

The ninth budget workshop was held on Thursday, May 7, 1987 called to order by Chairman David A. Gessert at 8:45 p.m. Council Members Adams, Bergamini, Gouveia, Holmes, Killen, Papale, Polanski, Rys and Gessert were present, along with Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers.

A motion was made by Mr. Rys to remove pages 184-185, Electric Division from the table, seconded by Mrs. Papale.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

ELECTRIC DIVISION, pages 184-185

A motion was made by Mr. Rys to move pages 184-185, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Walters passed out amended pages to the Council and explained that this is in effect, the same thing as presented the other night as an alternative to what was printed in the book on page 184 & 185, to reflect the changes that had been approved by the Council. There had been one error in there, one of the zeros (fifth item down), had shown as a 1, came up with an incorrect total of people to be authorized. As you just reviewed the Plant Superintendent, did not get favorable action. There are presently 7 people at the plant and we are requesting your consideration of the 1 new Utility Operator, at the bottom of the first page (see attached pages) for a total of 8 people.

Mr. Killen pointed out that some of the figures have been changed around and Mr. Walters explained that what this reflects, when the last information you had was put together, that was a projection as to what we had hoped to hire individuals at. Since that time, this reflects the actual rates that people were hired at and now employed as of a week ago Monday.

A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to amend the totals on pages 184 & 185 to reflect pages 33 & 33A as presented to the Council on May 6, 1987, seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mr. Seadale explained that they reclassified after discussion with the Council, one of the Chiefs of Shift, down to Utility Operator and 2 of the Switchboard Operators down to Utility Operator and these were just vacancies. The higher level positions had become vacant through retirements. We had tried to hire at the higher level and were not successful. We had tried to hire at the lower level and were finally successful just a week ago.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made to remove page 61, Forensic Lab, from the table, by Mr. Polanski, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

FORENSIC LAB - POLICE, page 61

A motion was made by Mr. Polanski to move page 61, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

Ninth Budget Workshop **TOWN OF WALLINGFORD** May 7, 1987  
**PERSONNEL DETAIL AND SALARY CALCULATIONS**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES - ELECTRIC DIVISION**

Position/Title/Name	Number	Hours Worked	Range Step	Date Last Step	Appropriated 1986-87	Requested 1987-88
<b>PRODUCTION</b>						
Chief of Shift	1	40	MAX		29,848	29,848
General 9/1/86						CONT
General 9/1/87						CONT

Chief of Shift (1) *(Filled by Utility Operator)	0	-	--	29,848	383	0
Switchboard Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87	1	40	MAX	25,979	25,979	CONT CONT
Switchboard Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87	1	40	MAX	25,979	25,979	CONT CONT
Switchboard Operator (2) *(Filled by Utility Operator)	0	--	--	51,958		0
Utility Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87 Merit 10/87 Merit 4/88	1	40	MAX	19,053	25,334	CONT CONT 983 208
Utility Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87 Merit 10/87 Merit 4/88	1	40	2	19,053	22,978	CONT CONT 983 208
Utility Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87 Merit 10/87 Merit 4/88	1	40	2	0	22,978	CONT CONT 983 208
Utility Operator General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87 Merit 10/87 Merit 4/88	1	40	2	0	22,978	CONT CONT 983 208
Utility Operator (NEW) General 9/1/86 General 9/1/87 Merit 1/1/88	1	40	2		22,978	CONT CONT 571

TO BE PROMOTED WHEN QUALIFIED.

**TOWN OF WALLINGFORD  
PERSONNEL DETAIL AND SALARY CALCULATIONS  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES - ELECTRIC DIVISION**

Position/Title/Name	Number	Hours Worked	Range Step	Date Last Step	Appropriated 1986-87	Request 1987-88
<b>REDUCTION - Continued</b>						
overtime					23,000	49,100
vacation & Sick Replacement					7,350	9,500
longevity (All Employees)					5,750	5,575
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>				<b>\$ 237,818</b>	<b>\$ 268,562</b>

A motion was made by Mr. Polanski to eliminate page 61, Forensic Lab, seconded by Mrs. Papale.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mrs. Bergamini, who passed; motion duly carried.

Mr. Gessert explained that line 4000, Office Supplies will go from \$2,085 to \$2,277, line 4180 - Printing from \$1509 to \$2,009, line 4260 - Supplies, Non Personal from \$1,947. to \$4,314, line 4280 - Dry Cleaning from \$2,032. to \$2,290. and line 4800 - Clothing & Equipment from \$2,700 to \$3,000. (Added to page 61 from page 55)

Mr. Killen made a motion to move page 55 as amended, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mrs. Bergamini who voted no; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Papale to remove page 164 from the table, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Polanski to delete A/C 2019 - Forensic Lab, page 164, in its entirety, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

POLICE- Detectives & Narcotics A/C 2014, page 158

A motion was made by Mr. Rys to add 1 Sergeant at a price of \$26,878., seconded by Mrs. Papale.

Mr. Polanski asked what this person, right now, would have for a salary and Lt. Butka explained that he would be a grade A Patrolman, which would be \$24,551.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mrs. Bergamini who passed; motion duly carried.

Mr. Gessert commented that you have a Detective, going up to a Sergeant position, so you have a new Sergeant position, but it will be filled by an existing personnel, 1 person will move up. Mrs. Bergamini pointed out that this slot is already listed.

Chief Bevan explained that they are replacing the Sergeant with another Detective from Patrol. The manpower in the Detective Bureau would go up one body. The new body, would be now, in the Patrol Division.

Mrs. Bergamini added that the Partolman that is going out into the Detective Division is already funded.

Mr. Polanski explained that the Detective Division will now have 11 people, because we put in a position there for the Sergeant. The Patrol will have a vacancy under an already made slot and he replaces that person. We don't add anybody to Patrol, its a replacement for 1 that he has.

POLICE - Detective & Narcotics Overhead A/C 2014 ,page 158

A motion was made by Mr. Polanski to increase :

	<u>NEW TOTALS</u>
Overtime by \$3,101.	\$25,786
Overtime-Training by \$491.	6,616
Shift Differential by \$48.	1,979.
Paid Holidays by \$724.	6,724

seconded by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Papale to move page 158 as amended, seconded by Mr. Killen.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mayor Dickinson asked to have what was done on the positions summarized, and Mr. Polanski explained that they upped the Detective Division 1 Sergeant

POLICE PATROL, page 57 A/C 2015

A motion was made by Mrs. Papale to move page 57, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini. (see next motion)

Chief Bevan explained that the low bidder for the custodial came in. He said he would do the job for \$23,000 and the Council approved \$42,000. I thought I could show you a place where you could move money around. What I requested here, when I requested \$5,000 for the development of new computer programs, it was reduced to \$1,000. I was requesting that this \$1,000 be moved to \$3,500 and it could be taken from the \$42,000 in Janitorial Services.

A motion was made by Mrs. Papale to reduce line 6290, Janitorial Services from \$42,000 to \$27,000.

385

Mr. Killen asked if there was a bond required with this and Chief Bevan replied yes.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to add \$6,000 to line 6520, Outside Contractors bringing the total to \$10,000, seconded by Mr. Adams.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

POLICE ADMINISTRATION, page 52

Mr. Polanski explained that line 9001, Computer Program-Develop/Main was knocked down to \$1,000 and Chief Bevan would like it increased by \$2,500.

A motion was made by Mr. Polanski to increase line 9001 by \$2,500 bringing the total to \$3,500., seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to move pages 52 and 57 as amended, seconded by Mrs. Papale.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to remove page 156 from the table, seconded by Mrs. Papale.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

POLICE ADMINISTRATION - A/C 2011, page 156

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to move A/C 2011, seconded by Mr. Holmes. (see next motion)

Mr. Seadale introduced Mr. Mark Wilson, the new Risk Manager (APPLAUSE)

Mr. Seadale explained that when he looks at a survey, and the survey that he looked at today, is the Spring 1987 survey. The Chief is currently is about 10.9% below the maximum of the communities in our area that are in the Meriden survey.

Mr. Polanski asked Mr. Seadale if it is the policy to keep the Police and Fire Chief on the same steps and Mr. Seadale replied no. The Police Chief is one grade ahead.

Mr. Gessert and Mrs. Bergamini agreed that they have no problem with the salary.

Mayor Dickinson commented that there were a number of requests for reclassifications and I did not approve them all. As a general rule, I felt that if someone was a first quartile or less, then in the interest of proper payment, the Town of Wallingford should be paying someone between first and third quartiles on averaging salaries. Where someone fell within the first and third quartiles I did not think it was appropriate, because I believe that at any given time, you can find 50% of the employees of the town, somewhere slightly below the mean average, in that very middle area. What are you going to do, increase everyone's salary every time they are slightly less than the exact average, no. You had to use some kind of indicator and I used the first quartile. If someone is gaining new duties, that enters a new element and that could cause a change in salary.

Mr. Adams stated that not having a job classification raise in over 10 years, is kind of hard for me to understand. I happen to feel that the Police in the entire town is more than adequate. I have lived in towns where the Police Department was questionable of their character and their honesty and I don't find that to be the same out here. I also feel that a head of a department should be paid an appropriate pay. I would like to feel that Wallingford would want to attract the best possible personnel. I feel that if we want to stay in the middle of the pack, somewhere along the line, we are going to get mediocrity and that is how I feel about it.

386  
Mr. Gessert commented that if it was demonstrated to him that a salary increase would produce a whole new attitude and a whole new dedication and a whole new commitment to revitalizing new programs, better morale and everything else in this department, I could be talked into it. I don't think you are going to change the Police Department with a change in his salary, anymore than you can change the Engineering Department by giving a certain individual a raise.

Mayor Dickinson pointed out that reclassification should not be based on who necessarily holds the position. Reclassification should reflect where the salary falls in comparison to others who perform like tasks. Larger towns pay more because the Police Chief has a bigger responsibility. If we determine that one position, because it has existed a long time without a reclassification, deserves a reclassification because of the time that has gone by, then I represent to you that there are many others who also should receive the same benefits. You have to keep in mind, whether there is a reclassification or not, every position receives the general increase, which is averaged from 5% to 7%. Reclassification means another 5% on top of that. If you compare it to the private sector, generally speaking, people are not making 5% to 7% increases every year. There has to be some form of objective standard to treat department heads more equally.

Mrs. Papale asked Mayor Dickinson how the decision is made to reclassify someone and Mayor Dickinson explained that there has to be a request from the Personnel Department. Mrs. Papale then asked Mayor Dickinson, what makes him decide to reclassify and Mayor Dickinson explained that it has to come from the department. It can be initiated from my office, or from any source, generally, it's a result of a department being interested in a reclassification for an employee or department head, etc. and I require that the Personnel Department provide input on it, and that does not mean that I will agree with it.

Mr. Seadale agreed with Mayor Dickinson's comments, and added, that if the position is slipping, that is when I will make my recommendation.

Mr. Adams pointed out that he does not like the system of reclassification and he does not think it is fair.

Mr. Seadale explained that there are only 10 positions left in the town that are non-union. One of the demands that they had at negotiation time was that a Committee be formed with the Union and with Management and that that Committee come up with reclassification for a 6 month period of time. We fought that and fought that successfully. The reason that the Fact Finder did not give it to them, was that we were able to show that we had, on an annual basis, looked at people, where they were in relationship to similar jobs in other communities, and where we felt it was necessary, we made changes, and this Council has gone along with it. Because of that, the Fact Finder said that we don't need a Union Management Study Team. We have tried to maintain it, there have been differences of opinions from time to time. I will still make my recommendations the way I see them and obviously if Mayor feels that you should be in the first quartile, that is his prerogative. I will do what I have to do in terms of trying to keep the pay structure current as I see it.

Mr. Holmes commented that the reason that he tabled this matter was because he felt it needed some discussion, because I feel that it has nothing to do with the Office.

A motion was made by Mr. Gouveia to go into Executive Session to discuss job performance, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Killen and Polanski who voted no; motion duly carried and the meeting went into Executive Session at 10:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to come out of Executive Session, seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried and the meeting came out of Executive Session at 10:25 p.m.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mr. Adams who passed; motion duly carried (original motion, A/C 2011)

Mr. Gessert explained that the reason that the Council went into

Executive Session was because, the other night, when they were talking about Public Works, we found out that when somebody has a letter that they can't work and our question was, if you only have 34 guys and 25% of the work force has a letter from a Doctor that they can't perform their duties, what the hell are we going to do about it so that we can get some bodies in there that can be assigned to a job and they can go and work without going to the doctor first to see if they can handle it.

Mr. Seadale explained that they have done that in other departments. People who couldn't work and perform their duties, have been terminated and that can be done.

Mr. Wilson explained that when someone is taking a leave because of a job related injury, he is receiving Workmen's Compensation during this time. During that time, he is under his doctor's care and they shouldn't return to work until the doctor o.k.'s that they have received their maximum recovery so that they can return to work. In the event that they return to work and their disability disallows them to perform their task, if we have a position of light duty, or a position that we can place them in, it is our own judgment that we can provide that position for them. If no position exists, we don't have to be in the position of make work for anyone, you don't have to create a job for someone. If they cannot perform the position that they were hired for, then the decision should be made to terminate them, lay them off.

Mr. Seadale added that they do have to meet that maximum time of recovery. There has to be a doctor that tells us that and sometimes the doctors are very reluctant to do that.

Mr. Adams asked Mr. Seadale if he ever had trouble with the Unions regarding placement of jobs and Mr. Seadale replied that some of the contracts have time limits and some of them do not, as to the period of time that a person that was injured on the job, has to receive Workmen's Compensation and the difference pay to make up his pay. The longest is about 2 years and there are a couple that have gotten 1 year in. We try to reduce them all of the time and bring them down. When they come back, you don't have to create a position. If you have a light duty position that's open, that fine, it's to your advantage. You are getting him off of Workmen's Compensation and you are paying him and getting some work out of him, but you don't have to create that position.

Mr. Killen asked if the man's doctor was the sole judge and Mr. Seadale replied yes and added that they can ask him to go to their doctor, but he can go to his own too.

Mr. Holmes suggested that an Investigator be brought in to look into some of these cases and Mr. Seadale agreed and added that this would be a good idea.

Mr. Seadale explained that they have every right to take a person that is on disability, send him to a doctor once a year for re-examination and if the doctor says that he can return to work, we offer him the position and if he refuses, the pension is cut off.

Mr. Wilson added that if for any reason we feel that an employee is taking advantage, of the Workmen's Compensation privilege we can file a motion to discontinue his disability payments with the Worker's Compensation Commissioner. This would be an informal hearing. What the Commissioner would do is, he would listen to our opinions and he would listen to the opinions of the employee. Both parties are also represented by Attorneys. You would also need proof that this person is rehabilitated. If we have reason to believe that someone is gold-bricking, we can request that that employee go to a doctor to re-evaluate his injury and if that doctor says that the employee is at maximum recovery or this person no longer has this disability, then we can request that this person come back to work and if he does not want to come back, then we can have a formal hearing. The Commissioner of Worker's Compensation is a position that is set up for the benefit of the employee, so you don't look to put your life in his hands as an employer. He tries to be very impartial and he will tend to recognize fraud. If there is a situation where there is fraud, and it is apparent, then you would start relying on 2nd opinions. What we always try to look for, and the key word is, maximum recovery.

388

When an employee has come to his maximum recovery level for any injury, what we can do at that point in time, is find out just how disabled he is. If his arm was hurt and it has been determined that he has 20% partial injury, we can award that employee, a pre-computed amount. We award him that and then we offer him his job and if he can't perform his job, we have to start laying people off. I feel that we have to have some guts. We may even have to go up against a Union and see what is going to happen.

Mr. Seadale added that they did it in Electric. We went to arbitration and we won it. We won it because the man lost it himself. He was suppose to swim and they asked him if he could swim, and he said that he kind of holds onto the tube.

The Council thanked Mr. Wilson and wished him luck on his new job.

SOCIAL SERVICES CONTRIBUTION/RED CROSS CONTRIBUTION- line 6791, page 80A

A motion was made by Mr. Killen to remove page 80A from the table, seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mayor Dickinson explained that this money represents that portion of their request which we figure to be transportation and emergency services expenses in Wallingford. In other words, the Red Cross operates the evacuation shelters and they also have transportation costs, within

Wallingford. I felt that the community definitely receives a service from those activities. The community would have to do those things if they didn't.

Mr. Killen commented that the Red Cross has always been a volunteer operation and what is happening in Wallingford, is an example of Meriden not picking up their end of the load. They should stay a voluntary operation.

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to move line item 6791, seconded by Mrs. Papale.

VOTE: Unanimous no votes; motion did not carry.

FIRE - Cook Hill A/C 2038, page 137 - Capital Requests

A motion was made by Mrs. Papale to add \$10,000 for paving, seconded by Mr. Gouveia.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mrs. Bergamini who voted no; motion duly carried.

FIRE - North Farms A/C 2037, page 137 - Capital Requests

A motion was made by Mr. Rys to remove North Farms A/C 2037 from the table, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.

Mayor Dickinson explained that it is really not a necessity to do North Farms this year. The refurbishing can be done, if it is possible, through the sales of trucks that Chief McElfish talked about.

Mrs. Bergamini commented that they have no right to put all of this into the budget, because of everything that they are getting.

Mr. Killen commented that the departments have a right to ask for what they want but, you don't have to vote for it.

A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to increase Fire Fighting Gear to \$4,000, seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Bergamini and Killen who voted no; motion duly carried.

A motion was made to move A/C 2037, page 137, as amended by Mr. Holmes, seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Bergamini and Killen who voted no; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Rys to reinstate Laborer (New) to Dog Warden at \$15,330 and remove 2 part time employees, seconded by Mr. Gouveia. (new position will be 2nd Assistant Dog Warden)

Mayor Dickinson explained that if you want to go with a full time instead of 2 part time, the problem was in the pay area, and what I didn't want to have an Assistant at the same rate as a Laborer, who is a new employee, so you will have to create 2 assistant positions. If you are going to add a full time employee, it should be another (2nd) Assistant Dog Warden.

Mr. Myers explained that the Assistant Dog Warden, is at the pay of a Laborer. The only difference in the numbers, is the Assistant is at step 1 and the Laborer is at minimum, but they are both in the same pay grade.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Bergamini, Holmes, Killen and Papale who voted no; motion duly carried.

Mayor Dickinson commented that he would like the Council to reconsider the playground equipment. It is generally requested by P.T.O.'s. The only request that I had was the Recreation Department. There has not been, the kind of cooperation that there should be in lining the fields, etc. but what we aren't going to straighten out in the short run is the playground equipment for the kids, whether it is the summer recreation program at the school or during the school year. I would rather not have, the P.T.O.'s sacrifice because what is all Town of Wallingford money, is just a question of what department it is in. I say, why not go ahead and put the recreation equipment out there and who is going to take care of it, we will try to resolve. Sacrifice them in this debate between education.

Mr. Gessert stated that this had better be the last time this is shows up in our budget under Recreation. It should be a Board of Education expenditure.

Mrs. Bergamini pointed out that this was probably taken away from the Board of Education because they do not have line control.

RECREATION, page 138 - Capital Requests A/C 4000

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to restore:

Prarie Cabin	\$900.00
Jr. Physical Act. Ctr'	650.00
Swing Set	900.00
Total	<u>\$2,450.00</u>

to A/C 4000, Recreation, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Killen commented that the Board of Education was only one part of this. The second part that disturbs me, is the fact that the P.T.O. had to tell this man that this is what they needed.

Mr. Adams commented that the Activity Center is a dangerous piece of equipment and he has no problems with the other two.

Mayor Dickinson commented that if this is approved, there will have to be some analysis.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Papale and Rys who voted no; motion duly carried.

Mr. Myers explained that he had a message from Mrs. Collins. She has most of the insurance packages in (premiums) and they are within the budget as established. There would be approx. \$20,000 available in the insurance lines, (page 123). She is recommending two things. \$20,000 that is available, might be necessary, if they have to insure Parker Farms as a vacant school. She would like the Council to consider, is she is very uneasy about the fact that Wallingford only has a \$1 million dollar Umbrella Policy. The bid came in on the Umbrella at the exact same price as last year, \$135,000. She recommends, that you put \$100,000 into Contingency to increase that Umbrella limit to \$3 million or \$5 million dollars. The premium at \$5 million dollars would be \$260,000, from \$135,000.

INSURANCE, page 123, line 8250

A motion was made by Mr. Killen to increase line 8250, Town Insurance,

710,000 for the purpose of buying more umbrella insurance, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

390

Mr. Myers explained that right now, through tonight's actions we are at 2/10th less than the Mayor's recommendation, we are at approx. 7/10th of a mill, so you cut it 2/10th of a mill. If you add \$100,000 you will have cut it 1/10th of a mill.

VOTE: Bergamini, Gouveia, Holmes, Papale, Polanski, Rys and Gessert voted no.  
Adams and Killen voted yes;  
motion did not carry.

Mr. Killen commented that you don't want to go for the \$100,000 for that but you go for \$234,000 on 319, and you don't know if you are ever going to need it and it is going to affect the tax rate just as much as that \$100,000 was and it doesn't make any sense at all. As I said before, Reserve for Emergency, and the biggest emergency we had, we didn't touch it with a 10 ft. pole.

COUNCIL CONTINGENCY, page 125 A/C 8050

A motion was made to move page 125, by Mr. Holmes, seconded by Mrs. Papale. (see next motion)

Mr. Killen stated that all of the departments have money left over because we feed it to them, out of this particular account.

A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to reduce line 3190 to \$150,000, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Adams, Killen and Papale who voted no; motion duly carried.

Mr. Myers explained that line 3230, Contingency Reserve-General Government is partially, \$11,856.00 for Inspector Spiteri's Office.

A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to move line 3230 as presented at \$331,856., seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mr. Killen who voted no; motion duly carried.

A motion was made by Mrs. Bergamini to move page 125 as amended, seconded by Mr. Polanski.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Killen who voted no; motion duly carried.

Mr. Myers explained that you understand that when I calculate the mill rate that contingency is not going to come out at \$150,000. 1/10th of a mill is worth \$96,000. If I come up less, that thing could end up anywhere from -0- to \$96,000 less or -0- to \$96,000 more. You are setting mill rates at 10th's of a mill. 1/10th of a mill is worth \$96,075. If I calculate that mill rate, and I have to come up with a calculated mill rate, and in order to do that, I have to throw the difference on that calculation into that contingency. So the swing would be \$96,000 below \$150,000 or \$96,000 above \$150,000.

Mrs. Bergamini commented that if it is below \$150,000 we are in trouble.

Mr. Killen commented that this is how things occur over and over again. The first time this account ever appeared we use to carry in it to round off the mill rate and to establish an emergency account. In rounding off the mill rate, it use to be that when the Comptroller got through, with the mill rate, if it was 32.7 he would round it off to 33 and then 3/10th of a mill went in there. You did not establish a line account, one way or the other. Now it is getting so, you are establishing X number of dollars in there and this is how the thing gets way out of hand. I am not going to argue the case again, that the Charter does not allow for it, because it falls on deaf ear, but this again, is how the mechanism changes, and in due time, people pick it up and you begin to wonder how you lost control. This is how we lose control of it. The Comptroller is going to have to do some computations now and one way or the other, he is going to have to juggle some figures around again and they are not going to come out right.

Mr. Gouveia commented that the way we do the budget, we always look at what the departments spend the previous year and when they ask for an amount and it far exceeds what they spent in the previous year, you almost give them an incentive to spend all of that money. Board of Education is perhaps more guilty than anyone when it comes to this time of the year. I would like to see if it is possible, if the Board of Education, at the end of this fiscal year, ends up with a surplus, could we attach this surplus and add it into next year's budget. 391

Mr. Myers explained that you can only do it by re-appropriating the money next fiscal year.

Mr. Gouveia added that he would also like to see if you were to do this, see if they had an incentive to save the money.

Mayor Dickinson explained that the system really allows that the way that it is. If they end up with \$100,000 and they know that they can spend that \$100,000, they will think they have already budgeted for the next year. They can still do that now.

Mr. Gouveia added that he would still like to see if they would save at least \$40,000. Just recently, I discovered that they were expecting an \$50,000 surplus and when I asked them about it they told me it was not valid. That \$50,000 is going to go for something that is not of a high priority.

Mayor Dickinson commented that whatever they spend it on, they don't have to spend it on next year's budget. The Superintendent is going to decide how much they can spend in a given year. They get constant reports from the business manager, what money is still out there, what is owed, what they have to purchase and it comes down to the end of the year. A previous manager got in trouble because he was not able to tell them where they stood at the end of the year. What you are saying Peter, is if they want to, if they have \$80,000 or even \$20,000, they can spend that on an item this year, that they were going to spend it on next year on their own.

Mr. Adams explained that there is a grant out right now for middle schools to pay up to \$50,000 and it is youth oriented. If someone looked into our position or at least part of it and also in the Chapter One monies, there are ways in which you could use those funds in a way which will allow you to replace a teacher, using Chapter One monies, as long as you show you are taking the kids and spreading it out so that, instead of having classrooms of 25, you are having 20. You can use some of that money to show that by lessening the class size, you are providing more in the way of educational remediation for these kids.

Mr. Killen stated that this balance in the General Fund shows \$2 million dollars, where is that in the budget and Mr. Myers replied that it is in the General Fund and it is not appropriated, but it is available to us.

Mr. Myers explained that they have \$30 million to \$40 million dollars in new bonds coming in and we have to have a certain amount of fund balance.

Mr. Killen added that at one time, the Electric Division had \$6 million dollars and the bond rating did not go down at all, we didn't have any control over it. We are adding another \$2 million and we are putting off projects, doing certain things that we should be doing and we are carrying \$2 million dollars for no reason in the world. It does not make any sense. Mr. Myers explained that this money is just like collateral.

Mr. Myers explained that the full faith in credit of a municipality is no longer considered the best assurance in the bond market because what happened when New York City and other cities defaulted on their debt, and then they couldn't go to the bank and borrow money. The bond market wants to see that an organization, a municipality has the financial wear with all, to stand on it's own, and to sustain some hard times without running to the bank to borrow money, without puttingh itself farther into debt. They want their money now.

Mayor Dickinson pointed out that the whole reason for this is the change in the Federal Law. You can't just borrow everything and then pay sometime later. You have to be paying the bills, then borrow and it is on a 6 month basis. We are talking about being able to pay the bills on all of these construction projects, before we borrow.

Ultimately, \$2 million dollars could be completely used and then in theory, you are reimbursing it through the money you borrowed. You have to have the money up front, and if you don't pay the bill up front, and you borrow, and you don't pay, and that work isn't completed, you are going to owe the Federal Government money.

Mr. Killen added that this is the group that should decide whether or not we want to put \$2 million dollars aside and the question was not brought up to us.

Mayor Dickinson explained that you have to have the money to pay on all of these bond issues.

Mr. Killen added that we still have \$2 million dollars in there.

A motion to adjourn was duly made, seconded and carried and the Ninth Budget Workshop adjourned at 11:28 p.m.

Meeting recorded by:  
Delores B. Fetta

Meeting transcribed by:  
Susan M. Baron, Council Secretary

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

412

May 7, 1987

7:00 p.m.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Thursday, May 7, 1987, for the express purpose of the Public Hearing on AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. The meeting was called to order by Chairman David A. Gessert at 7:10 p.m. Answering present to the roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary Rascati were Council Members Adams, Bergamini, Gouveia, Killen, Papale, Polanski, Rys and Gessert. Council Member Holmes arrived after the roll was called. Also present were Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers.

Mrs. Bergamini read and moved the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

Be it Enacted by the Town Council in Session:

I.

Ordinance No. 347 is hereby amended by increasing the appropriation therein from Two Million Five Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand (\$2,575,000) Dollars to Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars for the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School, including architect and construction management fees and construction costs, as more particularly set forth as follows:

<u>Description of Expenditure</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Architect, construction management and roofing	585,000
Window, walls and related work	400,000
Site work	315,000
Interior work and finishes	400,000
Mechanical & electrical	355,000
Debt administration	368,500
Contingency	573,500
 Total Amended Appropriation	 <u>2,997,000</u>

The amount set opposite each expenditure description shall be reserved for the stated purpose. Transfers from one expenditure description to another may occur only upon approval of the mayor and council.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

II.

To meet said appropriation, not more than Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars of bonds, notes or other obligations of the Town of Wallingford may be issued pursuant to Chapter XV of the Town Charter, as amended, and Section 7-369 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

III.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell the bonds, either all at one time, or from time to time, in series, at public sale, either as a separate issue or combined with other authorized but unissued bonds of the Town of Wallingford, at not less than par and accrued

interest, an advertisement of which shall be published before the date of sale in The Bond Buyer or other publication or media specializing in municipal finance. They shall determine the rate of interest of such bonds, the amount of each issue of such bonds, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such bonds, by whom and how such bonds shall be signed or countersigned, provisions for redemption prior to maturity and the terms, conditions and prices thereof, and all other particulars of such issue. The Town Treasurer shall deliver the bonds and receive the proceeds thereof. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, N.A., of Hartford, Connecticut, shall be the certifying and paying agent. Adinolfi, O'Brien & Hayes, P.C., Attorneys-at-Law, of Hartford, Connecticut, shall render an opinion approving the legality of such particular issue. Such bonds shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the bonds in accordance with their terms. 413

IV.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell temporary notes of the Town, from time to time, in an amount not to exceed Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars, under and pursuant to the provisions of Section 7-378 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended, in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds from the sale of bonds hereby authorized, and are authorized to comply with the provisions of Section 7-378a, as amended, and any other legislation regarding the extension of temporary periods whether presently in effect or enacted subsequent to the passage of this ordinance, if the maturity of such notes shall extend beyond the time permitted by Section 7-378; the Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to determine the rate of interest of such notes, determine the amount of each issue of notes, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such notes, and by whom and how such notes shall be signed or

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

countersigned, and all other particulars thereof. Such notes shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the notes in accordance with their terms.

V.

The Mayor and the Comptroller are authorized pursuant to C.G.S. §7-369b to make representations and agreements for the benefit of the holders of any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are necessary or appropriate to ensure the exemption from federal taxation of the interest on the bonds, notes or other obligations authorized herein, including the full faith and credit pledge of the Town to rebate to the federal government such sums as are required to be rebated to it if tax exempt obligations are issued pursuant to this resolution.

The Comptroller is hereby authorized to establish separate reserve accounts within which to deposit and hold such rebateable sums obtained from the issuance of obligations authorized herein and as are defined in H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, or such other federal legislation requiring such rebate as may be enacted, to timely rebate such sums to the United States, and to perform all acts necessary and appropriate to ensure that the interest on the obligations authorized herein remains exempt from Federal income taxation.

VI.

Nothing herein shall prohibit the advancement of expenses by the Comptroller from the general fund for the purposes authorized by this ordinance and the reimbursement of the general fund for such advancement of expenses from the proceeds received from the issuance of bonds or notes authorized by this ordinance.

seconded by Mr. Rys.

414

Mr. Edward Musso, 56 Dibble Edge Road, commented that he believed that there were things done on the Parker Farms School that he thinks they could have saved money on. He then asked how much the interest was going to be and Mr. Gessert replied, \$368,000 for openers. Mr. Devine added that the interest is reimbursable by 62%.

Mr. Rys commented that he took a walk around the back parking lot at Parker Farms School and stated that it does not look any different than the other schools, and added that the sidewalks do not look bad and asked why they were going to be dug up. Mr. Roming explained that the back parking lot is going to be used for overflow parking. Jennite is not used to repair pavement, it is more of a cosmetic coating and is used only in service areas where you are trying to prevent gas or oil from going into the pavement and destroying the pavement. When you do a school and you have a major rehab on the school, you are liable for all of the areas that you do. Mr. Rys commented that if you were to get rid of the Jennite and just put a coating on that, that should last for a few years. Mr. Roming did not agree and explained that the first crack that you get in there, you are going to get the same failure. There is no way to put a coating over that and even a contractor, who specializes in bituminous paving will say the same thing. There was no base under that pavement originally, they used the sand for a base. Mr. Rys added that he is looking to open the school to the best that we can for the students. I recognize the fact, that they use it sometimes, and I spoke to a couple of teachers and they said that they don't use the lot as a general parking lot, they use the grassy section. Mr. Roming added that they have also used painted markings, so they would have more use for it. We are only doing what the program that was set forth to us stated. If you do the back, at least you will get some partial reimbursement for it. The drive has to be completely reconstructed and we are moving the walk to the other side for the safety of the children. The children should walk away from the traffic on their way to school. The road is being kept at almost the same width, but it is being separated from the sidewalk. We are also crowning the roadway and putting curbing in there to direct the drainage into catch basins. There is no way that you can salvage a sidewalk. I received a letter from the Town Engineer on 3/3 and it was regarding our plans, which stated that is not necessary to construct the parking areas with the same cross-section. Detail C would appear to be adequate for the parking areas and actually conform to the state statute for driveways. For Detail B & C, you might consider a gravel base as an alternate to the process base. On another correspondence, the Town Engineer said we should reduce the base under the pavement to 4 inches from the 8 inches we proposed. In all of the years that I have been doing this kind of work, I have never put in a 4 inch base for a driveway or anything else, especially in Connecticut. The state standard is almost identical to ours, and if you read it, you will see it is for driveways. What is proposed, in that letter, is less than standard according to the State of Connecticut. If you are going to do it, do it right.

Mrs. Papale asked Mr. Roming if he has ever talked to Mr. Costello on a one on one basis and Mr. Roming replied that he has talked to Mr. Costello 2 or 3 times and he said he would reply to my comments, and this is the way he felt.

Mayor Dickinson commented that he spoke with Mr. Costello and asked him, what kind of savings would be involved and he thought, off of the top of his head, that it could be \$30,000. He felt that the savings would not be much and he stood by his feelings on the standards.

Mr. Roming added, that if they were going in and leaving the road pavement and we were going to try to save the base that was under there, we would come in and strip the bituminous that was under there and put in whatever additional base we needed and then put on a bituminous surface. In this case, we are lowering the whole front because we have to get the drainage away from the building. If you go out there, you can see the water is running into the building.

Mr. Gessert asked if gutters would have any impact on getting the water away from the driveway and Mr. Williams replied that it is set now so that the leaders drop to the ground and spill onto a splash box.

Mrs. Papale asked if the back lot was left alone if it would be a .

liability and Mr. Roming explained that there is always a liability, but it has increased because you have pavement that is cracked.

415

At this point, Mr. Roming showed the Council plans for the back area and the play area for the kids.

Mr. Gouveia commented that if they were to eliminate the back parking lot, you would save \$50,000. Obviously, if you were to eliminate it, you can't leave it the way that it is. You will have to rip it up, bring in some soil and reseed it. Mr. Roming explained that you will not save anything. It will cost you just as much because, you will have to excavate, haul it away and then you will have to bring in top soil. Top soil is \$20.00 a yard and then you have to seed it, and we would probably have to put some more drainage into it because it is blacktop now and the water runs free over it and if we put grass in there, we have to put in drainage.

Mr. Gouveia commented that he had 3 documents that are important. The first one is dated 9/18/86, where the Committee shows a comparison between the 1984 and the 1986 budgets. The 1986 budget shows \$2,206,500. but there are 5 notes added to it that are important, and at the bottom it says that these figures are based on the preliminary drawings or in some cases, no drawings at all. The Committee states that it should be noted is that depending upon what is included in the final drawings, the actual cost could be higher or lower. The other document is dated 1/5/87. This is the document with which we discussed the site work and we had the choice of both parking lots or only one. One was for \$479,000 and the other was for \$346,000 and this was at the meeting we had in the back room, and the only thing that we asked you not to do was the planting for \$10,000 and I think a consensus was taken of the Council at that meeting and everyone agreed that we should go with the higher one, which is what you were saying at that time. On 1/15/87, the Committee supplied the Council with another estimate and this was \$2,847,000 and this did not include the cost of bonding. Today, you are giving us a figure of \$2,997,000 minus the \$368,500 so, in essence, I think you have reduced the cost from \$2.8 million dollars to \$2.6 million dollars. I think the Committee has done their work.

Mr. Gessert asked to have the line items explained and Mr. Devine explained that the Architect is \$120,000, Construction Manager is \$85,000 and the amount spent for roofing was (as of 3/31) \$308,800, and these are encumbered not expended. Most of the roofing money is all under contract or job change.

Mr. Gessert asked what on-site cleanup was and Mr. Williams explained that this is the daily and weekly cleanup that is effectively not covered within the trade contractors, such as debris left behind after they do their own cleanup within the project. That cost is more geared to the end of the project when they leave the job and leave any materials behind and general cleanup of the final project. Mr. Gessert then asked how the figure of \$8,000 was arrived at and

Mr. Williams explained that it was estimated as a per week basis within a final cleanup cost as a lump sum cost, and this has been contracted for, under the reimbursable expenditures. Mr. Devine explained that this is under the Construction Management Contract for on-site expenses on a reimbursable cost basis. This is the estimate that we have at this point, to try to give you a final number. Mr. Gessert asked if anyone asked a cleaning company to give them a price on this and Mr. Devine replied no and added that if the Town Council wants them to go out to bid, the Committee will do it. He also added that \$85,000 is for the professional Construction Management service. Just as you would with a general contractor, you would pay him for his services, a percentage and then it would be his on-site expenses, which would be reimbursable on a cost basis. If you look at \$85,000 for a job of the magnitude that we are talking about, I don't think we got a bad deal. Mr. Gessert added that the graffiti removal at \$5,000 was also too high. Mr. Williams added that the graffiti removal is not intended to be used for services performed by the C. F. Wooding Company. When the project is completed, this is something that would be put out to bid and would be presented to the Committee for approval.

Mr. Gessert pointed out that the Council received some information about 3 or 4 months ago regarding the Gym floor which stated the gym floor would cost \$19,000 and a credit of \$2,800. Mr. Devine

explained that it would cost \$2,800 for the tile floor to be put down, and that would be a credit from Design Distributors and to pour the gym floor it will cost \$19,500. 416

Mr. Devine explained that when they reduced the mill work as part of our savings, we saved approx. \$50,000 alone. We felt that the reduction that we made there, was adequate to compensate for getting the gym floor back on into the project. We netted out with probably a \$30,000 savings with the mill work alone with the reductions.

Mr. Polanski commented that he feels that they were given \$2,575,000 and if they could have saved money, he really felt that they should have stayed within that figure and if they save \$50,000 on mill work, they shouldn't go back and spend \$50,000 on something else that they feel that they wanted to put into that thing. On the first page, refurbishing metal lockers, total projected project cost \$6,251.00, then you are going to eliminate from the project, refurbishing old lockers, instead of replacing \$21,730.00. You are throwing figures at us. Mr. Devine explained that the cost of new lockers was \$21,000. and the cost of refurbishing was \$6,250. Mr. Polanski added that he does not like the figures being tossed back and forth. Mr. Devine explained that the doors, frames and related work, which are shown for \$45,130.00, we were able to reduce that to \$34,540.00. The mill work, which we show for \$107,700. we were able to reduce down to \$58,930. The projection screens, we cut out of the project. The total cost of \$200,200. of unbid items came in at approx. \$137,000 due to various cuts that we took, adjustments and rebidding and trying to get some of the work done by on-site contractors. Mr. Polanski asked what was done with that money and Mr. Devine explained that they were talking about \$2,847,000. without any expense for bonding. We are coming back to you and saying, for hard construction they are asking for \$2,629,000. From these figures, we have cut approx. \$200,000.

Mr. Gessert asked, that if it was cut by \$200,000., why the number never went down and Mr. Devine explained that the cost did go down. Hard construction cost on this number was \$2,847,000.

Mr. Polanski asked who was supposed to be there for \$1,200. a week for on-site construction and Mr. Devine stated that it would be an employee of C. F. Wooding and he has been there every day, from 8:00 to 4:30+.

Mr. Killen commented that if someone has a recommendation, we will start with the \$34,000, and if someone wants to cut it, let's see what the reaction is from the other side of the table and we can go on through that way and see where we end up.

Mrs. Papale commented that we as the Council people, are a little bit to blame as to what has happened here. When we asked Wooding to come up with an estimated price based on a preliminary drawing, in some cases there were no drawings, I think the price that came up was because we were rushing you. We the Council, voted for Wooding to be the construction manager and we gave the O.K. to your Committee. Many of us worked with Wooding on the Police Station and I don't know what happened, but all of a sudden, everyone is so unhappy with Wooding. I think we pushed him against the wall, and it is not all of Wooding's fault that this is happening. I think if we had more time, prices would have been put in differently.

Mr. Devine added that maybe if we had an opportunity to rebid some of the critical trade-ons, we might have been able to do better on the bids. I wish we would not look at this as a mistake (what we are paying for the school). You had a building that was deteriorating away to nothing.

Mayor Dickinson commented that if you look at the price per square foot, you use 42,000 square feet, an estimate of \$1.3 million dollars, gives you \$37.00 per square foot. That is way below what was reasonably expected. To a certain extent, it was unknown exactly what had to be done in the building and I think everyone is realizing that it has to be done from ground up. I do have to say that the initial estimates were way off. If you don't include the bonding costs, we are now at \$62.00 - \$63.00 a square foot and if you include the bonding costs, it is at \$71.00 a square foot. Both are well within range for my information as to what it should cost on reconstruction. We have 8-10 major construction projects going in this town and every dollar that goes more than what we expect, is of serious consequences. We have gone this far, so let's open the school, because the school

kids are the ones that we are doing it for. The bottom line is, the project has to be completed and maybe we learned some lessons from this. Maybe we have to stay away from situations where it has to be done by a certain time, or else. 417

Mr. Gessert stated that he agreed with Mayor Dickinson's comments and added that if you look at the \$1.2 million dollar figure that we were given a year ago, this month, and then the professionals became involved and then the professionals, after 3 or 5 months, came back to us with a figure of \$2.3 million. This Council was not thrilled with \$1.2 million dollars but, if we had to spend it to correct the problem, then we were willing to spend it. I think everyone here swallowed hard when we were told the figure was \$2.3 million dollars. Then after appropriating the \$2.3 million dollars (2 or 3 weeks), we found out that some of the major bids were 50%-70% inaccurate for some of the estimates.

Mr. Gessert continued by saying that the Council is sitting there writing checks and if we don't write a check for whatever anybody wants, then we are no good. (Mr. Musso applauded)

Mr. Devine explained that the estimate of \$1.2 million was given in 1985. In all of the time that I have been Chairman of this Committee, other than the times that I spoke with Mr. Gessert, no one has ever called me and asked me what is going on and what we were trying to do and where we were at. Most of the information that has been given to this Council, is from us to you. I can only remember on 2 occasions where members of the Council, came to our meetings. The problem might have been that there was not enough communication and there was not enough participation, maybe by the governing bodies of this town. I think we can all take some blame for that, but I hope, in the future, that we have all learned something. To have a building committee without someone from town government sitting on it, I think it is a very big mistake.

Mr. Gessert agreed with the statement Mr. Devine made and added that the Police Station Committee had representation from the Council on it and the Robert Earley Committee also has representation from the Council also.

Mr. Killen pointed out that he noticed, items which have not yet been established and Mr. Devine explained that the sheetrocker has not given them a breakdown on the ventilation system or the total cost of the Handicapped Accessibility, because that has not been completed yet. All of these things, are in the process of being done, they have not been completed yet so we do not have a final cost figure on them. Any new space that we create in the building or any new facilities would be reimbursable.

Mr. Killen commented that the Council is working on the budget which will be adopted on Tuesday. We have put in dollars this year for Capital Improvements that are going to be done. Those figures were given to us and year in and year out, they come fairly close to coming forth with a figure and living within that figure. I cannot understand why this Committee can come forth and say that they that they couldn't come anywhere near with the figures. I cannot understand this.

Mr. Devine explained that the state of the construction industry today, has resulted in you paying higher prices than you would have paid for the same work. I think that we are paying that price for it.

Attorney Joseph Fasi pointed out that there are other expenditure descriptions than the one listed in the Ordinance originally. I would suggest that the Ordinance be amended to authorize the Council and the Mayor to approve the creation of additional expenditure descriptions, and I have some language for that proposal.

Mr. Gessert explained that Mr. Devine indicated earlier, that the numbers numerated here, some of those line items have already gone beyond that.

Attorney Fasi explained that the original Ordinance was created to appropriate a lump sum of money. It contained a mechanism within the Ordinance, so that the Council and the Mayor could do what you

have done in re-appropriating the money among different items within the Ordinance. That is fine if the Ordinance says a certain amount of money, and you haven't expended that total amount, you can expend it however you want, as long as you follow the procedure in the Ordinance. The amendment that I am proposing, simply says that there may be additional descriptions of expenditures in addition to the specific ones listed.

Mrs. Bergamini read and moved the following amendment to the Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

Be it Enacted by the Town Council in Session:

I.

Ordinance No. 347 is hereby amended by increasing the appropriation therein from Two Million Five Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand (\$2,575,000) Dollars to Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars for the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School, including architect and construction management fees and construction costs, as more particularly set forth as follows:

<u>Description of Expenditure</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Architect, construction management and roofing	585,000
Window, walls and related work	400,000
Site work	315,000
Interior work and finishes	400,000
Mechanical & electrical	355,000
Debt administration	368,500
Contingency	573,500
<b>Total Amended Appropriation</b>	<b><u>2,997,000</u></b>

The amount set opposite each expenditure description shall be reserved for the stated purpose. Transfers from one expenditure description to another may occur only upon approval of the mayor and council. The mayor and council may approve the creation of additional expenditure descriptions, except that, such additional expenditure descriptions shall be related to the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School and in no event shall the total of all expenditures exceed \$2,997,000.

II.

To meet said appropriation, not more than Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars of bonds, notes or other obligations of the Town of Wallingford may be issued pursuant to Chapter XV of the Town Charter, as amended, and Section 7-369 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

III.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell the bonds, either all at one time, or from time to time, in series, at public sale, either as a separate issue or combined with other authorized but unissued bonds of the Town of Wallingford, at not less than par and accrued interest, an advertisement of which shall be published before the date of sale in The Bond Buyer or other publication or media specializing in municipal finance. They shall determine the rate of interest of such bonds, the amount of each issue of such bonds,

419

seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.  
(amendment)

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Bergamini, Polanski  
and Gessert who voted no; motion duly carried. (amended Ordinance)

A motion to adjourn was duly made, seconded and carried and the  
Special Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Meeting recorded by:  
Delores B. Fetta

Meeting transcribed by:  
Susan M. Baron, Council Secretary

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
David A. Gessert, Chairman

5-12-87  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

420

May 7, 1987

7:00 p.m.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Thursday, May 7, 1987, for the express purpose of the Public Hearing on AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION. The meeting was called to order by Chairman David A. Gessert at 7:10 p.m. Answering present to the roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary Rascati were Council Members Adams, Bergamini, Gouveia, Killen, Papale, Polanski, Rys and Gessert. Council Member Holmes arrived after the roll was called. Also present were Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers.

Mrs. Bergamini read and moved the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

Be it Enacted by the Town Council in Session:

I.

Ordinance No. 347 is hereby amended by increasing the appropriation therein from Two Million Five Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand (\$2,575,000) Dollars to Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars for the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School, including architect and construction management fees and construction costs, as more particularly set forth as follows:

<u>Description of Expenditure</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Architect, construction management and roofing	585,000
Window, walls and related work	400,000
Site work	315,000
Interior work and finishes	400,000
Mechanical & electrical	355,000
Debt administration	368,500
Contingency	573,500
Total Amended Appropriation	<u>2,997,000</u>

The amount set opposite each expenditure description shall be reserved for the stated purpose. Transfers from one expenditure description to another may occur only upon approval of the mayor and council.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

II.

To meet said appropriation, not more than Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars of bonds, notes or other obligations of the Town of Wallingford may be issued pursuant to Chapter XV of the Town Charter, as amended, and Section 7-369 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

III.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell the bonds, either all at one time, or from time to time, in series, at public sale, either as a

421  
separate issue or combined with other authorized but unissued bonds of the Town of Wallingford, at not less than par and accrued interest, an advertisement of which shall be published before the date of sale in The Bond Buyer or other publication or media specializing in municipal finance. They shall determine the rate of interest of such bonds, the amount of each issue of such bonds, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such bonds, by whom and how such bonds shall be signed or countersigned, provisions for redemption prior to maturity and the terms, conditions and prices thereof, and all other particulars of such issue. The Town Treasurer shall deliver the bonds and receive the proceeds thereof. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, N.A., of Hartford, Connecticut, shall be the certifying and paying agent. Adinolfi, O'Brien & Hayes, P.C., Attorneys-at-Law, of Hartford, Connecticut, shall render an opinion approving the legality of such particular issue. Such bonds shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the bonds in accordance with their terms.

#### IV.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell temporary notes of the Town, from time to time, in an amount not to exceed Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars, under and pursuant to the provisions of Section 7-378 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended, in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds from the sale of bonds hereby authorized, and are authorized to comply with the provisions of Section 7-378a, as amended, and any other legislation regarding the extension of temporary periods whether presently in effect or enacted subsequent to the passage of this ordinance, if the maturity of such notes shall extend beyond the time permitted by Section 7-378; the Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to determine the rate of interest of such notes, determine the amount of each issue of notes, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such notes, and by whom and how such notes shall be signed or

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

countersigned, and all other particulars thereof. Such notes shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the notes in accordance with their terms.

#### V.

The Mayor and the Comptroller are authorized pursuant to C.G.S. §7-369b to make representations and agreements for the benefit of the holders of any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are necessary or appropriate to ensure the exemption from federal taxation of the interest on the bonds, notes or other obligations authorized herein, including the full faith and credit pledge of the Town to rebate to the federal government such sums as are required to be rebated to it if tax exempt obligations are issued pursuant to this resolution.

The Comptroller is hereby authorized to establish separate reserve accounts within which to deposit and hold such rebateable sums obtained from the issuance of obligations authorized herein and as are defined in H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, or such other federal legislation requiring such rebate as may be enacted, to timely rebate such sums to the United States, and to perform all acts necessary and appropriate to ensure that the interest on the obligations authorized herein remains exempt from Federal income taxation.

Nothing herein shall prohibit the advancement of expenses by the Comptroller from the general fund for the purposes authorized by this ordinance and the reimbursement of the general fund for such advancement of expenses from the proceeds received from the issuance of bonds or notes authorized by this ordinance. 422

seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mr. Edward Musso, 56 Dibble Edge Road, commented that he believed that there were things done on the Parker Farms School that he thinks they could have saved money on. He then asked how much the interest was going to be and Mr. Gessert replied, \$368,000 for openers. Mr. Devine added that the interest is reimbursable by 62%.

Mr. Rys commented that he took a walk around the back parking lot at Parker Farms School and stated that it does not look any different than the other schools, and added that the sidewalks do not look bad and asked why they were going to be dug up. Mr. Roming explained that the back parking lot is going to be used for overflow parking. Jennite is not used to repair pavement, it is more of a cosmetic coating and is used only in service areas where you are trying to prevent gas or oil from going into the pavement and destroying the pavement. When you do a school and you have a major rehab on the school, you are liable for all of the areas that you do. Mr. Rys commented that if you were to get rid of the Jennite and just put a coating on that, that should last for a few years. Mr. Roming did not agree and explained that the first crack that you get in there, you are going to get the same failure. There is no way to put a coating over that and even a contractor, who specializes in bituminous paving will say the same thing. There was no base under that pavement originally, they used the sand for a base. Mr. Rys added that he is looking to open the school to the best that we can for the students. I recognize the fact, that they use it sometimes, and I spoke to a couple of teachers and they said that they don't use the lot as a general parking lot, they use the grassy section. Mr. Roming added that they have also used painted markings, so they would have more use for it. We are only doing what the program that was set forth to us stated. If you do the back, at least you will get some partial reimbursement for it. The drive has to be completely reconstructed and we are moving the walk to the other side for the safety of the children. The children should walk away from the traffic on their way to school. The road is being kept at almost the same width, but it is being separated from the sidewalk. We are also crowning the roadway and putting curbing in there to direct the drainage into catch basins. There is no way that you can salvage a sidewalk. I received a letter from the Town Engineer on 3/3 and it was regarding our plans, which stated that is not necessary to construct the parking areas with the same cross-section. Detail C would appear to be adequate for the parking areas and actually conform to the state statute for driveways. For Detail B & C, you might consider a gravel base as an alternate to the process base. On another correspondence, the Town Engineer said we should reduce the base under the pavement to 4 inches from the 8 inches we proposed. In all of the years that I have been doing this kind of work, I have never put in a 4 inch base for a driveway or anything else, especially in Connecticut. The state standard is almost identical to ours, and if you read it, you will see it is for driveways. What is proposed, in that letter, is less than standard according to the State of Connecticut. If you are going to do it, do it right.

Mrs. Papale asked Mr. Roming if he has ever talked to Mr. Costello on a one on one basis and Mr. Roming replied that he has talked to Mr. Costello 2 or 3 times and he said he would reply to my comments, and this is the way he felt.

Mayor Dickinson commented that he spoke with Mr. Costello and asked him, what kind of savings would be involved and he thought, off of the top of his head, that it could be \$30,000. He felt that the savings would not be much and he stood by his feelings on the standards.

Mr. Roming added, that if they were going in and leaving the road pavement and we were going to try to save the base that was under there, we would come in and strip the bituminous that was under there and put in whatever additional base we needed and then put on a bituminous surface. In this case, we are lowering the whole front because we have to get the drainage away from the building. If you go out there, you can see the water is running into the building.

Mr. Gessert asked if gutters would have any impact on getting the water away from the driveway and Mr. Williams replied that it is set now so that the leaders drop to the ground and spill onto a splash box. 423

Mrs. Papale asked if the back lot was left alone if it would be a liability and Mr. Roming explained that there is always a liability, but it has increased because you have pavement that is cracked.

At this point, Mr. Roming showed the Council plans for the back area and the play area for the kids.

Mr. Gouveia commented that if they were to eliminate the back parking lot, you would save \$50,000. Obviously, if you were to eliminate it, you can't leave it the way that it is. You will have to rip it up, bring in some soil and reseed it. Mr. Roming explained that you will not save anything. It will cost you just as much because, you will have to excavate, haul it away and then you will have to bring in top soil. Top soil is \$20.00 a yard and then you have to seed it, and we would probably have to put some more drainage into it because it is blacktop now and the water runs free over it and if we put grass in there, we have to put in drainage.

Mr. Gouveia commented that he had 3 documents that are important. The first one is dated 9/18/86, where the Committee shows a comparison between the 1984 and the 1986 budgets. The 1986 budget shows \$2,206,500. but there are 5 notes added to it that are important, and at the bottom it says that these figures are based on the preliminary drawings or in some cases, no drawings at all. The Committee states that it should be noted is that depending upon what is included in the final drawings, the actual cost could be higher or lower. The other document is dated 1/5/87. This is the document with which we discussed the site work and we had the choice of both parking lots or only one. One was for \$479,000 and the other was for \$346,000 and this was at the meeting we had in the back room, and the only thing that we asked you not to do was the planting for \$10,000 and I think a consensus was taken of the Council at that meeting and everyone agreed that we should go with the higher one, which is what you were saying at that time. On 1/15/87, the Committee supplied the Council with another estimate and this was \$2,847,000 and this did not include the cost of bonding. Today, you are giving us a figure of \$2,997,000 minus the \$368,500 so, in essence, I think you have reduced the cost from \$2.8 million dollars to \$2.6 million dollars. I think the Committee has done their work.

Mr. Gessert asked to have the line items explained and Mr. Devine explained that the Architect is \$120,000, Construction Manager is \$85,000 and the amount spent for roofing was (as of 3/31) \$308,800, and these are encumbered not expended. Most of the roofing money is all under contract or job change.

Mr. Gessert asked what on-site cleanup was and Mr. Williams explained that this is the daily and weekly cleanup that is effectively not covered within the trade contractors, such as debris left behind after they do their own cleanup within the project. That cost is more geared to the end of the project when they leave the job and leave any materials behind and general cleanup of the final project. Mr. Gessert then asked how the figure of \$8,000 was arrived at and

Mr. Williams explained that it was estimated as a per week basis within a final cleanup cost as a lump sum cost, and this has been contracted for, under the reimbursable expenditures. Mr. Devine explained that this is under the Construction Management Contract for on-site expenses on a reimbursable cost basis. This is the estimate that we have at this point, to try to give you a final number. Mr. Gessert asked if anyone asked a cleaning company to give them a price on this and Mr. Devine replied no and added that if the Town Council wants them to go out to bid, the Committee will do it. He also added that \$85,000 is for the professional Construction Management service. Just as you would with a general contractor, you would pay him for his services, a percentage and then it would be his on-site expenses, which would be reimbursable on a cost basis. If

424  
you look at \$85,000 for a job of the magnitude that we are talking about, I don't think we got a bad deal. Mr. Gessert added that the graffiti removal at \$5,000 was also too high. Mr. Williams added that the graffiti removal is not intended to be used for services performed by the C. F. Wooding Company. When the project is completed, this is something that would be put out to bid and would be presented to the Committee for approval.

Mr. Gessert pointed out that the Council received some information about 3 or 4 months ago regarding the Gym floor which stated the gym floor would cost \$19,000 and a credit of \$2,800. Mr. Devine explained that it would cost \$2,800 for the tile floor to be put down, and that would be a credit from Design Distributors and to pour the gym floor it will cost \$19,500.

Mr. Devine explained that when they reduced the mill work as part of our savings, we saved approx. \$50,000 alone. We felt that the reduction that we made there, was adequate to compensate for getting the gym floor back on into the project. We netted out with probably a \$30,000 savings with the mill work alone with the reductions.

Mr. Polanski commented that he feels that they were given \$2,575,000 and if they could have saved money, he really felt that they should have stayed within that figure and if they save \$50,000 on mill work, they shouldn't go back and spend \$50,000 on something else that they feel that they wanted to put into that thing. On the first page, refurbishing metal lockers, total projected project cost \$6,251.00, then you are going to eliminate from the project, refurbishing old lockers, instead of replacing \$21,730.00. You are throwing figures at us. Mr. Devine explained that the cost of new lockers was \$21,000. and the cost of refurbishing was \$6,250. Mr. Polanski added that he does not like the figures being tossed back and forth. Mr. Devine explained that the doors, frames and related work, which are shown for \$45,130.00, we were able to reduce that to \$34,540.00. The mill work, which we show for \$107,700. we were able to reduce down to \$58,930. The projection screens, we cut out of the project. The total cost of \$200,200. of unbid items came in at approx. \$137,000 due to various cuts that we took, adjustments and rebidding and trying to get some of the work done by on-site contractors. Mr. Polanski asked what was done with that money and Mr. Devine explained that they were talking about \$2,847,000. without any expense for bonding. We are coming back to you and saying, for hard construction they are asking for \$2,629,000. From these figures, we have cut approx. \$200,000.

Mr. Gessert asked, that if it was cut by \$200,000., why the number never went down and Mr. Devine explained that the cost did go down.

Hard construction cost on this number was \$2,847,000.

Mr. Polanski asked who was supposed to be there for \$1,200. a week for on-site construction and Mr. Devine stated that it would be an employee of C. F. Wooding and he has been there every day, from 8:00 to 4:30+.

Mr. Killen commented that if someone has a recommendation, we will start with the \$34,000, and if someone wants to cut it, let's see what the reaction is from the other side of the table and we can go on through that way and see where we end up.

Mrs. Papale commented that we as the Council people, are a little bit to blame as to what has happened here. When we asked Wooding to come up with an estimated price based on a preliminary drawing, in some cases there were no drawings, I think the price that came up was because we were rushing you. We the Council, voted for Wooding to be the construction manager and we gave the O.K. to your Committee. Many of us worked with Wooding on the Police Station and I don't know what happened, but all of a sudden, everyone is so unhappy with Wooding. I think we pushed him against the wall, and it is not all of Wooding's fault that this is happening. I think if we had more time, prices would have been put in differently.

Mr. Devine added that maybe if we had an opportunity to rebid some of the critical trade-ons, we might have been able to do better on the bids. I wish we would not look at this as a mistake (what we are paying for the school). You had a building that was deteriorating away to nothing.

Mayor Dickinson commented that if you look at the price per square foot, you use 42,000 square feet, an estimate of \$1.3 million dollars, gives

you \$37.00 per square foot. That is way below what was reasonably expected. To a certain extent, it was unknown exactly what had to be done in the building and I think everyone is realizing that it has to be done from ground up. I do have to say that the initial estimates were way off. If you don't include the bonding costs, we are now at \$62.00 - \$63.00 a square foot and if you include the bonding costs, it is at \$71.00 a square foot. Both are well within range for my information as to what it should cost on reconstruction. We have 8-10 major construction projects going in this town and every dollar that goes more than what we expect, is of serious consequences. We have gone this far, so let's open the school, because the school kids are the ones that we are doing it for. The bottom line is, the project has to be completed and maybe we learned some lessons from this. Maybe we have to stay away from situations where it has to be done by a certain time, or else. 425

Mr. Gessert stated that he agreed with Mayor Dickinson's comments and added that if you look at the \$1.2 million dollar figure that we were given a year ago, this month, and then the professionals became involved and then the professionals, after 3 or 5 months, came back to us with a figure of \$2.3 million. This Council was not thrilled with \$1.2 million dollars but, if we had to spend it to correct the problem, then we were willing to spend it. I think everyone here swallowed hard when we were told the figure was \$2.3 million dollars. Then after appropriating the \$2.3 million dollars (2 or 3 weeks), we found out that some of the major bids were 50%-70% inaccurate for some of the estimates.

Mr. Gessert continued by saying that the Council is sitting there writing checks and if we don't write a check for whatever anybody wants, then we are no good. (Mr. Musso applauded)

Mr. Devine explained that the estimate of \$1.2 million was given in 1985. In all of the time that I have been Chairman of this Committee, other than the times that I spoke with Mr. Gessert, no one has ever called me and asked me what is going on and what we were trying to do and where we were at. Most of the information that has been given to this Council, is from us to you. I can only remember on 2 occasions where members of the Council, came to our meetings. The problem might have been that there was not enough communication and there was not enough participation, maybe by the governing bodies of this town. I think we can all take some blame for that, but I hope, in the future, that we have all learned something. To have a building committee without someone from town government sitting on it, I think it is a very big mistake.

Mr. Gessert agreed with the statement Mr. Devine made and added that the Police Station Committee had representation from the Council on it and the Robert Earley Committee also has representation from the Council also.

Mr. Killen pointed out that he noticed, items which have not yet been established and Mr. Devine explained that the sheetrocker has not given them a breakdown on the ventilation system or the total cost of the Handicapped Accessibility, because that has not been completed yet. All of these things, are in the process of being done, they have not been completed yet so we do not have a final cost figure on them. Any new space that we create in the building or any new facilities would be reimbursable.

Mr. Killen commented that the Council is working on the budget which will be adopted on Tuesday. We have put in dollars this year for Capital Improvements that are going to be done. Those figures were given to us and year in and year out, they come fairly close to coming forth with a figure and living within that figure. I cannot understand why this Committee can come forth and say that they that they couldn't come anywhere near with the figures. I cannot understand this.

Mr. Devine explained that the state of the construction industry today, has resulted in you paying higher prices than you would have paid for the same work. I think that we are paying that price for it.

Attorney Joseph Fasi pointed out that there are other expenditure descriptions than the one listed in the Ordinance originally. I would suggest that the Ordinance be amended to authorize the Council and the Mayor to approve the creation of additional expenditure descriptions, and I have some language for that proposal.

Mr. Gessert explained that Mr. Devine indicated earlier, that the numbers numerated here, some of those line items have already gone beyond that.

426

Attorney Fasi explained that the original Ordinance was created to appropriate a lump sum of money. It contained a mechanism within the Ordinance, so that the Council and the Mayor could do what you have done in re-appropriating the money among different items within the Ordinance. That is fine if the Ordinance says a certain amount of money, and you haven't expended that total amount, you can expend it however you want, as long as you follow the procedure in the Ordinance. The amendment that I am proposing, simply says that there may be additional descriptions of expenditures in addition to the specific ones listed.

Mrs. Bergamini read and moved the following amendment to the Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

Be it Enacted by the Town Council in Session:

I.

Ordinance No. 347 is hereby amended by increasing the appropriation therein from Two Million Five Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand (\$2,575,000) Dollars to Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars for the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School, including architect and construction management fees and construction costs, as more particularly set forth as follows:

<u>Description of Expenditure</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Architect, construction management and roofing	585,000
Window, walls and related work	400,000
Site work	315,000
Interior work and finishes	400,000
Mechanical & electrical	355,000
Debt administration	368,500
Contingency	573,500
Total Amended Appropriation	<u>2,997,000</u>

The amount set opposite each expenditure description shall be reserved for the stated purpose. Transfers from one expenditure description to another may occur only upon approval of the mayor and council. The mayor and council may approve the creation of additional expenditure descriptions, except that, such additional expenditure descriptions shall be related to the renovation for reuse of Parker Farms School and in no event shall the total of all expenditures exceed \$2,997,000.

II.

To meet said appropriation, not more than Two Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Seven Thousand (\$2,997,000) Dollars of bonds, notes or other obligations of the Town of Wallingford may be issued pursuant to Chapter XV of the Town Charter, as amended, and Section 7-369 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 347, BY INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATION FOR THE RENOVATION FOR REUSE OF PARKER FARMS SCHOOL FROM \$2,575,000 TO \$2,997,000 AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

427

III.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell the bonds, either all at one time, or from time to time, in series, at public sale, either as a separate issue or combined with other authorized but unissued bonds of the Town of Wallingford, at not less than par and accrued interest, an advertisement of which shall be published before the date of sale in The Bond Buyer or other publication or media specializing in municipal finance. They shall determine the rate of interest of such bonds, the amount of each issue of such bonds,

seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes; motion duly carried.  
(amendment)

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Bergamini, Polanski and Gessert who voted no; motion duly carried. (amended Ordinance)

A motion to adjourn was duly made, seconded and carried and the Special Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Meeting recorded by:  
Delores B. Fetta

Meeting transcribed by:  
Susan M. Baron, Council Secretary

Approved: David A. Gessert  
David A. Gessert, Chairman

5-12-87  
Date

Rosemary A. Rascati  
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

5-12-87  
Date