -2000 budget. He asked for an explanation.

Mayor Dickinson explained that it refers to the North Farms project and one other project that (precisely which one escaped him at the moment) was not pursued and that project was carried over to this year. That money became available for re-appropriation, re-designation in the F.Y. 2000-2001 budget.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville asked for a status report on the new computer system.

Mayor Dickinson reported, the project is still in process and not close to completion. There are a lot of facets that still have to be worked out. It will be a continuing effort for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Melillo asked, who has been paying to correct these problems all along?

Mayor Dickinson answered, thus far, it has been part of the costs that have been appropriated for the computer project.

Mr. Melillo asked, if the system doesn't work and any problems arise; malfunctions, glitches, etc., will the vendor be financially responsible to correct the problems and not the Town?

Mayor Dickinson answered, they are legally required in accordance with the terms of the contract that defines their contractual relationship with the Town.

Mr. Melillo asked, shouldn't the vendor be paying for the consultant the Town hired?

Mayor Dickinson answered, no, we hired the consultant before hiring the vendor. The consultant assisted us in writing the bid specifications and with hiring and choosing the software vendor as well as hardware components. The consultant is our responsibility.

Wes Lube, Montowese Trail asked, why are there twelve transfers on the agenda when the new budget was passed only one month ago?

Mr. Parisi pointed out that although the new budget was approved, it does not go into effect until July 1.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street stated that he has five able-bodied grandsons and one able-bodied granddaughter who have offered to help him remove the dead tree off of Wallace Dam. Being that it is Town property...he would like to see someone take the initiative to remove the tree. We have witnessed efforts to clean up the river yet, there sits the tree. He asked, do you think we will get anything done on that this Spring? I could get some volunteers to do this, including my family. I have chainsaws....I can pull the thing out of there.

Mr. Parisi stated, we don't want to accept the liability of your efforts.

Mayor Dickinson answered, at this time there are no plans to remove it. There are concerns about the integrity of that dam there. If, for any reason there is damage to that, then we are in to trying to repair that. Thus far there is no expected danger to the bridge or any of the other pipes that are on the bridge. I think that is the only basis in which we have reason to go and try and remove the tree.

Mr. Wright asked, the integrity of the dam is what has been holding this up for six months and this is the first time that that has been mentioned as the roadblock.

Mayor Dickinson answered, it has never been an accepted project as far as I know. It is not a problem.

Mr. Wright stated, we have been told here numerous times that John Thompson (Town Engineer) has said that it was o.k. I checked with Mr. Thompson a year ago and he said that we can do it. Henry McCully (Director of Public Works) was going to do it in his good time and now you are saying that it is the integrity of the dam that is holding it up.

Mr. Parisi stated that he was the one who said that at some point Mr. McCully said that he might be able to deal with it; never said a date or time, but I did say that at some time in the future he would deal with it.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Parisi if he was aware, before tonight, that there was a problem with the integrity of the dam...

Mr. Parisi answered that he has not talked to Mr. McCully for well over a month if not more. I have not discussed it with the Mayor or anyone else.

Mr. Wright asked, is this the first time you have heard about the dam being a roadblock?

Mr. Parisi answered, yes, but I think it is logical.

Mr. Wright asked the Mayor, when did the integrity of the dam rear its ugly head?

Mayor Dickinson answered, it has never been a defined project, Mr. Wright. I can tell you that it really doesn't matter when any component became an issue. It doesn't present a problem. I asked several months ago if there was a danger to the bridge or any of the pipes connected to the bridge and I was told, no. We have plenty of more important things for Town personnel to be dealing with and at the point that they have nothing else to do, we can deal with trying to work on the tree trunk. Until such time as all other work is completed, I can't say that that is a priority.

Mr. Wright answered, at least I got a straight answer.

Mr. Agosta asked the Mayor if he had received the message he had left at his (Mayor's) office yesterday regarding the tree on Wallace Dam. Mr. Agosta stated that he received a phone call that individuals were in the Quinnipiac River fishing standing under the tree perched on the dam. The trunk has turned, jutting out over the dam. The caller was concerned that the tree trunk may fall onto the people in the water, injuring them.

Mr. Parisi stated, the water is not deep on the other side of the dam and the tree won't move. If it goes over the dam, it will not go anywhere. The water is very shallow.

Mr. Agosta was concerned that that tree would fall on the people while they were fishing.

Mr. Parisi stated, the people are not supposed to be in there, are they? That is another problem entirely.

Wes Lube, 15 Montowese Trail stated that he observed three boys riding the trunk of the tree like it was a horse the weekend before last. They were astride of the tree. If that tree had rolled and caught one of their legs in the process, I think we would have some very serious liability. There were two people standing on the bridge; I was stopped for the light, and they were yelling to the kids to get off the trunk. The kids gestured back in a very rude way, ignoring the adults' advice. A young person injured in that matter is probably the greatest liability that we could experience. He asked, Mr. Mayor, are you familiar with that?

Mayor Dickinson answered, no, I am not familiar with that.

Mr. Lube asked, are you familiar with the liability involving young people seriously injured?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I do not believe the Town has liability if someone assumes the risk of going into the river and climbing on a log or trying to swim in the Quinnipiac or anything of the kind. I do not think the Town has any liability.

Mr. Lube asked, did you ever hear of attractive nuisances?

Mayor Dickinson answered, there are tree trunks throughout the length of the Quinnipiac River. That is one of the common things that people who like to canoe point out as obstructions. The Town has never gone in and removed tree trunks along the length of the Quinnipiac. Yes, they are potential hazards but I do not believe the Town has any liability or responsibility to remove tree trunks from the Quinnipiac River.

Mr. Lube asked, even though it is on our dam?

Mayor Dickinson answered, I am not sure it is our dam, frankly.

Mr. Lube stated, I thought John Thompson cleared the air on this subject. He never crossed paths with you on that subject?

Mayor Dickinson answered, if there were a public walkway to reach that dam and there was a way of walking out across that dam, I would agree there could be some liability but

there is no way that anyone is encouraged to walk on, around or near that dam. No one has the right to do so nor are they encouraged to do so. I do not think we have any liability.

Mr. Lube stated that there is a walkway on the bank next to the river.

Mayor Dickinson stated that the Town does not take any responsibility for any walkway on or near the dam.

Mr. Lube stated, I am concerned that someone is going to get hurt and we are very much aware of this happening and we don't seem to care whether or not someone gets hurt. I think that is terrible. The idea that we may jeopardize that dam by lifting that trunk is an irrational excuse for not doing something about it. It was originally brought up in the beginning because of the appearance that it gives to the entrance of our town. It is a point of neglect that has gone on now for eight solid months; it is a joke.

Frank Wasilewski, 57 N. Orchard Street stated, W.P.A. built the dam and bridge years ago. I don't think it is the Town's liability. I don't think that Wallingford has any claim to the Quinnipiac River except that it flows through Wallingford. Not that the tree should be there, but as far as liability, it does not fall on the town.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville asked, the Town has put in at least \$1.5 million into the Wooding Caplan Property to date; do we have it organized legally, that proportionately the Town will get its money's worth relative to developing that Wooding Caplan Property with the developers?

Mayor Dickinson stated that he did not want to make any comment on that.

Mr. Parisi did not wish to comment either.

Mr. Melillo asked again, are we going to get our money's worth proportionately relative to the Town's specific investment in the property? Do we have it organized legally that way?

Mayor Dickinson answered, probably not.

Public Question and Answer Period was declared closed at this time.

ITEM #8 Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Move Agenda Item #8 Up to the Next Order of Business, seconded by Centner.

VOTE: Centner was absent; all ayes; motion duly carried.

ITEM #8 Revaluation Update

Thomas Myers, Comptroller and Shelby Jackson, Assessor were present to present the update.

Mr. Myers briefly explained how employees of Vision Appraisal, the firm selected to perform the revaluation process, will soon be visiting residents to perform an appraisal of their property for the Grand List, October 1, 2001. Revaluation will impact the budget for F.Y. beginning July 1, 2002. Vision Appraisal was the lowest responsible bidder, submitting a price of \$730,000 to perform the work. They have successfully performed 100 appraisals over the past 10 years; 55 of those conducted in CT. They have performed a total of 250 revaluation updates for CT. municipalities; Hamden, Naugatuck, Danbury, Norwich, West Haven and Manchester, to name a few.

Mr. Jackson explained the Data Collection Phase of the process. Beginning June, 2000, collectors will be visiting properties the week of June 12th or June 19th. The process will take between 6-8 months to complete. The collectors will compile information about each residence which will be used to determine market value of the property. The collectors themselves do not determine market value. The collectors will physically inspect the interior of the residence and will measure the exterior of the dwelling. Location, size, age, condition, type and quality of construction, how many bedrooms, bathrooms it has; whether or not there is a fireplace, finished basement or attic; what type of heat and whether or not it has central air conditioning will all be documented by the collector. Personal property items such as furniture, above the ground pools, sheds less than 64 sq. ft. in size and metal sheds in excess of 100 sq. ft. will not be figured into the market value. Entry-level appraisers collect data only. They do not set the market value and therefore cannot answer any questions one may have about their market value. The homeowner will sign what is known as a Data Collection Form verifying that the property was inspected. Inspection of the average home should take between ten and fifteen minutes.

Mr. Myers stressed that it is to the homeowner's advantage to have the interior of the dwelling inspected. It will be one of many factors used to determine market value. The

more accurate the data collected, the more accurate the market value will be that is assigned to the property. If an inspection is refused, the Town will have to guess what the dwelling is like, using the best estimate it can to arrive at a new market value. It would be to the property owner's advantage to remove the guesswork from the process.

Mr. Jackson stated that the town will be divided into five sections. Inspections will be conducted from the outskirts of town to the center. One or two sections at a time will be done and residents will be notified by mail of the timeframe in which to expect a Vision Appraisal representative in their area. Newspaper advertisements will also be placed. Announcements will appear on government channel 20. The Police Department will be informed of the data collector's names and locations. If no one is home at the time the residence is visited, all exterior data will be collected and a door hanger will be left with a telephone number on it for the homeowner to call and schedule a future visit. An adult over the age of 18 must be present in the home at the time of inspection, otherwise the data collector will not enter the property. The Assessor's Office will monitor all the information that is being collected and may visit some residences also. All data collectors will carry photo identification with them, including a letter from the Assessor's Office verifying their authority to inspect. The Police Department will have a copy of the Assessor's letter and photo identification as well. Homeowners are advised to call the Police Department first to verify the identity of a data collector if they do not feel comfortable with the identification that has been presented to them at the time of the inspection.

Mr. Myers concluded, the final step will be to confirm, in writing to the homeowner, the data that has been collected on their property. This data collection mailing will serve as a double check to all property owners that the information collected is accurate.

Mr. Farrell asked, if a resident disagrees with the information, what is the process they should follow to notify the Assessor that they are contesting the data?

Mr. Myers answered, information will be made available to the public that there will be revaluation hearings held between December of 2001 and January of 2002 at which their market value can be disputed.

Mr. Knight was concerned that people may be reluctant to sign the data collection form for they may fear that by doing so they agree with the data collected. Can they note at the time they are signing that they dispute the information that has been collected?

Mr. Jackson replied, yes, they can indicate that they dispute the findings at the time they sign. Their signature is only to verify that the data collector inspected the dwelling as they were supposed to. Once the homeowner receives their data collection form, they can respond in writing or by phone to the Assessor's Office.

Mr. Knight suggested that the data collectors make it clear to the homeowners that their signature is requested only to verify that the dwelling was inspected. He also stated that the public, when calling the police department to verify identification, should not be calling the 9-1-1 number but the routine business number.

Mr. Myers made a note of the suggestion and will give such instructions to the appraisers.

Mr. Parisi wanted it stated for the record that if the public finds any part of the process confusing the Assessor's Office is there to help them.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place asked if commercial and industrial properties will be inspected as well?

Mr. Jackson answered, yes, as well as tax-exempt properties, including vacant parcels of land. This evening's presentation was focused, if you will, on informing the residents, the homeowners of the town so that they may better understand the process.

Mr. Melillo asked, doesn't revaluation result in an increase in taxes?

Mr. Myers answered, it is too early to predict what will happen. We are seventeen to eighteen months away from concluding the process and if we take it a step at a time to ensure that all the information is gathered correctly, used correctly, interpreted correctly and applied against the same standards for everyone, we will then be able to make a determination as to the impact based on the results. It is far too early to do that. Revaluation has nothing to do with property taxes. It is to assign a new market value, as of October 1, 2001 for every property in the Town of Wallingford.

Jack Agosta, 505 Church Street, Yalesville asked, have we had revaluation performed in 1970, 1980 and 1990 or close to that date?

Mr. Myers answered, yes. It was 1971, 1981 and 1991.

Mr. Agosta asked if the firm we are using this time is the same firm that was used each time in the past?

Mr. Myers answered, no, it is not.

Mr. Agosta asked if letters were sent out to homeowners in the past notifying them of the impending visit?

Mr. Myers answered, yes, we did it for the first time in 1991.

Mr. Agosta stated that he has occupied his home since 1968 and no one has ever inspected his home to revalue it. He had never received a notice.

Mr. Myers did not dispute Mr. Agosta's remarks. He stated that there are some 16,000 homes in Wallingford. To say the Town will achieve a 100% inspection rate is unrealistic.

Mr. Jackson stated, the Town is looking to achieve 95% for interior inspections. We will be able to document which properties have been entered and which have not and why we weren't able to get into them.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street felt it was good that the firm hired to perform the work had never worked for the town before.

Mr. Melillo asked if the firm was fully-insured should their employees be involved in any action that may occur on individual's or business property?

Mr. Myers answered, they are fully-insured.

Motion was made by Mr. Knight to Move Agenda Item #9 Up to the Next Order of Business, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

ITEM #9 Consider and Approve a Revised Assistant Youth Officer Job Description – Personnel (Appendix I)

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

Personnel Director Terence Sullivan explained, the Youth Officer position in the Police Department has undergone some change over the years. The change was discussed with the union president who is also the current Community Youth Officer who has a lot of

personal and professional knowledge in that area. The draft was distributed with your packets showing the changes. Besides the language changes, the job rates out as a pay grade 4 which is one pay grade higher than it currently is funded at.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, does this job description exclude anyone who has specifically requested or expressed an interest in this job either officially expressed an interest or unofficially expressed an interest?

Police Chief Douglas Dortenzio stated that the job has not been advertised yet. It has been vacant since last September.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, things get around, if you know what I am saying.

Chief Dortenzio replied, not that I am aware of. It has been a work in progress for almost seven months.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, have these qualifications been drafted around the resume of a particular person who either you want or who has expressed an interest in the job?

Chief Dortenzio replied, absolutely not.

Mr. Knight asked, is it the qualifications that has raised the pay grade? Or is it additional responsibilities or a combination of both?

Mr. Sullivan answered, it is a little of both. When I rated this using the matrix that we paid a consultant to design for us years ago, points were added under the knowledge and skills category and when you look at the knowledge, skills and abilities, you can see there is an awful lot of change; a lot of meat to this. There was a reduction in points for human relations skills. This is a second in command but not an entry level position. This is a person that you want to fill in for the Community Youth Officer in his absence. It merited more points under knowledge and skills; the proposal is much meatier now. It has more responsibilities and the qualification statement on page 3 bears it out. You need more years supervisory experience preferred. Those are statements that lends itself to more points.

Mr. Zappala asked, how does the pay compare to similar positions in other towns?

Mr. Sullivan stated, this rating is solely based on this job in this town; the kinds of things this chief wants for the department are borne out in this job description. What other towns

pay is very difficult to gauge because you cannot find apples to apples comparison in all cases. If it was a truck driver you probably could do that; if it were a police chief, you could probably do that. We looked internally to see what service delivery we need for the Town and the input from the Police Chief and Community Youth Officer was valuable. That is where this job description came from.

Mr. Zappala asked, you are saying that you don't know if this job in another town pays more or less than we are willing to pay?

Chief Dortenzio answered, you won't find very many places in the State that provide the type of service we provide through the Police Department. It is very unorthodox. Many, many places, the skills that you see listed in this job description are not available through the police department in other communities. They may use a police supervisor as a Youth

Officer who has absolutely no background in the majority of the services and skills that you see listed in this job description.

Mr. Zappala asked, is this something that we really need to have?

Chief Dortenzio replied, I think our community is better served by it. I think in a lot of places if you have youth problems that are brought to the attention of the police department, the method by which they handle those is very singular in terms of dimension. The basic question is, is there a violation of law and, if so, just refer the youth to juvenile court and let the court worry about whether or not there are any other underlying causations for the problem. We probably divert more kids to outside social service agencies, provide them some crises intervention, needs assessments and the minority of youth in Wallingford go to juvenile court, that are involved in problems. That is really attributed to the skill set and model that this community utilizes. I have seen it on both sides and believe it is a much better product and service to the community than you would normally see in other towns.

Mr. Zappala stated that he did not know the Town had an assistant to the Youth Service Officer.

Chief Dortenzio answered, we had one for 13 years and she left us last September to pursue some family responsibilities.

Ms. Papale asked, is this John Bruce's division?

Chief Dortenzio answered, yes.

Ms. Papale asked, since the lady left there hasn't been anyone there in her place?

Chief Dortenzio answered, that is right.

Ms. Papale asked why?

Chief Dortenzio answered, this has been in the works for quite some time; since last September. This has been the fifth or sixth revision of this. We have had the first look at this job description in fourteen years and the old position, when Jackie was first hired, the job actually entailed different responsibilities, some of which have now been picked up by the school systems, health teacher, guidance counselors. Little by little over her tenure, the role evolved into something that was no longer found in the four corners of the document. We went back to square one and met with Dr. Cirusuolo and talked with Craig Turner (Director of Youth & Social Services) and met with John Bruce. It has been a process of not only of what are we currently delivering, but what skills do we need, what services do we need to provide for the future.

Ms. Papale stated, I remember when Jackie was there, how important her role was and I have only heard good things from parents as far as John Bruce is concerned. I think it is very important that we fill the position as soon as possible. I know people who have had problems in their family and they look up to John Bruce as the only person who can help them. I am in favor of approving this.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, if this is such a unique position and other towns have different levels and different people providing the services, how are you going to fill the job?

Chief Dortenzio answered, you have to take a look at what is available in the market place. It is a tight labor market which has impacted us in a number of ways and I don't expect this position will be any different. Where we had attracted both John and Jackie was through residential treatment facilities for juvenile delinquents. John, himself, came from the Meriden School for boys when he came to the Town of Wallingford. The youngsters who were there were there because their conduct or behavior was outside the scope of the law, sent there sometimes by the court and sometimes by the court in combination with input from the parents. There are still people who do that sort of work and may be looking for a change of scenery which is how we found the last two folks who were very talented.

Mr. Parisi asked, how long do you expect to take to fill this position?

Mr. Sullivan answered, we have an obligation to post through the union for five days; if we get an ad in the paper, generally, it takes about 6-8 weeks to fill a position.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street asked, what is the salary range on this job?

Mr. Sullivan answered, the job currently pays \$41,000 - \$50,000 and I am proposing a pay grade change to \$43,000 to a maximum of \$52,500.

Mr. Wright asked, will this individual be reporting to John Bruce?

Chief Dortenzio answered, yes, and then up through the chain of command from there.

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

ITEM #7 Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider and Approve a List of Municipal Projects and Corresponding Resolution to be Submitted to the State of CT. Under the Neighborhood Assistance Program – 7:45 P.M.

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Read the Ordinance, in its Entirety, and to Append the Entire Ordinance to the Minutes of this Meeting, seconded by Mr. Knight.

VOTE: Centner was absent; Papale, Zappala and Rys could be heard voting, aye; no audible votes were heard from other councilors, yet no opposing votes were cast either.

It is noted that the public hearing involves a resolution and list of municipal projects and not an ordinance per say as is commonly addressed by the Council. Therefore to carry out the intent of the motion, a copy of the resolution and the Summary List of Neighborhood Assisted Programs will be appended to the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Rys read the resolution into the record. (Appendix II).

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Approve the List of Municipal Projects and Corresponding Resolution to be Submitted to the State of CT. Under the Neighborhood Assistance Program, seconded by Mr. Knight.

Due to Mr. Brodinsky's involvement with the Ulbrich Boys & Girls Club and Mr. Farrell's involvement with both the Center Street Cemetery Association and the Historic Preservation Trust, both Councilors abstained from voting.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville asked for an explanation of the program.

Don Roe, Program Planner explained how the program was adopted by the State Legislature approximately 10 years ago. The State allows private businesses to make contributions to approved projects; projects that are submitted through the Town, channeled to the State Dept. of Revenue by the Town, who then prepares the final list. The companies are making a payment to not-for-profits, rather than making their State tax payment.

Mr. Melillo supported the program.

VOTE: Center was absent; Brodinsky & Farrell abstained; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #10 Report Out from the Town Engineer Regarding the Construction Status of Phase I of the Quinnipiac River Linear Trail, Including Percent of Completion by Grand Opening/Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on June 3rd as Requested by Councilor Rich Centner

Town Engineer, John Thompson, reported out that the linear trail is currently under construction which has been hampered by unusual weather conditions. Presently, the trail is 40% complete and should be paved by the grand opening ceremony. Landscaping and fence work will occur after the grand opening and hopefully a significant portion of the trail; 55-60% will be completed in time for the June 3rd ceremony.

Mr. Knight asked, is the Sewer Division construction project at the end of Phase I of the project still affecting work that is being done on Phase I?

Mr. Thompson answered, the contractor finished his work in the middle of February. That contractor also encountered severe weather last Fall which hindered their ability to finish the job earlier. As soon as they got out of the construction area, our contractor moved in and aggressively began working.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville asked, how many more phases are there to the project?

Mr. Thompson answered, about 6 phases total taking us from the Wallingford Town line to the Meriden Town line. It will take approximately 6-10 years to complete the trail.

No action taken.

ITEM #11 Report Out from the Town Engineer Regarding the Status of Plans to Repair those Bridges Heretofore Designated as Needing Work; and Plans and Goals for the Repair of Each of Said Bridges as Requested by Councilors Brodinsky, Papale, Vumbaco & Zappala.

Town Engineer, John Thompson handed out a summary of the seven local bridges that the Engineering Department is currently advancing from the earliest identified project to the most recent. The summary lists the date the project was initially funded, the original amount that was appropriated, the current amount obligated or encumbered, the current status of the design, some comments, the anticipated completion date, the current estimated construction cost to build each of the bridges, and what possible outside funding might be available for each of these bridges. (Appendix III)

POND HILL ROAD BRIDGE

Mr. Thompson reported that presently, the department has advanced the Pond Hill Road Bridge; it has been advertised; the contract awarded; construction is imminent. That bridge will be under construction this summer.

SCARD ROAD BRIDGE

This bridge is scheduled next for construction. Hopefully, Mr. Thompson will be able to advertise this project within the next couple of weeks and have construction take place during the summer and fall of this year.

GRIEB ROAD BRIDGE & SOUTH TURNPIKE ROAD BRIDGE

Mr. Thompson is anticipating construction of this bridge and the South Turnpike Road Bridge next year. He is trying to implement a program of addressing two bridges per year.

WALL STREET BRIDGE & WILLIAMS ROAD BRIDGE

Hopeful the Wall Street Bridge and Williams Road Bridge will follow those projects listed above.

WEST DAYTON HILL ROAD BRIDGE

This will be the last bridge on the current list to be addressed.

Mr. Thompson stated, as we look out into the future at each one of the planned projects, each bridge gets more complicated, thus the reason why they are pushed out to future years. There are either right-of-way issues, hydraulic issues or abutting property ownership issues.

Mr. Brodinsky thanked Mr. Thompson for the detailed report which was compiled in an easy to read fashion. He stated, during the budget workshop you (Mr. Thompson) mentioned that the construction or reconstruction of the bridges was in the pipeline and would be spread out over a number of years. It looks as though, according to this schedule, the last bridge should be finished in the year 2002/2003 is that correct?

Mr. Thompson answered, the last bridge of these seven, the W. Dayton Hill Road Bridge, I don't have the anticipated year of completion for that one. The reason is that there are a number of complexities associated with that bridge. There are two abutting property owners that we are trying to work with in terms of getting their cooperation to have the roadway realigned on the bridge. It is quite conceivable, on that bridge, that we may have to go out through a complete design process. Directly adjacent to the W. Dayton Hill Road Bridge is the W. Dayton Hill Road Pond dam of which we are talking to the same two property owners about cooperation in getting in there and doing some things. We are establishing a relationship with the owners and hopefully that will allow us to get their cooperation when we get around to realigning the road and coming up with a bridge and road width that will be on their properties.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, the bridges we are talking about seem to have a track record of ... the Town has gotten some warnings from the Dept. of Transportation before you were hired with the Town, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes.

Mr. Brodinsky continued, I want to put this problem into context before I ask my next question for I want you to know where I am going with it. The first letter from the State was in 1993, the next one was 1995; we got another warning from D.O.T. in 1997 and then the Town got another warning about structural deficiencies and poor conditions of these particular bridges in 1999 and in 1999 I think you said that we were having trouble with the repair work because enough contractors weren't interested and we could not get a competitive bid so I think the bid that you got in June of 1999 was rejected. I believe it was just one bid and so you put it out to bid again. How many people bid this time?

Mr. Thompson answered, four contractors.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, how tight were the bids for the construction of this bridge?

Mr. Thompson answered, the bids ranged from the low bidder of \$370,000 up to about \$570,000. There was a \$200,000 spread.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, did the low bidder get it? Were they a qualified bidder?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes. The contract has been awarded to them.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is there anything about this improved experience; four bids as opposed to one; which would suggest to you that there may be some merit in the position that all of these projects should be put out to bid all at once thereby accelerating the project? Maybe now there is enough people interested and if the bid is packaged so that more than one; maybe two bridges, maybe three; maybe it would now be a more attractive project and we could accelerate this matter so we are not a decade away from the first time we got a warning letter. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. Thompson answered, if one consultant engineer were designing all seven bridges, perhaps there might be some merit to packing these. However, we have four different consulting engineering firms designing the seven bridges. They were put out various times over the number of years. The biggest, significant difference that we found from our bidding experience in June of 1999 to the bid experience we had now, was that we put the project out during the winter when the contractors were typically slower and were more interested in getting work for the spring. We learned a lesson; we asked the question, why didn't we get more bidders and they said that we put them under a very tight time frame of bidding in the spring for summer work. If you put the bids out in the winter, you have a lot better chance of getting more and more competitive bids.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, what month did this go out to bid?

Mr. Thompson answered, we put it out in late February/early March.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is it your advice then that the next time this goes out to bid it be about the same time; January, February, March of 2001?

Mr. Thompson answered, the next two bridges would be the Grieb Road and South Turnpike Road bridges. I am hopeful of putting those out during a winter bid for spring/summer construction.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, it will be two projects going out to bid simultaneously?

Mr. Thompson answered, and it is conceivable that your suggestion of putting those two projects together; because they will be done by the same consultant; as a package, might make some sense.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, when I asked you that before you said that there was different design professionals working on different bridges and that may be an obstacle for you to package the deal, did I understand you?

Mr. Thompson answered, that is correct.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is there a way that you can manage those design projects in such a way that they are ready sort of simultaneously and ready to go in a package situation so that in February, 2001 we can send every single bridge on this list out to bid and have them all done sooner rather than later?

Mr. Thompson answered, I think that it is just unlikely that that is going to happen. Just physically managing the number of projects...

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I am a believer in management by objectives; you set the objective and you shoot for it. Is that a worthwhile goal to shoot for? Obstacles, I am sure there are but...

Mr. Thompson replied, it is a laudable goal but I want to be honest, I don't think it is achievable given the number of issues that have to be dealt with; the permitting, the property acquisition, it is physically, practically impossible that all of these issues that

would lead us to be able to advertise more bridges than two could take place between now and the winter time.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I am trying to get my arms around the obstacles; first you said it was the many different design professionals. Have you added to the mix issues with landowners?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes. Every single bridge that we are undergoing planning for reconstruction activities involves coordination with the abutting property owners. That coordination literally has to take place through my office and personally by me. The Pond Hill Road Bridge, for example, I attempted to negotiate with all four abutting property owners and was unsuccessful with three of them and we were finally successful with the Gaetanos who granted the Town a No-Cost Construction Easement to go onto their property in order to do this. I can tell you...it is a very time consuming undertaking meeting with property owners and explaining to them how both the town and the property owner can benefit by entering into an agreement which allows them to go onto their property.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, you have remedies for that and we don't have to discuss them now. My question is, these bridges have been on the D.O.T.'s list since 1993 and maybe this question is rhetorical but, how long do we allow issues with property owners to slow up a significant project like bridges which are deemed to be structurally inadequate or in poor condition? I am not necessarily looking for an answer to that unless you want an answer but, again, it might have some merit if you just say look, we are not going to let this go beyond a certain date because the interests of the Town are in this case are so substantial that we can't allow these kinds of issues to slow up a major municipal project. Do what you feel you need to do. I am just interested in accelerating this to the year 2001 and I would like to see all the bridges done by that time. You have obstacles but I suspect you may be able to overcome that.

Mr. Thompson replied, the obstacle, quite honestly, would come back to the Town Council and its willingness to exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire the properties or portions thereof in order to do the construction.

Mr. Brodinsky answered, we have not heard from you on that; we don't have a recommendation on that.

Mr. Thompson answered, that is correct.

Mr. Brodinsky continued, that is why I say that I think you have got... I hope you go back to your office and sort of figure this out and see how long this is going to hang fire before you decide the deadline needs to be set. I will leave that up to you to do that but...

Mr. Thompson responded, I have discussed this issue of eminent domain with the Mayor and he has cautioned me about whether we really want to go that route and wouldn't it be better that I pursue all the prudent design alternatives before I come to the Council to ask that question. In fact, on some of the right-of-way issues, I have gone back to the State; the Wall Street Bridge specifically; where they are going to assist us in acquiring the right-of-way to do the bridge. If I get to the point where there really is a safety issue involving any of the bridges that necessitates imminent repairs, and the Pond Hill Road Bridge was one of those bridges where the State told me we had to do something, we did the intermediate repairs, we did advance that bridge as our highest priority. If there is a public safety issue that would warrant me coming to you for an eminent domain or some other strategy through the Mayor's Office, I certainly would be willing to pursue that.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, given these issues with the landowners, what is the last date, the light at the end of the tunnel, by which these issues with the landowners you think will be resolved? Is it twelve months, six months, you can't be held to this I know but...

Mr. Thompson answered, in looking at the most complicated of all of these bridges, being the West Dayton Hill Road Bridge, I suspect we are talking about a two year time frame before we are able to have in place a final negotiation with the property owners, if it is on a cooperative basis. If it is not cooperative, then I would have to come back and say, through the Mayor again, that we are unsuccessful in getting the cooperation of the abutting property owners, a design has not been able to be advanced that does not require property impacts and then we would have to make a decision about what we would want to do with that bridge.

Mr. Brodinsky restated, two years to deal with property issues on the W. Dayton Hill Bridge, is that your bottom line?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes.

Mr. Zappala asked, how do you expect to resolve the W. Dayton Hill Road Bridge issue when the people in that area don't want the bridge to be touched?

Mr. Thompson answered, I am actually cautiously optimistic that we are going to be able to work something out. One of the two property owners that are involved in this issue,

was adamantly opposed to the bridge. One of the owners was willing to talk to us, the other was dead-set against it. In dealing with that owner on the W. Dayton Hill Road Pond dam improvement issues, she's actually come to me and said, "I'm willing to talk to you about the road." I think as we are going through the dam rehab process that we are establishing a level of cooperation and confidence where ultimately I feel that, if we can work through the process and protect her interests on her property, that she can see that there is a benefit to doing the improvements on the bridge and they won't be detrimental to her property. That takes time and she really doesn't have a long track record with me and it will take time to get that. I believe we are going to get there. We are looking at a softer roadway design; a more rustic design and a design that has less impact on the abutting property owners. That does not happen overnight. I feel confident that we will at least be able to understand the abutters concern and hopefully come up with a design that they can buy into.

Mr. Zappala wished Mr. Thompson luck. He feels that none of the residents who live in the immediate area want it to be changed.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, how actively involved are you in the process of designing and working with these? How much time do you put into it?

Mr. Thompson answered, a lot. I can't say in terms of an hour a day, but each of these bridges requires us to go before the local Inland Wetlands Commission; before P&Z for an 824 Referral; before the Department of Environmental Protection for permitting. I have to review the documents, process it through our Purchasing Department; it is a fairly time-consuming effort. I would say on the Pond Hill Road Bridge, just to get the documents through D.E.P. and local Inland Wetlands, Purchasing and get a signed contract is probably a 50-60 hour exercise just on my part. That is having the consultant engineer do the design.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, besides the bridge work you also have to be working with the road construction currently going on in town. Mr. Dooley was good enough to provide us with a list of projects at the last meeting that the Engineering Department is working in conjunction with the Recreation Department on and I know there are a lot of things that are not on this list that are being requested of your department such as the parking lot at the pool, etc. There is a lot on the Engineering Department's plate and the question I have is, can any of that be farmed out so that we can get some of these issues resolved without having to lay on your head? Obviously, whenever someone is looking for something, that particular issue becomes that person's number one priority. Unfortunately, in the situation you are in, you have to prioritize based upon needs, safety, etc and dollars committed to

the project. Is there anything that is available that is on your table....maybe you could develop a list for me or for the Council...I am wondering if there are some projects that should be pushed a little forward that aren't being done because of the workload and can that be alleviated by us hiring someone on a temporary contractual basis to come in and help relieve that load and start bringing us back up to some reasonable level of...

Mr. Thompson replied, I am doing two things to try and address the workload issues in the department; one, I am telling the consultant engineers that are currently under contract in the department that I expect them to take a greater role and responsibility in advancing the projects which will hopefully minimize my involvement, reducing the amount of time that I have to spend on those projects from 50-60 hours and in the processing of the documents, something less than that; bridge work. In saying that, when you tell someone you want them to do more, there is an incremental cost that goes along with that instruction. In order to maintain some sanity and some sense of moving these projects ahead, I have to make the concession that we are going to spend a little bit more money, but in order to get the projects out faster, we have to recognize that expenditure. The other thing we are actively doing is, we are moving ahead with the hiring of an Assistant Town Engineer and hopefully, by summertime, we will have someone on board who will be able to take away some of the project load so that everything is not a crises. That way we can somehow better manage the workload that is currently before the department.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, I am glad to hear that. There is some safety issues out there that are not being addressed currently and it is through no fault of any personnel, it is just the fact that there is a lot of work that needs to be done. My concern was, if we have to go out and spend a few dollars to bring someone in from the outside on a temporary basis, beyond the bridge issue, maybe we should do that. When you have some time, can you list out for me what your backlog is and maybe the priority you have set for that?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes.

Ms. Papale stated, the next item on the agenda is to approve a resolution for work on the Pond Hill Road bridge. What will that give us?

Mr. Thompson answered, it was advertised, it was bid, we had a contract awarded and construction is beginning right now with some gas main restoration work and water main relocation work. The last item on the summary document was a list of what is possible in terms of outside funding. If you go to the second page, the Pond Hill Road Bridge, the last item talks about a D.O.T. grant of 31.08% of the project costs. By acting on the next item on the agenda, you authorize the Mayor to enter into the agreement with the D.O.T. for

this grant. That gives the Town 31.08% of the total project costs; that includes the money we have spent for the engineering and design, the actual cost of construction and the cost of the administrative oversight during construction. Can we accelerate these projects by spending some additional money as Mr. Brodinsky asked? The fact that we are getting a 31.08% grant back from the State...I think it is wise to spend some upfront money to accelerate these in anticipation of getting the grant money back from the State.

Mr. Rys stated, looking through the list, I noticed that there are two projects with possible grants and three with no grants at all.

Mr. Thompson explained, some of the bridges that we have are just not eligible for any D.O.T. grants. The ones I indicated as a possibility, we may get grant money. The issue with the State is, if we don't satisfy their design criteria, we also through ourselves out of being eligible for their funds. Not only do we have to satisfy local design standards, but the State and Federal requirements for the design.

Mr. Rys asked, is that one of the reasons why we are taking a little more time on the W. Dayton Hill Road Bridge because if we don't satisfy what the State wants, that could be a project that we would have to undertake ourselves? At a cost of \$1 million?

Mr. Thompson answered, that is exactly correct.

Mr. Rys asked, so the public can hear; are these bridges safe?

Mr. Thompson answered, to the best of my knowledge, based on the information that is provided to us by the State of CT. Dept. of Transportation, none of these bridges have any imminent structural problems that should cause the public any safety concerns. There are no bridges that have sufficiency ratings that would indicate imminent failure or any actions that the Town should be moving to close the bridges. If the State tells us something is wrong, that we need some immediate repairs, we do that. None of the bridges that are listed on here should be of concern to the public that they will feel uncomfortable driving over them.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville asked about federal grant monies.

Mr. Thompson explained, we are pursuing every grant we can.

Mr. Melillo asked, what do the warnings from the state really mean?

Mr. Thompson answered, with all due respect to Mr. Brodinsky, I don't know whether the word "warning" is the exact word to use. The State is sending us letters saying that they are, I guess "disappointed" that we are not making as fast progress as they would like to see us make. The warning is not regarding the structural carrying capability of the bridge as so much as a disenchantment with the lack of progress that the Town is making on the bridges. If it is a warning, it is warning us to move ahead more aggressively as opposed to warning us about problems with the structural capabilities of the bridges. Every time there is an opportunity for funding, even though it takes coming to this Council and action by the Mayor and follow up activities in terms of record keeping and monitoring costs, we are pursuing those because we believe getting the state and federal funds is important to the project.

Mr. Melillo asked if Mr. Thompson intended to put all work out to bid relating to the projects?

Mr. Thompson answered, yes.

Mr. Melillo asked if the state is responsible for a share of the cost to repair the bridges?

Mr. Thompson answered, the seven bridges that are on the list of the local bridge program are all the Town's responsibility. There are other bridges in town that are state responsibility; there are some that are the responsibility of the railroad; but these seven we are currently advancing are our responsibility.

Mr. Melillo asked for a detailed explanation of the department's preventative maintenance inspection program.

Mr. Thompson stated, the State inspects the bridges every two years and if there is anything that needs to be done, we do it.

Wes Lube, 15 Montowese Trail asked Mr. Thompson if the State D.O.T. bridge experts have discussed what they find in particular to be the basis for their poor ratings?

Mr. Thompson replied, I don't know if I would categorize poor ratings the ratings of the bridges. Some of them are not rated particularly poor, they are just rated in need of repair. The answer is, yes, we do discuss exactly what needs to be done.

Mr. Lube stated, the report that I saw had poor ratings on all of the bridges. In setting up the schedule...have you submitted to the State your proposed schedule of modifications?

Mr. Thompson answered, the State has not received the schedule that I have submitted to the Council this evening, no.

Mr. Lube asked, are you optimistic that they will approve it?

Mr. Thompson answered, I don't know that it is a situation where they approve it or deny it. They understand that we have a lot of bridges in town that need to be worked on because of their involvement with me at some of the public hearings on these bridges. They have a much greater sensitivity about some of the problems we are running in to and a greater appreciation that it is going to take some time to resolve these. They are fully aware of where we are going with these bridges. This is not an effort that is being done one-sided without their involvement. They understand exactly where we are going.

Mr. Lube stated, with regards to the 1993 initial revelations, I am wondering if, in the opinion of the State bridge experts, they feel that those items that they found to be deficient can wait until 1993 (sic) for final resolution, is there a possibility that they may not?

Mr. Thompson answered, I don't want to speak for what the State does believe or does not believe. I can tell you, based on my discussions with them, and my understanding of the assessment program that if there was a problem, they would bring it to our attention and they would tell us to deal with it. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. Lube asked, are you planning on submitting this proposed schedule to the State?

Mr. Thompson answered, I hadn't planned on it.

Mr. Lube asked, would it not be prudent to find out if, in the opinion of the bridge experts, this is a reasonable time schedule?

Mr. Thompson answered, it would be a worthwhile exercise but, again, the State does not tell us what to do or how to do it. They just inspect the bridges and tells us what needs to be done.

Mayor Dickinson stated, there is no requirement that we run any schedule by the State of Connecticut and I would not want to initiate anything that isn't required.

Mr. Lube stated, my reason for asking is, I respect you as an engineer but I also have respect for the State bridge experts or specialists because they are concentrating on that particular area and they have had some fiascos around the state that they are not very proud of and they are doing everything they can to avoid any more. If we have a schedule, they know what is wrong with these bridges; it would be worthwhile to know, for the security of our bridge travelers, that their recommended changes can, indeed, live with the schedule that you are proposing. I think it would be very worthwhile whether it is required or not. For the confidence of our people, it would be well worth doing.

Mr. Thompson answered, I am not a bridge engineer; I am not a structural engineer. I rely fully on what the State tells me with respect to the structural integrity of these bridges. We do coordinate and cooperate on a regular basis.

Mr. Parisi asked, has the State indicated to you that there is an extreme emergency or unsafe condition that is perilous to the everyday lives of people that are traveling over these bridges?

Mr. Thompson answered, not at all.

Mr. Lube stated, Mr. Thompson is speaking about today. I am saying that John is setting up a proposed schedule that is going to extend another three years and I wanted to know... I would feel a lot better if the State bridge experts say that if we can do this within three years, they think it will not present any problems.

Mr. Parisi stated, I can appreciate your view however, in looking at it from a different perspective, I have every confidence in the world that the State would be down here if they felt that that bridge had to be fixed within the course of a year. I don't think that they would wait for one year to pass. To me, it appears to be rather clear that work has to be done on the bridge. At this point there is no reason to send up danger flares that someone is going to get killed. That isn't the point this is at. I feel confident from what I am hearing that we are o.k.

Mr. Thompson added, we really are looking at these things, as Mr. Brodinsky has indicated this goes back a number of years. Every two years we get another series of inspection reports from the D.O.T. I look at the sufficiency ratings of the abutments, the superstructure and see whether there has been any deterioration in those ratings. If I see a deterioration, that says to me that I have to push that bridge up a little further in the schedule. A lot of these bridges, in the seven years from 1993 to today, have not experienced any deterioration; any further deterioration from what existed in 1993. We

are looking at it not only in today's situation but what is happening over a period of time to give us some indication, will these bridges be expected to deteriorate more seriously in the near term which would force us to say, this bridge has to go right now. We are looking at it in a dynamic environment.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, I think we all agree that we don't want to push the envelope...I think we are all on the same page. The ratings given out by the State are on a 1-9 scale.

They are as follows:

- 1 - imminent failure and the bridge gets closed (not an issue here)
- 2 - critical condition
- 3 - serious condition
- 4 - poor condition - 5 of our bridges had this rating
- 5 - fair
- 6 - satisfactory
- 7 - good
- 8 - very good
- 9 - excellent

Mr. Brodinsky asked Mr. Thompson, do these numbers square with your memory as to how the State gave us a report card?

Mr. Thompson answered, absolutely.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, that is the perspective, Mr. Chairman, that I did not give initially and perhaps I should have.

Mr. Parisi stated, I think it was pertinent to the discussion. My point was that the bridges are not going to collapse tomorrow and I wanted to be sure the viewing public understood that.

Mr. Brodinsky agreed with Mr. Parisi.

No action was taken.

ITEM #12 Consider and Approve a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Agreement Between the State of CT. and the Town of Wallingford Under the Local Bridge Program for Pond Hill Road over Wharton Brook, Bridge No. 03733 - Engineering

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Approve the Resolution and Append a Copy of the Project Grant Agreement to the Minutes of the Meeting, seconded by Mr. Farrell.
(Appendix IV)

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

ITEM #3 Presentation of Jackets to the Sheehan High School Boys' Indoor Track Team in Recognition of Winning the Class S State Championship

Mayor Dickinson stated, we are privileged to have the State Championship Track Team from Sheehan High School. We are very proud to have you; welcome the State Championship Team, please. (Applause) Coach Farley is here and I know he is a very proud person having gone through one or two seasons without State Champions. This is a great time for Sheehan. The team of six achieved all team status as a result of their placement in the events. Any school that has a State Champion should be recognized. We do that; we have jackets and I want Coach Farley to say a few words and introduce the members of the team so that they can come down.

Coach Farley thanked the Mayor and Council for inviting the team tonight, to show their appreciation for the accomplishment the team achieved this winter in the Indoor Track season, Class S Championship. The team takes great pride in their performance. The team will wear their jackets to show the entire town the pride they have in the town's pride in the team.

Coach Farley introduced Coach Palange, his right hand person.

The Class S State Championship team members are as follows:

Kyle Bassoli	Nick Annatone	Erik Bergvik
Chris Eckert	Art Fredericks	Mike Furtak
Greg Isaacs	Dan Jakiela	Danya Kross
Mile LaRussa	Anders Lolle	Tom Martell
Graig Maschio	Jeremy Miner	Dustin Miner
Scott Purvis	Joe Pyne	A.J. Sandella
Brian Joy	Pierre Brown	

Coach Farley stated, it was a wonderful afternoon; it was exciting; I waited 35 years for this to happen and finally it did. Hopefully we will get one more in the spring time.

(Applause)

Mayor Dickinson stated, most student athletes never experience the extreme pride of being a State Champion and this team, we can't say enough; you really came through for everyone; your coach, the school and the town. Congratulations, I hope you enjoy the jackets and I am sure you will continue to represent us in such an exemplary way.

(Applause)

ITEM #13 Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$50,000 Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt West Side Tankage Acct. #800-427-012 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank – Water Division

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

Roger Dann, General Manager of the Water & Sewer Division explained how he is moving funds from the "Use of Funds" section of the budget where it was indicated as Projected Interest for Bonds to the "Non-Operating Expense" area from which the actual interest payments will be made, now that the bonds sales have taken place.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street asked, is this project finally winding up; is all the financing complete?

Mr. Dann answered, the project is coming close to an end. There is final pavement overlay work to be done and I anticipate that it will be one within the next one to two months. At that point the actual work activity will be completed. There will be the necessity for the Public Utilities Commission to actually levy the final assessments associated with this project and that should bring the project to closure.

Mr. Wright asked, do you anticipate any need to come back to the Council for further financing on this project?

Mr. Dann answered, no, I don't.

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

ITEM #14 Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$4,700

Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Seiter Hill Road Acct. #800-427-015 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank – Water Division

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

ITEM #15 Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$1,000 Increasing Interest on Long Term Debt Fox Run Drive Acct. #900-427-016 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest West Side Tank - Water Division

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

ITEM #16 Consider and Approve a Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$13,000 Increasing Power Purchased for Pumping Acct. #800-623 and Decreasing Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the West Side Project by \$4,700; Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the Seiter Hill Area Project by \$6,900; and Use of Funds Section, Projected Bond Interest for the Fox Run Drive Project by \$1,400 – Water Division

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Knight.

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

ITEM #17 Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$6,000 to Chemical Expense Acct. #800-641 from Outside Services Employed Acct. #800-923 in the Amount of \$3,000 and from Employee Pension and Benefits Acct. #800-926 in the Amount of \$3,000 – Water Division

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

ITEM #18 Remove from the Table for Discussion and Possible Action to Approve A Motion Authorizing the Waiving of Bidding Provisions of Chapter VII, Section 4, Sub-

Paragraph 8 of the Town Charter in the Selection and Hiring of Levitsky and Berney as the Town Auditor for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2000

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Remove the Item from the Table, Seconded by Mr. Knight.

VOTE TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE: Centner was absent; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Rys that the Town Council Deem it to be in the Best Interest of the Town to Waive the Bidding Provisions of Chapter VII, Section 4, Sub-Paragraph 8 of the Town Charter in the Selection and Hiring of a Town Auditor and that the Town Council Hereby Approves the Appointment of Levitsky and Berney as the Town Auditor for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2000, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, I am not going to go through the scenario that I laid out on the table at the last meeting however, just to state that I still firmly believe that it is necessary for the Town to go out to bid for the auditing firm for the sake of testing the waters. I still strongly believe that there has to be a test to make sure that the individuals that are working for the Town do it in the best interest of the community. Even more so after listening to Tom (Myers) give me the explanation that the majority of the work anyway is performed by his organization and I would like to add that I think they do a more than admirable job, they do a fantastic job for the Town of Wallingford; Tom's limited staff. Therefore with this firm coming in and basically performing a review process, I think all the awards and all of the accolades that the Town of Wallingford receives as a result of our audited statements, is not the result specifically of the auditing firm but more from our Comptroller's Office. To sit back and say that one of the reasons we should waive this bid is because of the good job that is done, I think that good job is done by Tom (Myers) and his staff. I strongly believe, as a person in the financial field, that the auditors have to be tested on a 5-6 year basis. I do not agree that we should keep an auditing staff on for the 17 years. The second reason I have is, I don't think that this is an emergency situation and I am not in favor of waiving bids, in general. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will not support this bid waiver this evening.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, we have two distinct issues tonight; somewhat related, but distinctive. The first issue is whether or not the case has been made to allow the Council to find it in the best interest of the Town to waive the bid. And the burden of persuasion, of course, is on those who would want to waive the bid; that is the first issue. The second issue is whether or not there is any rational basis to believe that rotating auditors periodically is sound business practice; they are two separate and distinct issues. I want to deal with the first part of that, the first issue, and that is; is this an appropriate case to

waive the bid? This is very basic stuff. When you waive the bid and when you don't waive the bid is very, very basic and very important to the governing philosophy of the Town Council. The purpose of requiring bids; I am going to read or paraphrase a legal treatise on McQuillan's Municipal Corporation, the same legal treatise that Attorney Small used for her Tyler Mill opinion; "The purpose of requiring bids is to invite competition, guard against favoritism; improvidence; extravagance; fraud and corruption and secure the best work or supplies at the lowest price practical and they are enacted for the benefit of property holders and taxpayers and not for the benefit or enrichment of bidders and should be so construed and administered as to accomplish such purpose fairly and reasonably with sole reference to the public interests. Competitive bidding provisions must be read in light of the reason for their enactment..."; I am skipping a little bit from Section 29.29 in McQuillan's; "...A fair opportunity must be afforded for free competition...inherent and competitive bidding is the requirement that the public body shall prescribe in common standard in all matters that are material to the proposals...", etc. Here is the point and I want to illustrate the point with an example which is not intended to match Wallingford or any personality in Wallingford. I am just making this up to illustrate the principle. Let's suppose there is a town that has a lot of paving work to do and they hire a paving contractor a couple of years in a row, either with or without bidding, but after a while the paving contractor keeps re-appearing on the scene and gets the Town's work. Why? Because the head of the department in charge of paving, let's say it is Public Works, says "The contractor or vendor does good work, their price is reasonable, I get along with him so there is no reason to switch." That is exactly where your bids are required; that is exactly the classic case when a department head says, "I like their work, pricing is reasonable, there is no point in changing contractors." That is the classic case to send it out to bid. That is not where you waive the bid. That is where you make sure there is a bid because from the competitor's viewpoint, in that particular town, it is who you know. Apparently, in the illustration that I gave, the contractor is pretty tight with the head of Public Works so what chance does other contractors have? Competition is locked out merely because a department head says, "I like him". Well, when a department head comes to you and says, "I like them, they do good work and the price is reasonable." Our antennae should go up instantly on this Council. We should say, "Aha, a perfect, classic case. Let's send this out to bid so that word does not get out that there is no point in Wallingford or any other town in trying to get that job because whoever has the contract now is politically protected." That impression, appearance, or perception has to be avoided at all cost for the benefit of the taxpayers. It is the burden of those who would waive the bid to tell us why and demonstrate why we have got an emergency situation because clearly, just stating that the vendor does a good job and the price is reasonable does not carry that burden or else you would not have a Charter provision requiring bids as a matter of general principle. The bidding process is presumptively the correct path to go

and waiving the bid is supposed to be the very narrow exception but if we waive the bid merely on a department head saying that the vendor is great and the price is reasonable, the exception chews up the rule. So either we are going to protect our Charter tonight or we are basically going to look the other way and waive the bid even though there is no evidence to waive the bid. As Councilman Vumbaco suggested, the classic case for waiving the bid is when there is an emergency situation. It is when the interest of the Town will be harmed if we take the time to put it out to bid. In that situation, the harm to the Town has to be manifest and it should be demonstrated by the department head who wants to waive the bid. We had a recent example of that, and I think it was Adam Mantzaris (Corporation Counselor) wanted to waive the bid for retaining legal counsel and I asked him why. He said, essentially, because the legal system isn't going to wait for the Town of Wallingford to send out bids to get a lawyer. Things happen in court or in the Workers Compensation Commissioner's Office. We have to attend to legal matters now. That is the time to waive the bid. I do not understand why we cannot take the time to send this out to bid and see what comes back. The second reason for not waiving the bid in this instance and that is, is it wise to rotate auditors periodically? I suppose we can debate that until the cows come home and I choose to phrase the issue differently; is there any rational basis to rotate auditors? If there is, we should put this out to bid, see what bids come back, find out what the competition is out there and the Town may be better off. There are a lot of smart people in the accounting world in government who have seen the wisdom of periodically rotating auditors. The issue has been raised in the U.S. Congress, there have been some proposals that rotating auditors be made mandatory in some ministries; that is not the law, that never passed, but it got some serious consideration. Some developed countries around the world have rules on their books that auditors must be rotated periodically in certain industries. There have been some studies and some articles and some research on the issue. I found some of these articles and it will only take a couple of minutes to give you the nub of it. I found a C.P.A., by the way, I did not find much in Connecticut or in CT. publications so I had to do a national search. There is a C.P.A. in Columbus, Ohio who has authored several articles that appeared in C.P.A. publications in Ohio. He wrote, "One reason auditors detect only 5% of material fraud is predictability; doing the same thing year after year. In fact, under S.A.S.82 which is a standard effective in a particular year, auditors have a positive, affirmative duty to protect fraud. Auditors are expected to do something different every year to keep their clients off balance. Keeping the same auditors year after year leads to complacency." This particular author says that auditors should be professional skeptics. The argument that have been raised across the country and around the world for compulsory auditor rotation I can summarize in about two sentences. Those that have proposed mandatory rotation say that it will prevent long term auditor-client relationships from developing; relationships that could impair independence and objectivity. In fact, several studies suggest that longer auditor

tenure leads to audit quality decline and there are three or four studies indicated, not necessarily that it would happen every time but this is an argument for auditor rotation. Rotation advocates propose that it would reduce audit failures, force clients to adopt conservative accounting practices and result in more complete financial statement, etc. That was the words of a professor at Villa Nova University, College of Commerce and Finance and jointly authored by another professor from the University of Virginia, McIntyre School of Commerce, Monroe Hall, Charlottesville, Virginia. There is another reason to send audits out to bid and that is because some people believe, after doing studies, that sending the audit contract out to bid results in discounts in the auditors' fee, it actually reduces the price. That is common sense to me; it may not necessarily reduce the price this time around but if there is any reasonable chance that by sending this out to bid we reduce the auditors' fee, we should do it; crystal clear; it is very simple. There is also a standard...but the American Institute of C.P.A.s S.E.C. Practice Session requires the engagement partner to rotate auditing on public service companies, every seven years. The engagement partner is the partner in charge of the audit. A professional association, the S.E.C. practice session requires the auditing partner to be rotated every seven years; not necessarily the auditing firm, they have not gone that far; but at least the auditing partner. On balance, I see no reason why this should not go out to bid. It may be that our auditor that we are now using may get that bid; he may be the best person and may be the lowest price, but let's find out. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I may have some further comments to respond to others.

Mr. Zappala stated, I voted two years ago against waiving the bid on this issue, not because it was Levitsky & Berney but because of the outstanding job our Accounting personnel does. I voted against waiving the bid a couple of years ago because we had them performing the work for 15 years because I felt it was time to get somebody new to look at our books. I will vote against it again, this year.

Ms. Papale stated, I guess I have to speak as the other person on the left of you, Mr. Chairman. Two years ago I did vote to retain Levitsky & Berney as the Town Auditor and I am going to vote the same this year. I listened to what my colleagues said and I know that they do have some good points but I really believe the Town is in the financial position that it is today mainly maybe because of our Finance Department but also because our auditor, working along with Mr. Myers makes a difference. I think the two of them, I won't say are partners because I know much of the work is done through our Finance Office, but I think it is the way Mr. Myers and whoever does the work from Levitsky & Berney work together that makes the difference. Other towns have kept different auditors for many years; I am not going to go into everybody that I spoke to but I know, if I am correct, that Levitsky & Berney is the auditor in North Haven and they have been there for

many years; probably as long as they have been here with us. As far as waiving the bid, I know we like to look at the lowest price but I found through the years that the lowest price as it might have come in, might not have been the best company for our town. The lowest price is not always the best. I just maybe look at things the old fashioned way. We certainly know what we have with Levitsky & Berney and we do not know what we will get if we do get another auditor in here and for one more year and I think I mentioned it last year that maybe it would be my last year not to change but the way things came out with our financial office so well, I feel I have to go one more year with Levitsky & Berney and I will vote to waive the bid, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Parisi answered, thank you.

Mr. Rys asked Mr. Myers asked, how intense is it or how complicated is it if you have to deal with a new auditor other than Levitsky & Berney at this time?

Thomas Myers, Comptroller, replied, whenever a change occurs there is a long training period where in any professional association, and it doesn't have to be auditors, where a new professional firm, be it an auditor or some other professional, doing work for either a private or public company, has to become acclimated or study to know the client. That takes up usually staff time, management time on the client and the professional organization. It can be a very time consuming, intense process and procedure.

Mr. Rys stated, the reason I brought that up is because we are entering into a revaluation year and I am just wondering if this is a good year to want to change?

Mr. Myers replied, we have revaluation and the computer project. I wish I could sit and say that the computer project will go as smooth as revaluation but we are pulling our hair out with the computer project. This is not a small operation; our billings, taxes, electric, water and sewer bills that we issue to our customers, approximate \$130 million annually. No computer conversion is simple. You throw into the mix that type of revenue stream with four different rates...and you really have some hair-raising times. We are faced with two major projects...do I believe it is the right thing for the Town to pursue the computer? Yes, because we are eliminating four separate systems and moving to one universal network/database which I believe will be a long term benefit to the Town.

Mr. Rys asked, if one reads the Charter, this might be in the best interests of the Town to continue with what we have? I have no problem supporting this firm and perhaps next year I may look at it a little closer; we may go out to bid next year. At this point, with what I have heard with revaluation and the computer system, I would not want to change.

Mr. Knight stated, one of the things that just occurred in the Town of Wallingford a few months ago was an improvement in our already excellent bond rating to Aa1. I would think that if we were pursuing a risky path by having the same auditing firm year after year that would enter into a bond rating agency's consideration for our rating. If these agencies felt that we were risking the fiscal integrity of the community by having the same auditing firm year after year, I have no doubt, what so ever, that that would be part of their report. It is not. In fact, quite the opposite has been taking place over the past seventeen years; that is the number of years that they have been here and that gives me a certain comfort level that other experts, people that evaluate communities all over the United States, are comfortable with having the same auditing firm as we are. I think that is a significant factor. That is why I have no problem supporting this motion. I am pleased and proud of the record the Town has and I am confident that Levitsky & Berney is proud of the reputation that they have obtained and would do nothing to jeopardize it.

Mr. Brodinsky replied, the bond rating of the town is about as irrelevant a factor as you can get. There are many private industries out there that are in excellent financial shape and change auditors. Their financial strength has nothing to do with the reason why they change auditors. I think the bond rating is a red herring. I listen to Mr. Rys' comments and Mr. Myers' answer and there will always be a reason or excuse why this year is not the right year. I did not hear any detail from Mr. Myers as to how possibly a new auditor, but that is not even the issue tonight, the issue is to waive the bid, it doesn't necessarily mean that we get a new auditor, but I never heard any detail as to how a new auditor is really going to interfere with the Town's mission. If the answer is, there is a learning curve, that would mean that no business or town would change auditors ever. Ladies and gentlemen, industry and government change auditors periodically and, as I indicated before, there are many smart people out there that believe it should be required. The inconvenience argument; the learning curve argument doesn't make the case for not putting this out to bid. The bond rating is fairly irrelevant to the issue. Back in 1996 Mr. Farrell seemed to be in agreement with putting it out to bid. The minutes from May 14 indicate that he agreed with two other Councilors and stated, "changing auditors from time to time would not be a good idea." He quoted John:23 "It is good to open the windows and let in the air"...so at least in 1996 there was something that motivated him to say, at least let's put it out to bid, for goodness sakes. It does not necessarily mean that we change auditors but let's see what the competition has to offer and let's see who they are and they should show themselves. The only way the competition could show themselves is if we put this out to bid.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, again, I am in the (accounting) field and I again, have to back up what Michael (Brodinsky) has said just now; the fact that it is done every day in business and there always is a learning curve. That is not, to me, a reason why we should not change auditors. I think we are losing track of the issue. The issue is not the auditors, it is the bid waiver process. To me, this is not an emergency situation. To me, there should be absolutely no reason why we cannot at least go out to bid and test the waters. I don't think that we should bring up the auditing firm and the issue of the bonds or the reports or any of that; it is all irrelevant to the issue that is on the table tonight of waiving the bid. We are asking to waive a bid for a service of which the fees range from \$70,000 - \$90,000. To me, that is a significant amount of money to the community and to this Council as far as our fiduciary responsibility. We should be demanding, I mean demanding, that we go out to bid; not just sitting back and making excuses why we should not go out to bid.

Mr. Zappala stated, Levitsky & Berney may be the lowest bidder if we go out to bid. I think going out to bid is important and maybe there is a chance of getting someone new to check our books. That is my reason for voting against the bid waiver.

Andy Kapi, 14 N. Turnpike Road directed his comments to Mr. Myers stating, I am struck by your reference to the computer system upgrade or implementation as how it relates to the whole issue of the auditors carryover and familiarity and methods for record keeping and tracking. I am not quite sure I understand specifically how that really fits. What is it that is irreplaceable in terms of what another firm can do? Do we have a problem here of keeping records of our incoming revenues? Is the problem with the computer system so bad that we are losing track of the funds that are coming in? What is the real world connection here to what we could conceivably lose were another firm to come in and be able to provide the service, building on what we have learned in 17 years in the way we keep this reporting methodology in place?

Mr. Myers answered, the computer system has impacted us in everything that we do. We are changing out from four separate systems which were developed over a 30 year period. To the best of my knowledge and memory, our original tax billing computer software came from the City of New Haven in 1969 or 1970. At around that time our tax bills were prepared by the City of New Haven, Data Processing. The City decided that they no longer wanted to do work for other municipalities so they offered the software to those who were using their services. We brought that software in house and, over the years, it has been changed and modified over and over for the past 30 years. Now we have moved to a software package that has been developed and maintained by an independent third party vendor. Any time you undertake a change like that, certain information moves over without a problem; in the industry it is called migration. Certain other information is left

by the wayside or it doesn't move. This results in a constant reconciliation process. For example, we balanced all of our tax records on December 27, 1999. We had an absolute figure of everyone who owed taxes to the Town; what the outstanding taxes were. That information was migrated from the old computer software to the new system. It took the Tax Office staff from December 27th until approximately the end of February to reconcile those numbers. It wasn't large dollar amounts but sometimes it is the small dollar amounts that pose more of a concern than the larger amounts because they can be net figures; a combination of missing information and information that came over incorrectly. Imagine the staff time that it took to accomplish that and then begin to move forward in applying payments that we have received in January and February. I do want to say that in no way has this computer system impacted our ability to collect cash and checks on customer's accounts and to apply those to the banking process and to the customer's accounts. It is these frustrations that ties up all kinds of time. We have to reach a comfort level in this changeover that we can accept the product of the new system without hesitation. We can accept it and know that it is correct and we are not there yet. It is very frustrating and is consuming all kinds of staff time.

Mr. Kapi stated, I am not really sure an examination of the computer system problems is totally germane to this point but since you introduced it in your explanation of your position here, I will refer to it. Given all the additional staff time and work that it takes to do the reconciliation, is the auditor working over people's shoulders while that is happening or are they following procedures, logging hours, recording their efforts and what ever accountability that comes to the plate? If an outcome from bidding were to be that another firm got this contract with us, what, essentially, would palpably be different in the way these people are undertaking their efforts now? They are going to have to do this regardless of which auditor we have in place. I am still asking the same question; how does maintaining a firm that is so familiar with us and has dealt with us so substantially and for such a length of time that we know their methods and they know ours in and out, if they were to go out of business tomorrow, what would be the difficulty in maintaining the same procedures, the same accounting methods, the same billing to accounts...what would be lost?

Mr. Myers answered, just the learning curve. You have a learning curve on the new technology system and then you have a learning curve with an independent auditor.

Mr. Kapi stated, to sum up; as someone who sometimes has spoken against our predilection for waiving bids for too little reason, I, again, would state that same position tonight. I don't know that we risk losing anything that has substantially been stated here to have an immediate impact on our ability to continue and build on procedures and methods

that have been given to us over the course of the years with this firm. Out of principle I support putting this issue to bid. With regards to the learning curve; if you are dealing with an outfit and you are not learning anything yourself from that, it is sort of a one way relationship. I think there is a lot of opportunity lost. I don't see that as a compelling argument for at least not allowing the possibility that another firm could, in fact, take over these duties and do them quite well. As a former member of a relay team who passed batons, you can do that here.

Jack Agosta, 505 Church Street, Yalesville stated, there is a fear of change here. I know Tom Myers, he is the best. Mr. Myers' people do all the work and someone overlooks and either agrees with it or doesn't agree with it. Regardless of who audits the books of the Town, Tom's crew does the work. Levitsky & Berney just looks at the work and approves how he does it; that's it. There is no reason why we should have the same auditor for seventeen years because it is comfortable to do so. I had three different accountants do my taxes for me the last three years and I will have a different one next year. I don't want my accountant to overlook anything of mine if he thought I was putting some down on my return that wasn't right. Having different auditors come in protects the Town. Tom has nothing to worry about, his people is doing the job. If the Electric Division has had computer problems for a year at a cost of \$300,000 to date, how many years are we going to have computer problems? We are going to have the same auditors for the rest of our lives because we don't want change. I think that is a fear of having someone else o.k. our work and I don't believe in that.

Philip Wright, Sr., 160 Cedar Street stated, I have listened to this discussion several years and I have heard Mr. Myers explain what the auditor does. I guess I can sum it up by saying that he comes in and says, "You have said $2 + 2$ is 4; I agree $2 + 2$ is 4." That is about what I get from this. I have listened to about every Councilperson up there say, "Gee, I am against waiving bids" yet, here is one that a good many of them have waived year after year after year. I wonder if 5, maybe 10 years ago we had gotten a different auditor in here, might he have told us that we should scrap the 30 year old computer business that is now choking us? Might it not have happened if we had gotten somebody else in here? If we had a breath of spring? From time to time I get together with my five children. The last occasion, Saturday, was the death of a brother-in-law; an uncle of my five kids. When I asked my five kids the same question year after year, "Am I a good father?" I get the same answer year after year; "yeah, pop. You are great." We are asking the same guy the same question year after year. We always get the same answer; "Wallingford, you're great!!" Then we say, therefore Levitsky & Berney are great and that we should never ever separate from them. I believe that it is time we go out to bid; that it is time that we erase all thoughts of coziness and be rid of it, thank you.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville stated, the words of Councilors Vumbaco and Brodinsky should be listened to. Levitsky & Berney have a tremendous advantage over other competitors; other auditor firms who would like to bid on this job. If you send it out to bid, Levitsky & Berney should be able to come up with the lowest bid most likely. Businesses advertise in the newspaper for bidders because they know by encouraging competition and as many applications as possible, they will possibly get the best workers. The same principle applies here; you have to encourage competition. The intent of the Charter is a lot like the intent of the law. Contrary to the intent of the Charter, bids have been waived all too often, over and over throughout the years. Bids should not be waived unless there is some kind of emergency. It is about time we got the bidding process straightened out the way it should be. This bid should not be waived in any way. Especially because of the intent of the Town Charter. The Council is supposed to listen to the taxpayers who are your bosses. The taxpayers here tonight have spoken. Mr. Brodinsky and Mr. Vumbaco should be listened to. Mr. Vumbaco is an accountant and an auditor, in the same ball park. None of you up there are; the rest of you are not. With regards to the bond rating statements; this has nothing to do with our bond rating. With regards to the computer system; the best computer to rely on is the one on top of your shoulders, much more than any other and we would be much better off.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, does anyone know when this was put out to bid last? I understand that this auditor has been with us since 1983, is that correct? Has it been put out to bid since then?

Mr. Myers answered, Levitsky & Berney have been with us since 1983. It was not bid at that time and it has never been put out to bid since.

Mr. Farrell stated, Mr. Brodinsky raises the question of perhaps why my mind has changed on this issue since the time in question. I guess I would say to Mr. Brodinsky that I am young and I can still learn. One of the things I have had the opportunity to go through since the time I voiced those concerns was three business audits of one of the organizations that I am involved with. I was the person who had to answer all of the auditor's questions. I understand what Tom Myers is saying; that there is a very extreme learning curve to this type of process. It gets slightly easier with every year as the auditor learns your accounts, corporate culture, etc. I also do take into mind, as much people have dismissed it this evening, that the Town's financial health as measured by all of these bond agencies is excellent. That is not something that we can just pooh-pooh and say that it would be anyway under a different auditor. The way we have set it up, it has resulted in excellent bond ratings. That has a value to it. Every time we go out and we have to sell

our bonds, the taxpayers are getting a better deal. As much as people may want to change it, I don't at this point see a reason to do that.

Mr. Myers added, we are required to file our audited financial statements with both bond rating agencies; Standard & Poor's and Moody's. That is an annual requirement. We are required to file our adopted budget annually with Standard & Poor's and Moody's. In addition, the auditor, whoever it may be, signs an opinion letter. When that auditing firm, whoever that may be, signs the opinion letter, they accept responsibility and liability for the work, the audit tests and the audit procedures that they have performed in looking at any client. We are also required to annually file our audit with the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management (O.P.M.) in the State of CT. Those audits are reviewed annually by O.P.M. We are required to annually notify O.P.M. who the auditor of record is. The last piece of information that I would offer and it is partially in answer to what Mr. Wright said; there are several different types of audits and Mr. Vumbaco maybe even more familiar than I am. There are financial audits, which is what we receive; operational or performance audits, where the auditor is asked not to come in examine numbers but to examine a process such as Mr. Wright's example with computers. That is a different type of audit than a financial audit.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, the learning curve is being bantered about tonight and I wholeheartedly agree with Tom that there is always a learning curve. I stated that it is done consistently but it also goes both ways. You can learn from auditors, too, and I think by rotating auditing firms if, in fact that is a decision that is made, it breathes new, fresh blood into the process, itself, more than would happen if stayed with the same firm and they bring in new people because the new people normally are younger people who are learning from the people they are auditing. I think the learning curve situation is a valid point but I would also like to point out that it is a two-way street as far as a learning curve is concerned.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, is the financial audit less invasive than the operational and performance audit?

Mr. Myers answered, a financial audit is an invasive process because it really tests a financial department from where information enters to where it exits. It tests almost every type of transaction, whether it be a cashier collecting money over the counter; the accounts payable section processing bills to pay vendors; testing payroll at the Board of Education; at the Town Payroll Office. I would say both types of audits are on an equal level. A lot of performance or operational audits are approached the same way; from point 0 to wherever they end up. A lot of performance or operational audits look at a process; other

than a financial process and ask, is this being managed in the most cost-efficient and cost-effective manner? Take it from there.

Mr. Brodinsky stated, the invasive nature of the financial audit is what we pay them for; that is what we want.

Mr. Myers replied, we pay them to be thorough. Their thoroughness is governed by a very strict set of standards that not we issue but are issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (A.I.C.P.A.) and the State of CT. Office of Policy and Management has a set of standards that all municipal auditors must adhere to and must confirm to O.P.M. that they have conducted there audit in accordance with not only the A.I.C.P.A. standards but with the State standards. There are two sets of standards there.

Mr. Wright stated, after listening to Mr. Myers and all the people who have justified that we must not go out to bid lest terrible things could happen; what I would suggest is that all of the people who are of that opinion, all the people here, and the townspeople go to their house of worship and pray that Levitsky & Berney never go bankrupt.

Mr. Parisi stated, I have supported every bid waiver that has come down the line for the auditor and my reasoning is a very simple one; I have the deepest respect for Mr. Myers, both for his professionalism and his guidance of the financial position of the Town and, as in the past, if this was his feeling, that this was the firm that should be hired, I have absolutely no reason to question his judgment. After twenty plus years and seventeen times supporting this, this will probably be the eighteenth time. I think this is ironic in a way because it is a start of the year; we usually approve a list of vendors and, at that time, we waive the bid for some 50, 60 or 70 vendors and, at no time at all do I ever hear an outcry about waiving the bid for vendors. I, for one, have stood with Mr. Vumbaco and others in the past as far as bid waivers but I also put a lot in the stock of the people who are making the recommendations, as I do in this case. I am very pleased and happy to support the request made by the Comptroller to approve this one.

VOTE: Centner was absent; Brodinsky, Vumbaco & Zappala, no; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #19 Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$10,000 From Public Works Salaries and Wages Acct. #001-5015-101-1000 to Professional Services – Lawyers Acct. #001-1320-901-9002 – Town Attorney

Motion was made by Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

Correspondence from Town Attorney Janis M. Small states that there are several workers compensation matters pending with activity expected through the close of the fiscal year.

Wes Lube, 15 Montowese Trail asked, if any attorney who is working for the Town has a fee in excess of \$2,000. it would still have to come for a bid waiver, would it not?

Atty. Small answered, for these particular cases, the bid was waived on prior occasions so those are already in place. We have, however, put workers compensation attorney services out to bid presently for future services.

VOTE: Centner and Parisi were absent; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ADDENDUM ITEM #24 Consider and Approve a Transfer of Funds in the Amount of \$22,000 from Gen. Purpose Contingency Acct. #001-8050-800-3190 to Registrar of Voters Computer System and Accessories Acct. #001-6010-999-9906 – Mayor's Office

Motion was made by Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

At the request of the Pyramid (Computer) Committee, RSM McGladrey has researched and sought proposals from vendors to implement a voter registration computer system for the Town. The system is to be developed on a stand alone, i.e., not connected to the Town Hall network, p.c. platform and will be wholly supported and maintained by the selected vendor. RSM has spoken with representatives from several software companies regarding the capabilities of their systems and their understanding of the Town's needs. RSM has also sought the input and insight from the Registrars of Voters on the merits of each software package. In addition, they have conducted conversations with Registrars in several comparable communities, municipalities to Wallingford in order to gain a better understanding of the State of CT.'s ConVeRse voter registration system. As a result of RSM's discussions with Wallingford's Registrars it is RSM's understanding that Kidd & Kidd, LLC software package will best satisfy the Town's Registrars' needs. Based on this understanding, the Pyramid Committee is recommending the purchase of this system plus additional hardware equipment. The anticipated equipment includes printers (one dot matrix and one laser jet), data line, and a tape backup device.

The cost to purchase the Kidd & Kidd, LLC Software Plus Training and Data Conversion from Kidd & Kidd is \$18,200. The cost to purchase the printers, telephone data line & tape backup is \$3,300., for a total cost of \$21,500 for the Registrars' office computer.

Mr. Farrell stated, I know right now the Registrar of Voters system is available to the Town Clerk in her office because it is on the Town's larger system. Is there a complication to the Town Clerk's Office...you are not going to be able to access it anymore?

Town Clerk Rosemary Rascati answered, it is going to complicate matters a little bit in my office if we can't be hooked up because when a voter is registered upstairs and he comes down to my office to obtain an Absentee Ballot Application, we have to check him out. The printed list is not updated very frequently, not like the computer whereas before we could bring the name up on the computer and check him out and make sure he is a voter and give him an absentee ballot application. Now we can't hook in which means that we have to call upstairs. Nine times out of ten the line is busy or maybe they are not there or we have to send the voter back up for a note or we have to run upstairs. It will complicate matters if we can't have access to it. It is not something that is insurmountable; we will work around it if we have to.

Mr. Farrell asked, there is no way the system could somehow be hooked up to a terminal in your office?

Mrs. Rascati replied, we can look into it; that is what we would like to have. We have a terminal now; whether it could be hooked up...

Mayor Dickinson stated, that could be looked into. I don't know whether the existing wiring can be used or not but at this point we need to get the system running in the Registrars' Office and we can deal with other things afterward. WE would like to get this up and going prior to July 1st. At that point the Unisys System comes to a halt. The State is also implementing a program so it will be two systems. We can take a look at what the issue should be afterwards but first I would like to get something up and running.

Mr. Farrell stated, I shared Mrs. Rascati's concern. We make the system cumbersome for someone who wants an absentee ballot. It is hard enough to get people out to vote that once they come into the Town Clerk's Office, you want to make it as expeditious a process in getting the ballot. That is my concern.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, I am fully supportive of automating your (Town Clerk's) area. Anything that we can do to make life easier, obviously, I am in favor of. When did we know that we needed to do this?

Mrs. Rascati replied, no one from the Voters' office consulted me. I am becoming aware of it now however they knew that I did have a terminal and that I used to access the old system.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, when did we know that we were looking into changing away from the Unisys system to a stand alone system? Was that decision just made recently or was it part of the entire plan? Was it discussed with your office weeks ago; months ago; years ago?

Mrs. Rascati answered, it was quite a while ago when we were looking into changing the system. However, at that time I was told that we were going to keep the old terminal and the old system running so that we could have access. Now it looks like it is not going to be running along side of this system and I won't have access.

Mr. Vumbaco stated that he had wished the consultant was present. He asked, is this the only company that can provide this service or is this a company based upon RSM's opinion to be the one to provide the service? Are there other companies out there that can provide this service?

Mayor Dickinson answered, Rosemary really hasn't been involved with this. It really deals directly with the Registrars and the Pyramid Committee. The only software that they were able to determine; there is a firm in Rhode Island, there is a firm in Tennessee and there is no existing software program in the State of CT. other than the State of CT.'s program. Various towns have their own systems but there is nothing that is an open architecture, a program that is maintained by an outside vendor. As a result of inquiries including calling other municipalities, our consultant brought forth the Rhode Island and Tennessee examples. The Registrars', after becoming acquainted with them, thought that the Tennessee software program was the one they wanted, hence we are here.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, again, this is another bid waiver and yet there is no one here to answer any questions. If you said it had nothing to do with Rosemary, I appreciate that but it has to do with the Registrars and the Pyramid Committee, there should have been representation here so that questions could be asked. My concern is, we are waiving the bid and I don't see an emergency situation here. If there is more than one company that can provide this service which, according to this letter, it says they talked to various vendors plural, there must be other people who supply this service. Therefore I think we should consider putting this out to bid, not waiving the bid unless it is an emergency situation where it is going to shut down Rosemary's or the Registrars' office. If that is the case then that case should be made by those people and they are not here to make that case.

Mayor Dickinson stated, as of July 1st the Unisys System comes to an end so we have to have a system up and running and that is the reason for taking the action tonight.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, we knew that as of July 1st we were taking the Unisys system down. It did not just come as a surprise on May 17th. We knew it. I can't believe that we are putting a system in that we did not know that they were not going to be able to hook in and all of a sudden we are asked on an emergency basis to waive the bid. I just can't buy it that we are putting in a multi-million dollar project here and we did not know we needed this until just now.

Mayor Dickinson stated, the time of our consultant and the time of the Pyramid Committee, the time of nearly everyone involved has been with the financial management and the billing processes associated with the network system. This is not part of the network system. This is an ancillary effect of ending the Unisys system. It is a stand alone feature that the Registrars had that will come to an end as a result of the Unisys ending. What was considered would be continuing with the Unisys and I think it costs us \$1,200 per month to stay on the system. If you compare the costs, rapidly we would exceed the amount of money we would spend for a new system. This has not been the focus of the efforts on computerization by any means. Far more complicated and larger issues have been the complete focus. In part, this became something that was secondary in importance. We have come to a point where we really do have to take action on it and that is why we are here. Many towns are going with the State system. We are concerned about going with the State system alone. If that goes down at a critical time, then you are without the voter records and we are worried about that. We are spending additional money in order to have a primary system here and the State as our backup system. We need to have the information migrated from the Unisys System on to this software program and have it up and running.

Mr. Vumbaco understood everything the Mayor said. He asked again, when did we know that we were going to make this stand alone system? I cannot believe that we knew around the May 17th date. It has to have been earlier....I can't believe that all of a sudden we have to go out and purchase this and this was not known.

Mayor Dickinson answered, it was well before that. It was part of the specifications in hiring the consultant.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, then we knew about it a while ago.

Mayor Dickinson answered, a long time ago.

Mr. Vumbaco asked, why didn't we pursue it going through a bid process then instead of waiting until the last meeting and now forcing it upon this Council by stating that the Unisys system is being shut down on July 1st and we are going to have problems if we don't do this now. I feel pressured as a Councilor that it has been put off to the last minute and now we are being forced to vote yes on it or we are going to have a potential problem in one of our departments.

Mayor Dickinson stated, that is a valid point, it is at the last minute, but you have to keep in mind that this is a \$22,000 part of a \$1.7 million project.

Mr. Vumbaco stated, that does not mean that we just drop the rules and do what ever we want.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville was opposed to waiving the bidding process.

Andy Kapi, 14 N. Turnpike Road asked what the proprietary nature of the software was? Could a Microsoft Spreadsheet, database-type program one could buy off the shelf be used?

Mayor Dickinson stated, it would have to have the capability of researching and pulling out the different registrations and keeping track of voters in different districts, etc., making the information available in the form that the Secretary of the State wants it in. Our Registrars wanted to have a product that would allow them to provide the services that they have been providing. Our consultant investigated the field and uncovered a multitude of municipal systems that have no one to maintain them. Other than that they uncovered a Rhode Island software program, a Tennessee program and the State of CT.'s program.

Mr. Kapi agreed with Mr. Vumbaco that the consultant should have been here to answer questions about the matter.

Mayor Dickinson stated, the \$1.7 million part of this computer project was all bid. We are talking about a stand alone system, which I understand and, ideally, we should have had time to bid it but with the amount of work that still has to be done and the amount of effort going into the rest of it, it is very difficult to keep up with a component like this. You have my agreement that this should have come along sooner but it didn't and we are in a spot.

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

ADDENDUM ITEM #25 Consider and Approve Waiving the Bidding Process for the Purpose of Awarding a Contract to Kidd & Kidd, LLC for Computer Software and Implementation of a Voter Registration Program – Mayor's Office

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

VOTE: Centner was absent; Brodinsky, Vumbaco & Zappala, no; all others, aye; motion duly carried.

ITEM #20 Executive Session Pursuant to Section 1-200(6)(D) of the CT. General Statutes Pertaining to the Purchase, Sale and/or Leasing Of Real Estate – Mayor

ITEM #21 Executive Session Pursuant to Section 1-200(6)(B) of the CT. General Statutes to Discuss Pending Litigation Involving the Matters of ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wallingford and Bristol Myers v. Town of Wallingford – Town Attorney

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Enter Into Executive Sessions Listed above, seconded by Mr. Mr. Farrell.

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

The Council entered executive session at 10:24 P.M.

Present in Executive Session were all Councilors, Mayor Dickinson, and Atty. Small.

Motion was made by Mr. Rys to Exit executive session, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

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

The Council exited executive session at 10:56 P.M.

ITEM #22 Consider and Approve the Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving ICC Performance 3 v. Town of Wallingford – Town Attorney

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Knight.

Comments made by Atty. Small regarding this case went unrecorded due to a malfunction with the audio system in Council Chambers.

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

ITEM #23 Consider and Approve the Settlement of Pending Litigation Involving Bristol Myers v. Town of Wallingford – Town Attorney

Motion was made by Mr. Rys, seconded by Mr. Farrell.

This settles tax appeals regarding Grand List 1995 –2000 pending in Appellate Court and the pending Tax Appeals in Superior Court and the range of reduction is between 5and 7.6%. There will be no refund but a credit towards their next bill and no cost or interest awarded to each party.

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

Motion was made by Mr. Farrell to Adjourn the Meeting, seconded by Mr. Knight.

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

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:59 P.M.

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:

Kathryn F. Zandri
Kathryn F. Zandri
Town Council Secretary

Approved:

Robert F. Parisi
Robert F. Parisi, Chairman

6/20/2000
Date

Rosemary A. Rascati (TS)
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

6-20-00

Date

RECEIVED FOR RECORD 6-20-00
AT ___ H. ___ M. ___ M. AND RECORDED BY
Rosemary Rascati TOWN CLERK

ASSISTANT YOUTH OFFICER
Town of Wallingford

POSITION TITLE: ASSISTANT YOUTH OFFICER

DEPARTMENT: Police

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

This is responsible professional work within the Police Department's Youth Division involving youth whose conduct, abuse or neglect has brought them to the attention of the Youth Division as the result of police investigation, by school or parental referral or through direct service request by the youth involving youth and family counseling and the advocacy and brokerage of services to young people and their families.

Work involves assisting sworn police officers with investigation of juvenile related cases; serving as liaison to community schools, juvenile court and community agencies; accessing, compiling and maintaining confidential juvenile records; conducting crises intervention and needs assessments, providing information and referrals services and case management for those youths diverted from the juvenile court process, in the Wallingford school system Work also includes responsibility for planning and directing juvenile delinquency prevention programs, and the general advocacy and promotion of and providing positive youth development programs for the community, through police department initiatives and membership in regional youth-focused organizations. Duties include promoting community awareness, providing information and referral services and serving in a crisis intervention capacity when required. This position has the responsibility for making standard professional level youth services or juvenile court referral decisions. The work requires that the employee have considerable knowledge, skill and ability in juvenile law, crisis intervention, direct counseling, group process, program coordination, social service and family dynamics and the ability to gain and maintain credibility with the respect of youth and their parents.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED:

Works under the general supervision of the Community Youth Officer or others as assigned.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES:

Performs case management and counseling activities as assigned. Plans and implements juvenile delinquency prevention programs ~~in the Wallingford school system.~~

Provides advocacy and brokerage of services to youth and their families. Makes appropriate referral of juvenile cases to community based programs. Serves as crises intervener and provides information and referral services to clients. Assigns youths, monitors and notifies the Juvenile Court of the successful completion of court-ordered community service. Reviews materials and programs related to concerns and problems of young people. Maintains a current and relevant appropriate information ~~film~~ library.

ASSISTANT YOUTH OFFICER
Town of Wallingford

Monitors progress through public and private contacts with family members, law enforcement agencies, community based programs and educational institutions. Follows up on school-initiated referrals involving truancy, suspected parental abuse or neglect, pregnancy and other problems arising from family dysfunctions.

Makes home and school visits for purposes of investigation and assessment. Transports clients to treatment or correctional facilities. Promotes delinquency and community awareness and community relations through presentations to ~~and~~ civic, school and community organizations.

Represents department in interagency activities with schools, juvenile court and other human services organizations. Works directly with other criminal justice agencies and professional groups. Assists uniform section and detective bureau with the investigation of juvenile cases as assigned. Works with other town departments on special youth oriented projects. Holds membership and attends meetings of planning and resource groups concerned with Wallingford youth.

Prepares reports, including, but not limited to, State court summonses, State notices of suspected abuse and neglect and various department forms and incident reports. Contributes to, and assists in the maintenance of department juvenile records system. Complies with confidentiality requirements set by department regulations and statute.

Performs Assumes on-call duties as required in the absence of the community youth officer.

Acts as the Community Youth Officer in his absence as assigned. Performs related work as required.

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES:

Considerable knowledge of social, emotional and economic factors which contribute to delinquency and criminal behavior. Considerable knowledge of methods of personal and social adjustment of juveniles. Considerable knowledge in the field of substance abuse including prevention, assessment and treatment. Considerable ability to assess client needs, risk and substance abuse behavior.

Considerable knowledge of and ability in counseling and interviewing techniques.

Considerable knowledge of the criminal justice system in Connecticut and a good knowledge of community resources. Good knowledge of relevant State and federal laws and regulations.

Good knowledge of office procedures and good ability to use computers and other office machines.

Considerable knowledge of the principles and practices of social services programs for youth.