

TOWN OF WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
Town Council Chambers

November 24, 2009

The following minutes are a record of the Regular Meeting of the Wallingford Town Council held in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall on Tuesday, November 10, 2009. The Meeting was Called to Order at 6:39 P.M. Responding present to the Roll Call given by Town Council Secretary Sandra Weekes were Councilors Mike Brodinsky, Nick Economopoulos, Jerry Farrell, Jr., John LeTourneau, Robert F. Parisi Rosemary Rascati and Michael Spiteri. Councilor Vincent F. Testa, Jr. arrived at the meeting at 6:43 P.M. Councilor Vincenzo M. DiNatale was absent from the meeting. Also present for the meeting were Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr., Assistant Town Attorney Gerald E. Farrell, Sr. and Comptroller James Bowes. Councilors-elect Craig C. Fishbein and Vincent Cervoni were also in attendance.

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

2. Chairman's Report

Chairman Brodinsky announced that this is Spirit Week and asked Mr. Economopoulos to say more about this special week for Wallingford high school students. Mr. Economopoulos said that events are taking place all week, and include awarding the Samaha Trophy and the Mayor's Trophy to the winners of the traditional football contests, which are the Samaha Bowl between the Lyman Hall High School girls and the Mark T. Sheehan High School girls, and the Carini Bowl between the Mark T. Sheehan High School boys and the Lyman Hall High School boys.

3. Consent Agenda

- 3a. Consider and Approve Tax Refunds (#407 - #420) totaling \$4,676.60
Acct. # 001-1000-010-1170 - Tax Collector
- 3b. Acceptance and Appropriation for Youth and Social Services Special Fund
of \$1,450 to Donations Acct # 213-1042-070-7010 and to Expenditures Acct
213-3070-600-6000- Youth and Social Services
- 3c. Consider and Approve a bid waiver request to comply with the fully executed grant, CT-
DPHA # 2010-0139, utilizing Quantitative Resources LAN LLC, to conduct data analysis
and generate the final report, not to exceed \$4,511
– Health Department
- 3d. Consider and Approve a bid waiver request Utility Excavator-East PBE, Inc. in the amount
of \$5,083 – Public Works
- 3e. Consider and Approve a bid waiver request for submersible Pumps-Godwin Pumps in the
amount of \$6,622 – Public Works

- 3f. Consider and Approve the Appointment of Thomas Wolfer (currently an Alternate on the Zoning Board of Appeals) as a Regular Member to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a Term ending on 1/13/2014 to replace William Andrew Barnett whose resignation will be effective 11/24/09 – Chairman Mike Brodinsky
- 3g. Approve Minutes of Regular Town Council Meeting of November 10, 2009
- 3h. Approve Minutes of Special Town Council Meeting of November 17, 2009

MOTION

Chairman Brodinsky made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda, Items 3a. to 3h. Ms Rascati seconded. All Councilors present (8) by voice voted Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting. The motion passed.

4. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

None

5. PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER

Geno Zandri, 9 Balsam Ridge Circle, regarding the town's closing on property on North Farms Road. Mayor Dickinson indicated the town is waiting for the parties and that there has not been a closing.

6. Acceptance and Approval of the following grants – Board of Education

- 1) ARRA 1
- 2) ARRA Preschool
- 3) ARRA IDEA Part B

MOTION

Chairman Brodinsky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Parisi, to approve and accept the following grants as requested by the Board of Education:

- 1) ARRA 1
- 2) ARRA Preschool
- 3) ARRA IDEA Part B

Mr. Bowes explained the grants and said that the funds are part of the Federal stimulus program and would supplement personnel that we have now and programs. He said that the funds will be expended over a two-year period and are accounted for in special revenue funds. He said that this is a federal government attempt to create some jobs. He added that the school system uses the funds for one-time-item type of purchase and not to support the operational budget. Following Mr. LeTourneau's question regarding the future of these special programs, Mr. Bowes said that it will be a question of how the Board of Education wishes to proceed. Chairman Brodinsky suggested that it will undoubtedly be discussed at budget time. There were no comments or questions from the public.

All Councilors present (8) by voice voted Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting. The motion passed.

7. Consider and Approve an Appropriation plus Expenditure of Funds in our Federal/State Education Grant as follows, to
 - Grant Revenue-ARRA/SFSF –Education Grant Funds \$1,971,677 Fund #235
 - Grant Revenue-ARRA/SFSF –Government Service Fund \$1,087,094 Fund #235
 - and to
 - Grant Expenditures - ARRA/SFSF –Education Grant Funds \$1,971,677 Fund #235
 - Grant Expenditures - ARRA/SFSF –Government Service Fund \$1,087,094 Fund #235
 - James Bowes, Comptroller

MOTION

Mr. Testa made a motion to an appropriation plus Expenditure of Funds in our Federal/State Education Grant as follows As requested by James Bowes, Comptroller.

- to
- Grant Revenue-ARRA/SFSF –Education Grant Funds \$1,971,677 Fund #235
- Grant Revenue-ARRA/SFSF –Government Service Fund \$1,087,094 Fund #235
- and to
- Grant Expenditures - ARRA/SFSF –Education Grant Funds \$1,971,677 Fund #235
- Grant Expenditures - ARRA/SFSF –Government Service Fund \$1,087,094 Fund #235

Mr. Bowes said that Items 7 and 8 are sort of the same issue. He addressed Item 7. saying that this year the State of Connecticut promised the municipalities that the Education Cost Sharing Grant would remain the same as the prior fiscal year, or \$21.4 million for Wallingford. As the budget moved forward for the state and in order to make every municipality whole in regard to the ECS grant, the Governor and the state legislature utilized 14.26% federal stimulus funds, but not the kind of stimulus funds referred to in Item 6., of the two ARRA-SFSF grants to pass through to each of the 169 towns and cities in Connecticut, or the grant for Education Cost Sharing would have been reduced by over \$3 million. He continued saying that the total of those items are in Item 8. or \$3,058,771. Under the provisions of the grant award, the federal government strongly recommends a separate set of accounts for these funds for auditing purposes. Establishing these in our special revenue fund under these two titles means that the revenue and the expenditures can be recognized. It's a better audit trail.

When the State of Connecticut adopted its budget enabling legislation about October 5, they allowed the municipalities to reduce the Board of Education budget by the amount of the ARRA funds. For transparency and audit purposes, it is important to keep the bookkeeping separate and not co-mingled with the general fund; however, the enabling legislation allows the budget making authority to reduce the school board budget by the corresponding amount, which is the why for Item 8. It is where we are going to show the revenues and the expenditures for these federal flow through monies through the State Department of Education to the Town of Wallingford. He said that the town's auditors are in favor of doing it this way.

In summary, Mr. Bowes said that we are taking \$3,058,771, and reducing our general fund revenue budget in what is called the ECS grant and we are reducing the Board of Education expenditures by \$3,058,771 and authorizing the revenue and the expenditures in a different bookkeeping fund for these ARRA funds. He said that the board of Education is whole and there is not reduction to the amounts that they can spend this fiscal year.

Mr. Testa said that the state has chosen to use the federal funds to augment what they would normally have been giving us. Mr. Bowes said, yes, but it is to replace what they would be giving

us. He said that it is an important distinction. He said that they would normally be giving us \$21.4 million of state grant funds for the ECS but this year they will be giving us \$18.4 million and \$3 million of the federal flow-through funds. He said that is as of today.

Mayor Dickinson said the state has reduced its contribution to the town for education, and the amount of the reduction is being replaced by the federal money. He said that this works out fine for two years but when the federal stimulus money stops, the state contribution will be \$3 million behind where it should have been and that is where a huge gap occurs, which gives rise to the question of how it is to be made up. He said that it will be very difficult for the local taxpayer to pick up that difference. Mr. Bowes said that he has read that in providing this money to the municipalities over two years that the state is hoping for an economic turnaround whereby two years from now they can make the towns whole again without the federal funds. He said the state's question is two years from now in deciding whether to fill the gap. He said that the \$3 million if it is not restored equals .785 (point seven eight five) mills in taxes.

There were no further questions or comments from the Council or from the public.

All Councilors present (8) by voice voted Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting.

The motion passed.

8. Consider and Approve a Reduction in the 2009-2010 Appropriations Expenditure budgets for the Amounts of Federal ARRA/SFSF grants, which will be accounted for in Fund #235:

Reduce Appropriation in the Amount of \$3,058,771 to Revenue ECS Grant
Acct # 001-1030-050-5025 and Reduce Corresponding Expenditures from
Expenditures-Education Acct # 001-7600-860-1110
- James Bowes, Comptroller

MOTION

Mr. Testa made a motion to Approve a Reduction in the 2009-2010 Appropriations Expenditure budgets for the Amounts of Federal ARRA/SFSF grants, which will be accounted for in Fund #235:

Reduce Appropriation in the Amount of \$3,058,771 to Revenue ECS Grant
Acct # 001-1030-050-5025 and Reduce Corresponding Expenditures from
Expenditures-Education Acct # 001-7600-860-1110

Mr. Parisi seconded.

Chairman Brodinsky explained that we just heard in Item 7. why we are doing this but he asked if anyone had any additional thoughts on the item. There were no questions or comments from the Council or from the public.

All Councilors present (8) by voice voted Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting.

The motion passed.

9. Presentation and Discussion of the final report regarding the Police Station Feasibility Study
- Mayor

In attendance:

Brian Humes, AIA, LEED AP, Member, Jacunski Humes Architects, LLC

Douglas Dortenzio, Chief of Police

Lt. William Wright

Mr. Humes said that his study has been going on since June 2008, so that this report, the *Feasibility Study for the Wallingford Police Department, Wallingford, CT*, dated November 2009, is over one year in the making with lots of research. He thanked the Police Chief for his involvement during the entire process. He said that he has been very helpful offering his time and his staff to give information and get answers to Mr. Humes' questions and act as advisor during the process. He thanked the Mayor for his involvement as well. Mr. Humes summarized the discussion from his interim, report meeting with the Council, which covered the Space Needs Assessment, and the Schematic Design documents. He said that he will not review them tonight but parts of the study needed to be completed, namely, the Traffic Study and the Project Cost component. He said there is an additional component to the report, which is an Evaluation of Existing Building/Existing Site to determine its suitability to be utilized for the needs of the Police Department into the future. He said that this feasibility was conducted in a very systematic approach, systematic being that they didn't want to go to Part B until they completed Part A, with Part C following Part B. He recommends the approach because everything is known in an order and then information is applied to the next stage.

Tab 1, The Space Needs Assessment was the first stage, which sets the perimeters and the size and then sets site requirements for how much land you need and how much square footage. It was concluded that 47,000 square feet would service the Police Department for a minimum of twenty years taking into account current and future needs. He said that they recommended certain site acreage of at least three (3) acres. Given the known components of 47,000 square feet on three acres, then they could they look at the existing building on how it compared to what they were planning.

In Tab 2, Evaluation of /Existing Building and Site, they gave a little building history, when it was constructed and when it was last renovated. He said that they looked into the historic significance of the building. He said that during the feasibility study he was told that the building was of historic significance in Wallingford and added that it has a designation as a contributing building to a downtown historic district, but that does not mean that it is listed on any state or national historic registry as a historic building but only as a contributing building to a district. This is separate and distinct as far as historic commissions are concerned. When it's a building within a district, it does not come with all of the renovation restrictions, and this was important to establish. This building was originally constructed as a state armory and the last renovations to this building occurred in the 1980s, including electrical and plumbing. He said that this is a building that is in operation seven (7) days per week and twenty-four (24) hours per day; it doesn't go to sleep; the mechanical systems run all of that time. All of the systems in the existing building need renovations or upgrades, and the building itself is not up to the latest energy codes or the latest fire safety codes. He said that anything that you want done to that building means that it has to be brought up to current codes. He said that it's a site that is very limited. The Space Needs Assessment requires parking requirements of up to 150 cars on the site.

In looking at the project, the building is about 28,000 square feet. He asked can we accommodate 47,000 square feet and 150 parking spaces. There are two ways to answer that question, one way to answer that is to ask- Do you want the site to accommodate *all* of the functional requirements of the Police Department or another way is to ask do you want that site *some* of the police functions and parking requirements.

For the first part – Can that site accommodate all of the police functions and parking requirements – and the only way for that to happen is the complete removal of that building and construction of a new building and to accommodate that on that site would mean the solution would have to be vertical, up or down, solution, since there is no horizontal area to grow. A vertical solution is not in keeping with the character of the downtown, and because of that, this idea was dismissed as a possibility and being feasible.

In the second component of the question – Can the site accommodate *some* of the police functions and parking – Mr. Humes said that in order to answer that question as is in the feasibility study, this impacts both the operational and functional requirements, and it does come back to a management solution for the department. It would be providing a headquarter solution in one part of the town and a satellite office in the existing building serving some other function for the Police Department. In his 25 years of experience, he has seen the satellite concept in use, and those towns and cities are typically having a population of 100,000 or more. It is a solution of multiple solutions like Hartford and New Haven. Satellite locations create problems of proper oversight functions. In the Space Needs Assessment, it was the desire of the police administration to consolidate all functions to one location, including the functions that are currently off-site. It is represented in the Space Needs Assessment and in the 47,000 square feet number. Two facilities would take additional conversations with the Police Administration.

He said that this is his conclusion; and his recommendation would be a new location and consolidating functions on one site. He said that the current site could not accommodate it. He said that the alternate site is the Wooding Caplan property and that within the Jacunski Humes Architects contract with the Town of Wallingford, Jacunski Humes Architects were to look at one other site in addition to the existing site. He said that the Mayor's Office gave direction that the one additional site would be the Wooding Caplan property. The Wooding Caplan property would meet the space needs that were recommended in the Space Needs Assessment; it would meet the site needs assessment for parking; it would maintain current police services during construction operations, which would reduce overall project costs. It would upgrade the physical conditions of the Police Department to newer code standards, including fire and seismic code requirements. It would provide for newer technologies and energy efficiencies. It would consolidate all of the police functions onto one site. He said that the current site would be available for alternate uses or for public sale.

In Tab 3, Mr. Humes said that the Schematic Design documents, which he exhibited at the last meeting with the Council, showed how this building would fit on the Wooding Caplan property and how it was design to minimize the impact on the abutting neighborhoods by screening light, noise and sound from the neighbors in the location of the parking and by supplementing the business parking with an additional 42 parking spaces for public use.

Mr. Humes added that all of the requirements that are outlined in the Space Needs Assessment and the Site Needs Assessment are accommodated on the Schematic Design for the Wooding Caplan property. Through efficiencies the site design would accommodate 44,000 square feet, meeting the 47,000 square feet level of the study, in lower, upper and main levels, staff parking, fuel

dispensing, traffic maintenance and all of the requirements of the Police Department with additional parking for downtown use.

The Traffic Impact Study, performed by GM2 Associates, was conducted by Mr. Vincent Aveno, and engineer, formerly with the CT-DOT, has over 38 years of experience in traffic maintenance. He said that all of the documentation is representing traffic counts, traffic studies, visual inspections and visits to the site to inspect the intersections on Center Street and of Fair Street and Wallace, the entrance proposed for the property. He said that the other exit from the property, utilized by the Police Department that exits onto North Main Street is being proposed for emergency use only. It would be a gated exit and opened only on an emergency basis. He said that the reason an alternate from the site is being proposed is because the police are first responders. He said that access to the police department could be blocked if there was an accident on Center Street. He said that egress and access site drive onto this property would be through the current fire house property between the firehouse and the police department but as an emergency location.

Tab 4, Mr. Humes continued that the traffic impact study centered on Center Street intersection and the recommendations are listed on page 8 of the Traffic Impact Study, under Tab 4. He listed the recommendations:

- 1) Wallace Avenue specifications
- 2) Center Street parking locations and a No Standing Zone on Center Street
- 3) Identity Sign for the Police Station
- 4) Do Not Block sign on Center Street
- 5) Wallace Avenue Stop Sign

In Mr. Aveno's conclusions, new construction that parking and site circulation that now uses Center Street and Wallace Avenue intersection will not significantly impact the existing traffic on Center Street. He discussed the installation of a traffic light at Center Street and Wallace Avenue and Mr. Aveno did not recommend one.

Mr. Humes next spoke about the project costs and the professional cost estimating firm in Boston, Massachusetts, KV Associates, Inc. that they used. Mr. Humes said they are good. They are construction managers with ability to take schematic design documents and utilize those documents as though they were bidding the project within the construction market with prevailing wage rates and utilizing municipal construction materials and techniques and have an ability to anticipate what a general contractor's bid would be with a high rate of accuracy. He said that they have put together the hard costs of the project, which is the cost of the construction and the site work. He said that when you put a project out on the street for bidding the bid number is for the hard costs, the building, the site work and the parking. How much does it cost to build? He said that a bid out in the spring of 2010, the hard cost only would be \$15,411,738.

Tab 5, Mr. Humes pointed out a budget worksheet for the proposed project, which includes not only the hard costs but also the soft costs and project contingency. Hard costs are broken down into site work at \$1.6 million; police facility at \$13.2 million; and the out building at approximately \$500K, which equals \$15,411,738. He explained soft costs which are project related fees that include furniture, fees, project management, owners oversight, surveys, commissioning services, geo-technical engineering, special inspections, testing, telephone and data systems, radio communications, dispatch consoles, audio-visual systems and equipment, communications antennae, maintenance equipment, re-location costs, printing, advertising fees, bonding costs and legal fees. He said that permit fees are assumed to be waived. He said that all of those items add another \$3,345,000. He said that all of those items are thought of as *allowance* amounts. He

addressed contingency as advised at \$1.5 million, or 10% of the hard costs, the industry standard. If there is a spring 2010 construction start the project estimate would be \$25,256,738. He said that on page 2 of Tab 5, he added a 4% inflation rate beyond 2010 and in giving construction totals for the year 2011-14, which extends the project budget from \$21 million to \$23,700,000. He said that it is very difficult to estimate future costs and that in the last two years the number goes into the negative, costs and coming down and scaled back by 10 years with the current bidding environment. Many towns are taking advantage of the current economic conditions by bidding projects today and he doesn't see significant changes for 2010 but beyond that he feels that there will be another inflationary time. He said that his 4% inflation rate is debatable.

Mr. Humes summarized saying that those are the components that they were asked to complete and are all in the Feasibility Study. He feels that he has answered the questions within the contract that he was asked and that are in the Feasibility Study.

Mr. Testa clarified 'historic district' v. "historic building", Tab 2, page 1, in reference to the former Armory, now the Police Station. Mr. Humes responded that the facility is within a historic district. He said that this has significance in that the building can be demolished, removed, altered, changed without any restrictions. If it was a building listed, that would change but that is not the case.

Mr. Testa asked about the satellite idea, using the existing facility and another satellite location and Mr. Humes commented that it is not desirable for Wallingford. Mr. Testa asked what if the satellite building is on the same site. Would the same objections apply? Mr. Humes said that the same objections would apply because the existing building carries 24,000 of space while you are needing 47,000 square feet so that 50% of your need in your existing building and about 50% somewhere else. He said that in that case it is no longer a main facility and a satellite with personnel in both location challenging the administration of two facilities.

With regard to the traffic study on page 1 of the Traffic Study in the second paragraph of the introduction, Mr. Testa asked why the discrepancy in square footage where it states that the new facility would have 60,400 square feet. Mr. Humes did not know and that it will not have 60,000 square feet. Mr. Testa asked if the whole point was to point out that there is less than 100,000 square feet, which would require a special study by the State Traffic Commission. Mr. Humes said that was correct. Mr. Testa wanted to know if a "stop bar" was a gate. Mr. Humes said that it is just a painted bar on the pavement with a stop sign and is routine.

Mr. Testa talked about peak volumes of traffic on center Street with regard to shift change and that the study concludes that no stop light is needed at the end of Wallace. Mr. Humes said that is correct and that police department shift change activity from the site occurs at regular intervals. He acknowledged that at times Center Street does back up past Wallace. He said that the Center Street back up does not coincide with the times of shift change. Mr. Testa asked that if the Council does not want this project on the Wooding Caplan property and found another suitable three-acre parcel where this plan would work, could we assume the same costs except for the cost of the site. Mr. Humes said if all of the site conditions are equal, like physical characteristics, and utilities, then the costs should be equal. They talked about the need for public parking on another site and how much.

Mr. Farrell recalled a tour of the existing building that Chief Dortenzio provided and that he pointed out three key things that were driving the need for a new building. 1) A change in statute regarding juveniles, which has happened since the time of our visit. 2) The evidence room and the volume and length of time that the department is required to keep evidence and that it is out of

control based on the space available. And 3) The locker rooms given the gender composition of the police force, which has changed substantially in the last 25 years. Mr. Farrell said that there were other things but that these were the key ones that the Council heard about. Now today, Mr. Farrell looks at the price tag for what may be a perfect facility but which has such a price tag on it that he thinks is a non-starter in this economy and that it will not improve in the next two years from what he can tell. He said that he doesn't know why we didn't look at something, which a little less costly than this while is considering those three key things. He said that juveniles could be a separate facility, meaning possible in a different building. The evidence room is in essence a storage facility that does not necessarily have to be in the larger facility footprint. He said that he sees the same issue with locker rooms in that if you are trying to make some space in the existing building, it would be worth discussing if you could take these items out and build something for \$1, \$2, or \$3 million. He said that it is not worth discussing a station for \$20 million. He asked, "Why wasn't that part of the considerations?" He said that they quickly came to the conclusion that it had to be a new facility. Mr. Farrell stated that he is questioning that conclusion.

Chief Dortenzio stated that he doesn't think that it has been an easy decision nor has it been a decision that was arrived at in the short term. He said that this has been discussed for years and this facility still doesn't provide a paved parking lot for its employees. He said that they walk in the mud. They park their cars in a field and are the only town agency that does that. He said that in addition to the three primary concerns but there are far from the most important and only a segment of the list previously discussed. He said that there have been lots of things that have changed in police occupation since this present building was originally designed, and in some respects, the shortcomings that they have in their current facility were the result of trying to do it in a limited capacity, when this was first designed, and there wasn't enough parking provided that was sufficient for police cars or for employees. There is no growth room in the building and they have gotten 20 years use out of it by scuttling various business functions, taking walls out and expanding to its limit.

Chief Dortenzio said that the infrastructure review revealed a building that is very dated. He added that an application for just a limited building permit for limited modification, for example to bring mechanicals to the current standards, means that the entire building must be brought up to code. He discussed satellite facilities and his knowledge of Hartford and New Haven with business functions off-site – their own academy, fleet maintenance, tow trucks, buses. He said that we are not a 100,000 plus community and don't have those business functions. He said that Wallingford's traffic maintenance is in several different places in several buildings and they are difficult to maintain. The town looks to use them for other purposes and those buildings are very dated. He discussed the management and to free up space in town is proposed to come on to the grounds of the new facility but not in the principal of what is thought of as headquarters facility. He said that they have a need to deal with storage of hazardous materials which cannot be brought into a building occupied with people. This is an issue. He discussed materials that they seize and the relation to the outbuilding. Moving functions to remote locations results in additional staff for management of those locations. He said that he does not need a large number of youth officers because with the function in police headquarters, it can be electronically monitored by supervisors in the building. He said that is not possible in an out-building. Hiring people is the most expensive thing that government does. He thinks that it is more cost-effective to have it all centralized with as few people as possible. He said that this needs to be looked at holistically. He gave an example of testing evidence and the use and need of storage to be part of the police facility; other wise, an officer spends a day going back and forth to a storage facility off-site, which is not cost-effective.

Mr. Farrell said that he hears the chief but that he cannot separate it from what he knows about the economy and the town's bonded indebtedness and people's ability to pay taxes.

Chief Dortenzio said that he understands the status of the economy but that discussion of this project began a number of years ago before the economy found itself in the position it is in. Clearly we are talking about serving the town for the next 20 to 25 years and the economy is not likely to be the same throughout that period of time. He said that when local government sets its budget that it is more about values and priorities than it is about the numbers. You assess the need for a professional police service, and if it isn't high on the totem pole, then it shouldn't be funded. If it is of concern to you going forward to protect the community, to provide the service, so that the residents of our community enjoy the quality of life that they do, then you will have to decide how important that value is when we set a municipal budget.

Mr. Farrell said that this is the conversation in that he pointed out those three things that he thought the Police Department has to do something about. He talked about the integrity of the evidence that they talked about and that it is important. That is a key thing and that he can understand even in a tough economy, that they can do that. He said that he has noticed that the state has zeroed out all dollars so that needs to be looked at again. It is now in doubt about how serious the state is about that issue. He said that he would like to find some things that we can do for the police department but he doesn't see a new police station of the scope that is being discussed for five years from now, and in the meantime, something needs to be done about these issues.

Chief Dortenzio said that they do not provide some services because they don't have the ability or the space to provide them. As long as this exists, they won't provide them. If people are OK with that, the status quo will be maintained. Mr. Farrell said that he didn't mean he isn't OK with it but that something needs to be figured out to maintain the level of services that are decent and commensurate with what the community's needs are and commensurate with the community's ability to pay for it.

Mr. Humes said that we are doing these space needs assessment, feasibility studies and new construction of police facilities throughout Connecticut and Massachusetts and have \$60 million under construction right now. Every town has this concern. He reiterated that when they did the Space Needs Assessment that they do not go into these communities assuming that they need a new facility, and he doesn't want this to be a conclusion that the Council assigns to this report. The need for a new facility is only a conclusion based on their Space Needs Assessment and their analysis. He said that we look at current conditions and how they compare to standards that have been set up by federal and state requirements on personnel current and future growth and how this facility can accommodate this community's needs well into the future. It is only after that analysis in looking at each area, and not just those three, that they have concluded that the current facility is well under its recommended square footage and it is only based on that that they have come up with the conclusion that a new facility would be in the town's best interests.

Mr. Farrell asked why the Council doesn't have some alternatives in the report, especially with those three items. Mr. Humes said that he could also go over another 30 (thirty) items that are also undersized and don't provide the recommended services. Mr. Farrell reviewed the three things that he saw and said that he drew his own conclusions and sometimes you resolve what you can and leave other things to when you can afford them. He said that no alternatives were offered nor their price tag.

Mr. Humes said that was not part of this feasibility study.

Mayor Dickinson said that the assignment for Mr. Humes was the feasibility of using the Wooding Caplan site for police department needs and that is really what brought us to have the study done. He said that part of that was giving us an idea whether the existing facility could continue to be used, expanded, etc. He said that Mr. Humes has fulfilled what he has been requested to do that is to let us know if the Wooding Caplan site was one that could be used for a new police station. He said that this is not before us tonight to decide if we are going to move forward in the next six months to build a new police facility. He said that the issue, which we shouldn't miss, is do we have a site that could be utilized for a new police department, and the report is saying yes. He said that these are the outlines of what it would look like, what it would cost and how it would be configured on the property and how the traffic would be handled. He said when we would actually move into a project is not before us nor are other ways to handle the question. This is review of a study of the Wooding Caplan property with respect to a new police facility. He spoke about the plan of a new facility and it being under one roof. In the near future, after 2010, we will need to address this issue.

Mr. Farrell asked the Mayor if he is saying that we are going to reserve this site for the foreseeable future for a new police station that we seemingly can't afford anytime soon. Mayor Dickinson said that we would be in a position to reserve this site for police department purposes. He said if there is another site that is better then the town would have to go through the process to analyze that site.

Concerning the 75 secured parking spaces for police staff, Mr. LeTourneau referred to Site Plan C-1 in the book and also the Traffic Impact Study, page 1. He asked where the spaces were. They reviewed the map to identify the 75 spaces and where people coming to the Police Station would park. Mr. Humes identified all of the various public access spaces. Mr. LeTourneau asked about the life-use of this design. Mr. Humes said 20-year growth that has been discussed is about as close as they can make it. They anticipate a minimum of 20 years. He spoke about Wallingford's build-out for twenty years and whether it occurs or not in relation to the need for police services. Within those twenty years there is no crowding, and the limits of the building are not exceeded, because the design accommodates growth from year one to year twenty. Mr. LeTourneau said that he is concerned about expandability and asked Mr. Humes if he would forward square footage on the roof area expansion along with how many employees it could accommodate. He said that he would like to see a site that if Wallingford grows that in 20 years there is room for expansion down the road. He thinks that 20 years of space is limiting. He thinks that we need to look forward farther than just 20 years. Mr. Humes agreed that this is a good point and is sorry that the expansion square footage is not noted on the schematic design. He said that they would forward that information through the Mayor's Office. He commented that the Space Needs Assessment goes through how they have anticipated staffing and vehicles and growth in that 20 year period. He said that this is not a management study but a space needs assessment and that there is a difference.

Mr. LeTourneau discussed opinions regarding the location of the police station, some say that it has to be there and that he asks why. He said that people seem to think that there is some danger if the police station is not in the center of town. They feel protection with the police station in the center of town. He asked if the police station is at another location and not in the town center, would the level of protection still be good for the town.

Chief Dortenzio said that he had previously addressed the question whether or not there was a business necessity for the police department to be located in the center of town and his response is and was that there is no such business necessity. He says this with a caveat that is that there is a

psychological benefit to the center of town both for the business community and for residents. He said that one of the things that distinguish our town center from other communities is the comfort with which people walk at all hours of the day and night. He said they walk by themselves. They go jogging. They walk their dogs. They walk as couples. They patronize the downtown business district. He said that many, many communities in this country and in this state, people do not feel safe enough to do that. He said in large part the reason for that is the presence of the police department downtown. Most of the walkers walk by the station and see it as a place of refuge if they need it and most of employees are operating well-marked cars for a variety of business reasons they are coming and going. They are visible in town and traveling Main and Center to return to the center of town station. These are the same routes of the walkers, and if you remove that building to another location, they are perhaps not any less safe than they are today but then you get to what is reality and what is perception. Will you change the climate and culture of the community by moving the facility to another location. He asked, "How do you put a price tag on that?" He suggested a location by Parks and Recreation where there aren't many walkers. Then downtown walkers, restaurants and businesses won't feel police presence. He said that some places in our community do not lend themselves to services like water-sewer. Options for other suitable locations are narrowing.

Commenting on safety downtown, Mr. LeTourneau asked if a storefront satellite could be used in order to have police presence downtown. Chief Dortenzio said that while you can do that, there is basically no service delivery along with the expense of staffing and maintaining such a location. He said that in many communities the storefronts are closing. Mr. LeTourneau introduced another piece of property which the town owns and is not far from downtown. It is located at the bottom of Cedar Lane and Old Colony Road. Chief Dortenzio said that they have looked at it. Mr. Humes said that they have looked at that site and his opinion on this property is the severe topography that would mean a completely different design with much higher site costs and site development.

Mr. Economopoulos said that we do have a need for a new facility and that the Wooding Caplan site is feasible but that he is frustrated with the repetition of the discussion. He said that the bottom line is that until we are fiscally prepared to make this large step that the feasibility study should be stored in the evidence room until we are ready to look at it again. We also have other issues on if this is the best use of that property for this town to be a police station. This is not the time for this discussion. We should thank Mr. Hume for a job well-done for the feasibility study, and then use it when it is time to use it.

Chairman Brodinsky asked about parking on page 3, the fleet inventory. He listed some particular vehicles in the emergency service unit and confirmed with the Chief that we still have those vehicles and that they have not been added to. He asked where they would be on the location C-1, the overall map. Mr. Humes said that they are on A-1 and located within the building on the main level. Mr. Humes said that the 32 spaces under the roof are all for cruiser parking and he pointed out storage bays, which are an overhead garage bay to accommodate the command tow vehicle and trailer, the main level on A-1. Chairman Brodinsky 56 employees would show up for the morning shift, the most at any one time. He confirmed that they would park in the 75 spaces shown in the schematic drawing. Mr. Humes added that you have to have enough spaces for a shift overlap to park to get the contingent of parking for the overlap; therefore, there are 75 spaces but also keep in mind that some employees park in a different location in the building due to the fact that they are coming on duty with an official vehicle. Mr. Humes said that for the 20 year growth the parking is adequate. He added that they did their traffic analysis in the month of May and used it to determine that 75 was the largest requirement throughout the month of May.

Ms. Rascati asked about the Cedar Lane property and confirmed with Mr. Humes that the topography site costs would add to the cost projection for the Wooding Caplan site. They discussed several aspects of that site including impound lots, parking, etc.

Councilor-elect Craig Fishbein asked about parking with respect to current personnel and projections of the future. He said that he is concerned because of the number of vehicles, 56, turning off of Center Street onto Wallace Avenue around the 3:45 PM to 4:15 PM. He talked about his own experience with this particular intersection. Mr. Humes said that Mr. Aveno used all of the factors in the study. Mr. Fishbein also asked about the firing range.

Councilor-elect Vincent Cervoni noted that this study was done for this site and asked if we are using enough foresight by looking 20 years into the future. He said that if the town does not build this facility for five years, would we be coming back to Mr. Humes to re-examine the feasibility of this particular structure for the future needs of the department. Mr. Humes thought that this was a fair question. He said that the most important component is the Space Needs Assessment, the first tab. That is where the value is because it determines size, square footage, requirements, staffing and vehicle projections. This is where the 20-year growth is. That is why so much time is spent on this assessment. This assessment should be accurate in five years, considering that this study considers 20-year growth. It should be accurate in ten years.

Mr. Cervoni commented on the traffic study and how effective it would be in ten years. He asked about the traffic study life. Mr. Humes said that he talked about this when they talked about a traffic light. He thinks that could be the next conclusion if that intersection over time has restricted access. Mr. Humes said that at this time based on the information that they have, it is not a recommendation to have a traffic light installed, and it would add approximately \$200,000 to the project. We cannot say that it is required. He said that these things evolve.

In response to Mr. Farrell's concern regarding homes on Academy Street on the C-1 drawing, Mr. Humes clarified that the C-1 drawing came from the Department of Engineering and that the Right-of-Way through to Academy Street is not being used in this solution in any way. Mr. Farrell asked that another look be taken as there is some premise that Right-of-Way has at least a last chance scenario if you were blocked from every other way out of here. He asked the Chief if he wouldn't go out that way. Chief Dortenzio said that they are not planning on using it and at the present time he doesn't think you can go out that way. He said trees and bushes have been planted along the fence-line. Mr. Farrell said he thinks a house on Academy is missing. Mr. Humes said that he is not aware that there is a house missing and that there is no intention to 'move' any houses on Academy Street.

Mr. Testa made a statement regarding the Wooding Caplan Property Roadmap, explaining that this is how this feasibility study evolved. He said that this did not start because there was a recognized need for a police station. On this roadmap, it is now known that a police facility on the Wooding Caplan property is an option. He said that this study will be useful to us when faced with making decisions regarding Wooding Caplan property development and a new police facility. Also included in these future decisions would be the disposition of the Armory building and the property on which it site. He said he thinks that the two sites go hand-in-hand.

Chairman Brodinsky added that he originally thought that the Wooding Caplan property was clearly feasible but that now he has doubts which are driven by the need for public parking and whether or not 42 spaces is adequate. He acknowledged that this was not part of the study.

Robert Gross, 114 Long Hill Road, commented on the funds for the demolition of 390 Center Street with respect to Wallace avenue road repairs. He asked about putting the study on the internet.

Jason Zandri, 35 Lincoln Drive, commented on investigating other possible properties for the police station but that if this search fails, then the police station should be located on the Wooding Caplan property. He also commented on the economy and construction costs.

Robert Sheehan, 11 Cooper Avenue, commended the architect on doing what he was asked to do and said that Center Street hasn't changed in 60 years. He said that downtown Wallingford is basically residential. He expressed his opinion about the downtown and the Wooding Caplan property.

Geno Zandri, 9 Balsam Ridge Circle, stated that we know that Wooding Caplan property can accommodate a police facility. He asked do we need a Police facility and do we want to use the Wooding Caplan property for the police?

Bob Hogan, Grieb Road, expressed his opinion regarding the issue and parking. Mr. Humes said that to use the existing parcel (Armory site) and a get 47,000 square foot building and 156 cars would require some unconventional architecture.

Chief Dortenzio addressed project timing. He said that if one begins today, then a facility would be ready in three years. He said that is how long it takes. He said that if you need a facility in five years, then you must begin in two years while also accounting for changes in the police profession. He added that it has taken three years to get to this point.

Chairman Brodinsky suggested that Chief Dortenzio perhaps update his police department report of two years ago for the incoming Town Council.

Councilwoman Rascati thanked Mr. Humes for a job well-done.

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

MOTION

Mr. Testa made a motion, seconded by Mr. Parisi, to go into Executive Session pursuant to §1-200 (6)(D) of the Connecticut General Statutes with respect to the purchase, sale and/or leasing of property as requested by the Mayor.

All Councilors present (8) by voice voted Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting.

The motion carried.

Executive Session commenced at 9:00 P.M.

At 9:13P.M., Chairman Brodinsky announced that the Council was back in session.

Attendance at Executive Session included eight (8) Councilors, Mayor Dickinson and Assistant Town Attorney Farrell, Sr. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting.

Chairman Brodinsky made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Farrell seconded. All Councilors present (8) by voice said Aye. Councilor DiNatale was absent from the meeting.

The motion passed. The Town Council meeting adjourned 9:13 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra R. Weekes
Town Council Secretary

Chairman, Mike Brodinsky

Date

Town Clerk, Barbara Kapi

Date