

MINUTES

WATERTOWN TOWN COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

WATERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL
LECTURE ROOM
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2010, 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Elaine Adams
Richard DiFederico
Katherine Duplissie
Richard Fusco
Linda Masayda
Raymond Primini, Chairman
Paul Rinaldi
Mary Ann Rosa, Vice Chairman
Thomas Winn

ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Lisa Carew, Recreation Director
Remo Ceniccola, Facilities Manager, Board of Education
Karen Clancy, Business Manager, Board of Education
Chuck Frigon, Town Manager
Frank Nardelli, Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director
Harry Ward, Parks Director
John Woermer, Chairman, Parks and Recreation Commission
Audio Technician

OTHERS ABSENT: None

1. Call Meeting To Order

Mr. Primini, Chairman, Called the Regular Meeting to Order at 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Ms. LaForme, Board Clerk, executed the Roll Call.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Primini, Chairman, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Public Participation

Richard Wick, 1051 Northfield Road, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. Wick: I am disappointed that the suggestion I made at the last Town Council meeting was ignored. That suggestion was to refrain from wasting any of the taxpayer's money on unnecessary legal costs. You went ahead anyway and asked for a legal opinion about the issue of minority representation. So you wasted some of our money.

I'm not going to go into everything I could question in the letter you received from our Town Attorney. I'm only going to comment on the totally incorrect premise stated in the first paragraph. I quote: "Specifically, the question presented is whether the Independent Party, by virtue of its having won three seats on the Town Council in the 2009 municipal election is entitled to any special status or special treatment with regard to minority appointment to Town Boards and Commissions." Special status? Special treatment? Who asked for anything special? You didn't ask the right question. The right question is how the Town Council should handle the process of minority appointments. That's not a legal issue. I told you that two weeks ago. The statute focuses on preventing abuse by a majority party. It does not address the issue of how to deal with multiple minorities.

The Independent Party does not expect anything special. But the Independent Party does expect a proper recognition of the status we received from the voters which should translate into proper treatment by the majority on the Council.

If you are worried about special status or special treatment, I think you have already done it. You have already given a special status to the Democratic Party because none of their candidates are present at the head table.

Bob O'Donnell, 241 Straits Turnpike, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. O'Donnell: I'm the head of the Senior Golf League at Crestbrook. I want to say I'm very disappointed that the Parks and Recreation Commission has chosen to increase the price of a season pass by more than 40% for a senior citizen or college students of Watertown to bail them out of their fiscal troubles at Crestbrook Park. The Commission seems to be of the opinion that if they raise their price of the season passes the same number of people will buy these passes in 2010 and they will make "x" amount of dollars more than they did last year, but what they can't seem to grasp is that they're going to put the cost out of range for a lot of these people, especially the seniors and a number of passes will drop as they did when they made the big price jump in 2006. I almost get the feeling they would like to discontinue season passes altogether.

In 2009 Crestbrook Park was making money (inaudible) month of May which kind of tells me that their prices from last year were doing their job. It wasn't until the rains came that they had to close the front 9 or the whole course due to poor conditions that the financial problems began. Numerous times when the course did reopen it was limited to cart paths only and many of the seniors and people with walking problems were unable to play and all of these things were responsible for the poor financial year the course suffered. If we suffer from that same (inaudible) conditions again in 2010, no amount of increase will help the course. As requested in the letter to the Parks and Recreation Commission that they take an average of the last 3 years and that 3 year intake before considering an increase in the cost to the public but as far as I can see they just used last year's results to come up with the increase. And one thing that I wanted to mention while I was here too, the way the commission presents the daily greens fees, it looks like, if you look at the fee it looks like the price is going down, when in fact all of the prices go up. 9 hole, \$3.00 more than what the price on the request goes and the 18 holes is \$4.00 more. They claim this is a surcharge, the same as the ones they charge for the senior pass. To me it doesn't make any sense doing this, you're going to charge \$19.00 for 18 holes, say \$19.00, don't say \$16.00 when the price that's going up on the board is going to be \$19.00. Thank you.

Gary Lafferty, 214 Belden Street, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. Lafferty: I did some research on appointments to boards and commissions. The records are on the Town's web site since 2002:

- And it shows like on February 4, 2002, there was an action item to be considered.
- In February 3, 2003 there was an action item there too on Page 20, they made some appointments.
- It was mentioned again in December, 2003 to start the terms of various boards and commissions are expiring and to start (inaudible) unless we fill them immediately.
- On January, 2004 the same statement, only one appointment was filled.
- On January 20th another action item, that's when they filled quite a few spots, Pages 16 and 17.
- February 2nd pages 6 they did a few more.
- And then it was brought up again in December of 2004.
- January 3, 2004 there was an action item there too, nothing was done.
- January 18, 2005 consider appointments to boards and commissions, only one appointment was made then.
- February 7, 2005 there was like Pages 6 through 13 with all the appointments.
- Then on December 19, 2005 page 13 item 9, same thing, just mention about consider appointments.
- January 3, 2006 no action.
- January 17, 2006 no action.
- February 6, 2006 it says consider appointments.
- February 21, 2006 pages 21 through 28 that's when they made all the appointments for that.
- December 2006 they said the same thing, consider appointments.

Watertown Town Council

Regular Meeting

February 1, 2010

Page 4

- December 18, 2006 is when they made the appointments there, on pages 14 through 21.
- January 2, 2007 no action.
- December 3, 2007 one appointment was made.
- December 17th, statement about consider appointments to boards and commission, there was none.
- January 17, 2008 under new business, consider board and commission appointments, pages 12 through 18 were all the appointments.
- January 22, 2008 consider a few more appointments.
- February 4, 2008 pages 6 through 10 were the rest of the appointments made.
- December, 2008, page 7, none.
- December 15, none.
- January 2009 was cancelled.
- January 20, 2009 some appointments were made through pages 11 through 14.
- And December 7, 2009 no mention.
- December 21st under new business, all of the appointments were made from pages (inaudible) appointments.

It just seems like there is no set standard when the appointments are made or whatever so it could be a thing where let everybody know and be on the same page so they know what's going on. I think if appointments were made in January or February like usual, then all of the parties would have had their list in and it would have been done more in a normal fashion and there would be a little less animosity against everybody. That's all I have.

Ken Dubauskas, 71 Westview Drive, Oakville, CT 06779

Mr. Dubauskas: I'm here to voice my opinion regarding the proposed rate structure for play at Crestbrook Golf Course. I've been playing at the course since it was acquired by the Town. I've been a member of the Crestbrook Retiree's Golf League since 1996, serving as President for 3 years and I'm currently a member of the Executive Board. Our membership, all retirees number 90 to 100 per year. Our league affords a retiree an opportunity to have some fun playing golf and socializing each week during the season which is about 25 weeks and also providing a large amount of income to the course. I've attended the Parks and Recreation Commission meetings and I'm aware that the rate structure for the 2010 golf season has been proposed and presented to the Council for approval. In viewing the proposed rate structure I find that the rate for resident seniors, the season pass is proposed for an increase of \$190.00. We are on fixed incomes. This proposed increase represents the largest increase in 14 years. This increase does not include a surcharge for each round of golf played by the season pass holder which is \$3.00 for 9 holes and \$4.00 for 18 holes. In the past a major increase for the 2006 golf season caused a loss of 25 members from our league and also income to the course. The data to support this increase is suspect. Using only the previous year's rounds of golf played, which contained, in June and July and August, some of the worst weather of all times including snow in October, quoting statements made by the staff, if the weather had been just average last season we would have done very well.

I'm not against increases. Supplies to maintain the course have gone up, but an increase of \$190.00 for a senior season pass is excessive. We have a very good course here in Watertown, plaudits to the course superintendent, Harry Ward and his staff for the ongoing maintenance of the course. We have to aggressively market the course, advertise, offer specials on days the course has slow periods. Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion.

Nancy Rahuba, 99 Old Farms Road, Watertown, CT 06795

Ms. Rahuba: I, too, am disappointed that you got a legal opinion on what is really a moral issue, a legal opinion on whether you can find a legal way to cheat the voters out of the representation they elected and expected to get in terms of minority representation on boards and commissions from the Independent Party. It looks like you did it to ease your conscience. The issue is a moral one, it's very simple, do you owe your loyalty to the voters who elected you, or do you owe your loyalty to the Democrats? That's the question. Thank you.

Denis O'Sullivan, 238 North Street, Watertown, CT 06779

Mr. O'Sullivan: I, too, am very frustrated by your decision to not include the Independent Party in your (inaudible) of boards and commissions. So I guess I have to then bring to your attention, since I can't talk with anybody on a board or commission, two issues that I am aware of. One issue has to do with the gymnasium at the High School. I was told by somebody, and I don't know if it's true or not, so I'm asking you if you know anything about it or if you could find out and get back to me, is there air conditioning planned for the gymnasium at the High School as part of, or as a change order to the work that is ongoing? I'd also like to know if it is a change order, what is the cost, capital cost, and finally what is the cost to run air conditioning annually if that's the case?

The second issue, much broader, has to do with the article I read in the newspaper with reference to Heminway Park School being, building it as a new town hall. Apparently there is a group that had made that determination. A number of years ago, perhaps it was 10, I was asked to sit on a blue ribbon committee with a number of other citizens and we were set up with 3 rules. We were appointed by a Democratic Council and we were asked to come back and report on the best solution for a town hall. And this group of citizens, we met on a weekly basis and we visited sites, we inspected documents that we had, and we came back with a 1 page recommendation, but the whole thing was set up in such a way that (a) we did not have a chairman, we were assigned a person that acted as a moderator, so we didn't have a spokesman for us, and then we were told, also one of the rules was that we were not able to look at any existing school buildings, and the third item was it was suggested that we try and choose a central location, midway through the central populous areas of both Oakville and Watertown. We came up with a recommendation in a form of a single page letter and just when we developed that letter of our recommendation, I think it was after about 8 or 9 months, we were asked to attend a meeting.

Watertown Town Council

Regular Meeting

February 1, 2010

Page 6

What happened at that time was the Democrats, there was an election, the Democrats were no longer in a majority, the Republicans took over and we were asked to sit up on stage and give a report. We didn't have a moderator so all of us were sitting there wondering how this would carry on, how would we give a report, we merely read the letter, I think I was the one who read the letter. No, that was it, thank you very much, goodbye. We recommended the site that was used for the John Trumbull School. We felt the site was large enough for both a town hall and a school and that was incorporated in our letter. I heard nothing back, and a couple of other people on the committee heard nothing back. We spent 8 months and it was a tragedy that all that energy was filed away. I had a 3 ring binder. Subsequently I think, somebody, it may have been you, Chuck, but it may have been your predecessor asked me for a copy of that because some questions came up such as would a new town hall incorporate a Police Department. Would it incorporate the Board of Education? Would we have Sewer and Water in there? It went on and on and we addressed all of those issues as I recall in that report. What a frustration.

Now I see on the agenda we're signing up, by the way, as far as town halls are concerned, and many of you may know of others, I was just writing them down as I was preparing some thoughts as I came over here, for a town hall we had a large expense to design and then we had a vote which was rejected, campus style, remember that one where we were going to take the old town hall, the medical complex, the condominium medical complex in between and we were going to take the town hall annex, put them altogether and connect them with covered walkways and that was put forth and it was rejected by the town. There was also a vote I believe on the large blue commercial building that is towards the backside of the post office, that was also proposed as a town hall. I don't recall if there was a vote, it may have been, but it was rejected. Then we had Depot Square Mall, I don't believe that was a vote, I think the owners of that property offered it to the Town and the Town said no. Very recently, less than a year ago, we were going to have somebody do a full design on Heminway Park School to see what it would cost, but we were going to pay for a full design, multiple dollars, and there was a public hearing on it, I don't recall whether there was a vote, but that concept was set aside.

I'm asking some basic questions here. Who decided on Heminway Park School as being our next Town Hall? Where is this group that came forward? Who is it? Can somebody put up their hand? Anybody? Well with that in mind why don't you ask the people, us, that are the taxpayers if we want Heminway Park School. I think it has a number of inherent flaws. Where are you going to park cars if you go there? I think you ought to set up a group of people that are independent, and I don't mean the Independent Party, just independent folks that are capable of looking at this and ask them to do a study and see if they can come up with an appropriate place. I remember the Police Department, I was reading some information recently and the Police Department, which is approximately a 20 acre site, centrally located on French Street, somebody said well why don't we put it there. I don't know what it would cost, but you've got to do something other than assigning it as you have on today's agenda to the Public Buildings Committee. And let me close by saying don't call me.

Jacqueline Wheelahan, Buckingham Street, Watertown, CT 06795

Ms. Wheelahan: I was reading in the paper today about the renovation of the Town Hall and how there was \$10,000 collected, and according to the paper it was given back to the Town. Now has that gone into the General Fund or is that money going to be put aside so that when they do have another drive it will be included?

Ms. Wheelahan: That money is in a special fund, it is not part of the General Fund, there is a special fund set aside for that, the money is still there.

Mark Werenko, Platt Road, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. Werenko: Ray, at the last Town Meeting, I felt as though when we left there on the subject of appointments to boards it was open, we still have an open mind, is there still an open mind on that?

Mr. Primini: Sure.

Mr. Werenko: I feel better about tonight then. Another subject, my friend Denis was up there and I felt like he was directing some of this at you, about the, what I refer to as the old Watertown High and I read in the paper, a quote from you which may or may not have been accurate, they might misquote from time to time, unintentionally, that all ideas are open, we are open to all ideas. You are open to more ideas?

Mr. Primini: About what?

Mr. Werenko: About whether it be the Heminway School as a Town Hall or other ideas?

Mr. Primini: Sure.

Mr. Werenko: I think that's fine, I think maybe Denis didn't realize that. That's all, thank you.

David Minnich, 319 Thomaston Road, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. Minnich: Last Friday morning the Planning and Zoning Commission was informed by the Connecticut Supreme Court that they denied certification to the Concerned Citizens for the Preservation of Watertown's lawsuit, so that effectively ends that lawsuit. As you recall that was about their request for a zone change to maximize the size of buildings in town to no bigger to 50,000 square feet and also to challenge the votes or the participation of the votes of two of the members. The cost to the Town for the first two phases of the lawsuit, which was the Superior Court and the Appellate Court was \$37,600. We have yet to receive the cost for the Supreme Court petition for non-certification. It was an 11 page brief and that will be added to that, as well as the cost of our Town Attorney for legal advice on the issue of the ethics complaint that was brought against these individuals.

The issue here is obviously what has been perceived as no to anything to develop business in our community. I am, and others are totally convinced, that in order for us as a community to move forward and to expand the tax base, which we need to do, is through business development. It is a sad state of our economy and as people have told us, it's probably not likely to be expanded in the area of manufacturing any time in the future. Therefore the only other kind, well one of the other kinds of business is actually retail. I have heard a number of times and in fact the whole purpose in 1989 as stated for the C.C.P.W. is their opposition to the Route 262 development, but having heard that and having heard it repeated several times as to the reason for this whole initiative, I remind you of this particular lawsuit and of the initiative that was presented by C.C.P.W. It was not just about Route 262, it was a Town wide proposal to not have the buildings larger than 50,000 square feet, so when folks say it's just about Route 262, I remind you that the facts are here in this case that it's whatever they choose it to be at the time and I think that's a sad state of affairs here in Town, and it needs, obviously it's been addressed many times and it needs to be further addressed and we certainly will look forward to working with the Town Council as the Planning and Zoning Commission as well as the Economic Development Commission and we have some other initiatives that we will begin.

I also wanted to inform you that as of this coming Friday a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission has been ordered by the Court of Appeals to attend a hearing in Waterbury regarding a lawsuit that was initiated regarding the Route 262 regulations and one of our members, I will attend as well as our attorney, the purpose of which is not the hearing of this on the matter but rather the court would like to attempt to talk about a settlement for that and that's the purpose of the meeting.

Once again it's this anti-development initiatives that seem to be prevailing in town and we need to move forward and get beyond the issues that we seem to be having with the (inaudible). I have totaled up the costs of both what we have here for the \$37,000 as well as other issues that have been occurring in the past couple of years and it is getting very close to \$90,000 of expense that this community has had to defend, all of which,, except for one issue, all of which are defensive costs, none of which are proactive costs, they are defensive costs. The one exception to that is the small amount of money that was spent on the ordinance change that was part of the (inaudible) process so that's what's happening on the legal front here at Planning and Zoning, but it's a sad state that we continue to not move forward in the community as we should be doing with business development.

Mr. Rinaldi: Dave, you said when you began Planning and Zoning won the case in Superior Court against C.C.P.W. Wasn't it in fact that you didn't win the case, and that the fact is that C.C.P.W. wasn't given standing (inaudible) big difference.

Mr. Minnich: No, there is, in order to bring a lawsuit in any (Tape #1, Side A ended – may have missed some) court, there are two issues you must prove to the court. One is that you do have an aggrieved, a standing in court to be there, and secondly on the merits of the issue that you present, and in both the Superior, the Appellate, as well as the Supreme Court, which denied certification, there was no standing and so what the claim from C.C.P.W. was denied.

Mr. Rinaldi: But there was never a trial, there was never a court hearing, other than standings?

Mr. Minnich: There were two hearings, one in Superior Court and one in Appellate Court.

Mr. Rinaldi: If they had no standing how could they have a hearing?

Mr. Minnich: That was what the hearing was about. When you go to court, as I mentioned, you first have to prove standing, that you have an agreement, and then you go to the merits of the case. In both of those they never approved that they have standing and have agreement in court, and therefore the claim that they had is effectively denied.

Bodhan Wasiutynski, 514 Sylvan Lake Road, Oakville, CT 06779

Mr. Wasiutynski: There is one very simple (inaudible). When Mr. Minnich became Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission, very little by way of legal costs. And with Mr. Minnich's amazing ability to infuriate people that makes people want to go to court, it's not just the concerned citizens, there are any number of private citizens who wanted to develop this or that and it was denied with no real reason, (inaudible). There will no doubt be more people going to court because you cannot get a fair hearing in front of Planning and Zoning as long as Mr. Minnich is in charge. He's in charge. He isn't just Chairman, he is running the whole show all by himself. And whatever costs the Town incurs are Mr. Minnich's costs, just keep that in mind. Thank you.

Gary Martin, 271 Bella Vista Drive, Watertown, CT 07795

Mr. Martin: What was just stated by this gentleman here is completely false. If he thinks that he can stand here and tell you that Dave Minnich runs the entire Planning and Zoning Commission then he's false. He has no clue what he's talking about. If you want to look at what happens in this community look at the group that's causing all these lawsuits. It's the same group all the way through, so for him to stand here and make like it's anybody else but him and his group that's causing this he's wrong and he's lying to you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Primini, Chairman, Closed Public Participation at 8:08 p.m.

5. Minutes

A. Regular Meeting – January 19, 2010

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes dated January 19, 2010 as presented.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Special Town Meeting – January 19, 2010

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. DiFederico) I make a motion to Approve the Special Town Meeting Minutes dated January 19, 2010 as presented.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Chairman's Report

A. Correspondence

1. Letter from the Independent Party, Watertown-Oakville Town Committee, Re: Appointments, dated January 21, 2010.

None

7. Subcommittee Reports

A. Finance Subcommittee

Mr. Fusco: We are having a meeting on February 9, 2009 to discuss and possible action the review of the town's communications needs.

8. Town Manager's Report

None

9. New Business

A. Consider Appointments to Boards and Commissions

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I move the appointment of Edward Undercuffler, Hamilton Avenue, Watertown, to the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency, Term to Expire January, 2011.

Discussion; None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I move the appointment of Kevin Killeen, 430 Northfield Road, Watertown, to the Board of Tax Assessment Appeals, Replacing David Dalton.

Discussion; None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Consider the Approval of Crestbrook Park Golf Course Fees for 2010

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion that we approve the list of fees presented by the Parks and Recreation Commission for the Crestbrook Park Golf Course Fees, with a change in the specials, and the specials to be offered Monday through Friday.

Discussion: **Ms. Adams:** Are they going to do a presentation? I was looking through the different rates and the proposed fee schedule and I see some things in here that I do like, and I see some things that I think are really, I don't think, I think you're on the right path with trying to increase business by lowering the non-resident rates. I think that's the right way to go because the one way we can have, build the course back up is of course is to bring in more golfers. I have no issues with any of those rates there. However, on the same token too, I think it's unfair to really clobber the residents, especially the resident seniors 40%. It seems to me that in this day and age, in this economy, the only way you're going to get people to come in is going to be by lowering the prices. You've got to give them a deal, you've got to give them a sale, something to bring the people in who haven't done it before or the ones that left. I'm hearing more and more people got very angry back in 2006 when they just, hey you know what, I can go to Western Hills, I can go to East Mountain, I can go wherever. Again, I have no issues with the rest of the fees or MaryAnn's, I think that's the Richie DiFederico special with the hot dog and going (inaudible). But I really think in order to really have Crestbrook successful, I would like to put in the form of a motion is:

MOTION: (Ms. Adams, sec. Ms. Masayda) that we amend the motion to keep everything the same except to keep the resident's season tickets the same as 2008/2009.

Discussion: **Ms. Adams:** Don't forget last year was a very rainy, rainy year.

Mr. Woermer: We spent a lot of time and we took a lot of your advice last year, and it rained, it's New England, and this happened the year before and it's always something. I'm just curious, do you have anything to backup what you're proposing like how much you think by not raising the rates, if we don't change the resident rates how many more residents will we get to come in?

Ms. Adams: I think what we're seeing here, this is what we've always done. If we find we're a little short on cash, we raise the rates, we raise the rates. That's not working. We have people who are leaving and going somewhere else.

Mr. Woermer: Do you know where they are going?

Ms. Adams: Is it 100% certain, no, but I hear tonight, I hear the amount of people who do have these season rates, and we sat here last year, John, and we were very, very concerned about what was going to happen. We had a year last year, who could predict we would have all that rain? That was unheard of and you've got the people who have been golfing since we've had the course have told you it has never happened before. I don't think it's right to go after the ones who have supported this course for years and years and years and try to get the money out of them, but I do think you are on the right track by lowering the out of towners rates to bring them in. The other thing I wish I saw here too is some money for advertising cause I think they're absolutely right when they say we do not advertise the course. And Councils and commissions have been very, very hesitant to put money forward as far as advertising but again, if you want to get these golfers in here, they're going to have to know about Crestbrook, put some deals out there to get them in when the golf course is not busy. What we've done over time, we've raised the rates, it's not working anymore. We have to try something else. Crestbrook is the jewel in Watertown's crown and I don't want to see it fail.

Mr. Woermer: I appreciate your opinion but we heard from 2 golfers, correct?

Ms. Adams: 2 that came to speak tonight, yes.

Mr. Woermer: Well you mentioned 2.

Ms. Adams: 2 that came to speak tonight (inaudible).

Mr. Woermer: (Inaudible) senior league that they didn't mention that their league is 50% residents, 50% non-residents. All right? They also have golfers that pay, that have the season passes, and a number of their members that pay as they play, they don't buy the season pass, they just pay when they go to golf. So half of their membership pays the out of town fees, but they can't possibly pay a discounted rate.

Ms. Adams: You're looking to increase it 40% for the residents.

Mr. Woermer: But every year we were reluctant to raise the rates on residents, so every year we got squeezed, not letting it raise, not letting it raise, not letting it raise and then saying oh, look how much you want to raise it. I find it difficult to accept that seniors can pay, if they live out of town, pay \$800 and think it's fine, but they can't possibly afford \$600 if they live in Watertown.

Ms. Adams: That's what you recommended, was the \$800.

Mr. Woermer: And it was \$810 last year.

Ms. Adams: \$830.

Mr. Woermer: So I look at it and say the panic like we can't possibly charge these. Someone has to pay. We've been losing money and I know we're getting (inaudible) cause it's probably not the fairest statement to be accurate couple of things we had a budget that you approved last year without depreciation, \$732,000. We were only allowed to spend, because we did not get the fees, \$625,000.

Ms. Adams: You didn't get the income from the golfers?

Mr. Woermer: Right, so we didn't get the income, so the budget got cut over \$100,000 and we took the surcharge money, which is roughly another \$100,000 that was supposed to be set aside for capital improvements and used that to cover expenses and still we're over \$100,000 short.

Ms. Duplissie: When you did all of this, did you talk to other golf clubs in the area, such as Fairview out in Harwinton, because they have the exact same rates as we do and they made money this past year, so all I'm saying to you is I'm not sure I agree with the increases, I think it's going to be a band aid and not a fix, cause it's a beautiful course, it really is, but I just think this is not a fix, we're not going to make money here, we're going to lose people.

Mr. Woermer: I feel for you, I mean trust me, we don't want to raise rates, but we need to. We've come here last year and the year before saying we undercharged for season passes and resident pay. The reason there was that big spread, if anyone remembers, when golf as a whole nationwide was booming, the course was booming and you had to wait in line at 4:00 a.m. to book tee times, we put the spread in basically trying to push non-residents away so that residents could have better access to the course. We did a really good job. Now nationwide play is down, so it's not Crestbrook Park, we can say look at Western Hills, look at East Mountain, they are all in the same boat, so we just need to recognize that there are less golfers, a smaller pie. We do have a great course and to say it's a jewel, it's awesome, but we can't possibly charge for it doesn't make sense to me and we'd like to keep it that way.

So for the last couple of years, at least 2 if not 3, I can't remember the third year, how much we took out of the, the capital improvement fund we've taken away so we've had no capital improvements. We believe to have a healthy course we need \$730,000. You agree we only get \$625,000, then the 2009/2010 budget again you're \$738,000 for our budget saying that we needed that to have a healthy course. We are behind on that pace \$50,000.

Unfortunately, and that's why there is always a lot of confusion with our numbers, our season is 180 degrees off for our new fiscal year so as of, we looked with Chuck, we got the information on I, historically over the last 5 years when we see our income, our revenue, you know what percentage comes in each month, so based on the first 6 months of the year what percentage of our income we should have, that we see against budget we're behind \$50,000 already so we're going to open our season to start \$50,000 behind budget and I think it's crazy, I'm sorry, I don't mean to say crazy, but when people say you did a crappy job of advertising

Ms. Adams: No, I never said a crazy job of advertising, I said we've been hesitant to put any dollars towards advertising Crestbrook outside of town. I never said crazy.

Mr. Woermer: Thank you, you're right.

Ms. Duplissie: Is Crestbrook on the golf website where they have, where you go for golfing in the State of Connecticut? Crestbrook is listed some place?

Mr. Ward: Crestbrook is on various web sites.

Mr. Rinaldi: First of all you guys have done an excellent job over the years, I was close to a lot of people on Park and Rec and I know you worked hard and it's a tough job. My fear us this, we have to deal at some point with reality and it seems to me that last year we raised our rates and membership went down, golfers went down.

Mr. Woermer: That's not correct.

Mr. Rinaldi: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Woermer: No. Season passes were even and so were actual rounds, round for rounds was equal.

Mr. Rinaldi: Okay, so there was no increase last year?

Mr. Woermer: No.

Ms. Adams: \$10.00 the year before.

Mr. Rinaldi: Even with no increase, you lost a lot of golfers. How do I know? They called me up screaming at me that's how I know.

Mr. Woermer: We didn't lose golfers. We have exactly the same number of rounds played an we had the same number of

Mr. Rinaldi: I'm just saying the people I knew stopped golfing plus I'm sure new people came in, maybe it's a wash, but if we raise the rates, I've got a feeling that a lot of people may stop golfing there. I have to believe golfing is down somewhat, I mean Tiger Woods didn't help the sport, I'm just saying I don't know, I heard some of the comments here tonight about advertising whatever, whatever, but I don't want to put a real burden on the taxpayers and the retired people, I'm one of them so I kind of understand the situation.

Mr. Woermer: Trust me, I understand that part of it, but I still don't understand this burden that people say that they can't, we look at the season pass, and it's just a financial decision. You don't have to buy a season pass. It doesn't mean if you can't afford a season pass that you don't golf. It just means you might decide to pay as you play and you might golf less if you truly are really that strapped for money. I mean I can understand that scenario but to say that I can't ever golf again because the season pass is higher, you don't have to buy a season pass. It's not like you have to buy one, it's not a membership, you don't have to buy your membership or you can't play, it's just that if you want to golf a lot, it's a discount, it's something off the normal rates.

Mr. Fusco: I know you did a lot of work on this because we attended some of your meetings and I commend you for it and I think you have a better handle on it than what we have here. My question is Elaine had said if we charge this amount people will go to another golf course. Now did you do the research to see how cheap they are or if they are a lot cheaper than us, will they go there?

Mr. Woermer: I mean there are a lot of reasons why people go to one golf course or another, it's not always price and the fact of the matter is, as a rule no, because a resident, if you're a resident in Watertown, it means you are a non-resident in another town, so you're paying a non-resident price there, so purely financially as a rule we would be less expensive.

Mr. Fusco: Thank you.

Ms. Rosa: I supported Crestbrook and the club since the Town purchased it and I think it's one of the few and greatest assets that we have. But I know how much time Park and Rec spent studying these rates, I went to their meetings and sat and listened to them and I reviewed everything, and I have to tell you that I serve as the liaison to the Board of Education from the Town Council and Ray Primini and I went to the Board of Education meeting to listen to their budget presentation and we're going to be asking them to do without a lot. They've already indicated the number of staff cuts and other things that they are going to have to cut in order to meet just the number they're going to present to us, never mind if we cut it any further. I would have a very difficult time approving anything that didn't have the potential to make the Crestbrook Park pay for itself. Anything that has the potential to put us in the hole and make us pay money I couldn't support, we can't afford it this year, we can't afford one additional expense that we don't know we're going to have. I talked to a lot of golfers since this started and during the discussion about this I started to find out how they felt about it and they were all very honest. They don't want to see the rates increase, but they're also very honest seniors, and I'm a senior, say well I only pay \$4.50 or \$5.50 a round of golf, so they play a lot, I can afford to pay a little more. And again, if they can't, it's a recreation, it's not a necessity in life and we're really down to necessities, folks, with this budget. People don't want to believe that, but we've turned off street lights, and we're cutting education programs, we can't afford to have recreational programs that are going to cost us a lot more money. We have to break even. And if that means increasing \$100 for people then I think we need to do it.

Mr. Primini: I ask this question every year, it will be the 9th year I'm going to ask this question, but how do we stand compared to the other public golf courses?

Mr. Ward: We're right in the ballpark with everybody else. Every year I put together a comparison of all of the area golf courses that are comparable, some aren't, some are a little better like the one you mentioned, actually is a little higher priced than us, they have a lot of tournaments there, they are set up that way, it's a brand new facility. There is another place in Oxford that's a brand new facility and they charge \$80.00 per round, per person to our \$32.00 so you can't really compare that course to our course, it's totally different. The maintenance is different, the way it's set up is different than (inaudible) the restaurant is different, it's very hard to compare. What you really need to look at is what John (inaudible) is our operating expense, what it cost, figure out what it costs per round, do the math, and divide it out and make it work, that's basically what John did, by doing the math. So to answer your question, yea, I make this comparison every year, it's given to the Park and Rec Commission, they compare it to all the other course rates in the area and we're right in the ballpark with everybody else.

Mr. Primini: You say you try to stay within that 50% range, in that ballpark?

Mr. Ward: It's \$1.00, maybe \$2.00 more, or \$1.00 or \$3.00 less than some.

Mr. Primini: The other thing I'd like to elaborate on (inaudible) compared to the two Waterbury courses, although they were less per round, I understand the City picked up quite a bit of money?

Mr. Ward: The City of Waterbury and Naugatuck with Hop Brook, they run their courses not as an enterprise fund, I believe where we have to be self sufficient, and make all the money for our operating expenses, they run it under the general fund of the city and are subsidized every year. I think the City of Waterbury was close to \$186,000 subsidized by taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Primini: For each course, right?

Mr. Ward: I don't remember, I think it was \$182,000 for one and then I think the other one was like \$63,000 and then I know Naugatuck is somewhere around \$40,000 (inaudible) subsidized. So Crestbrook is still paying for itself, still. We may not be paying on time, but every expense we incur we have to pay back, just so you understand how that works. Frank can explain it much better than me.

Ms. Duplissie: The money that we approve for this every year, is this for just the golf course? It's not for the pool and

Ms. Rosa: It's for everything.

Ms. Duplissie: So we're not just talking the golf course here, we're talking the pool, the tennis courts, the whole thing?

Mr. Ward: The Crestbrook Operating Budget takes care of the golf course, all of the buildings on the property, the swimming pool, the tennis courts, the lake management for (inaudible) the list goes on forever, roads, bridges, stands, everything.

Mr. Woermer: And it does get the income from Cavallo's.

Mr. Ward: Yea, we do charge rent to Cavallo's.

Mr. Woermer: We have a letter requesting, asking just so you know, asking to remove some of the pool expenses from Crestbrook Fund into Park and Rec, we're asking you if we can account for it and handle it similar to the other swimming areas in town where the lifeguards and all that are provided through the Recreation budget and not through the Parks budget or in this case Crestbrook's budget.

Ms. Duplissie: That would certainly help you, right, that would?

Mr. Woermer: That would help so that is something we asked for last year and we're asking for again this year.

Mr. DiFederico: Well when I hear the golfers, I always said I think the pool should be right out of it myself. But I agree if you could do that this year that would be great. You did do very well on this, I was surprised this year on this and I even did my math up, but the special is good, it's about right for Crestbrook and I will tell you that. The membership for Hop Brook, believe it or not, is \$500 and that's only a 9 hole course and for probably non-residents it will be \$800 up there at Hop Brook. I'm saying yes on this tonight with hopefully you take the \$32.00 and make it Monday through Friday as it is in the motion and I think that will suffice. I figured the math out. If you were a senior and you said 50% were out of towners?

Mr. Woermer: In the senior league that the two gentlemen represented when they spoke, 50% of their membership, give or take 1 or 2 members, are out of town residents, so there are non-residents and residents that make up their league . . .

Mr. DiFederico: They play 9 holes or 18?

Ms. Carew: 9 holes.

Mr. DiFederico: Just 9 holes. Well it would come out pretty good. So I guess it's a pretty good price for non-residents to play 9 holes up there.

Ms. Adams: Harry, you talked about Waterbury and how they subsidized their golf course last year, and they do not have an enterprise fund, it's run through their general fund. I think it's important to mention too that for many years that the City made a ton of money off of those golf courses. Now it's come to pay the piper now, but for many years Waterbury was getting a lot from those golf courses, the City.

Mr. Primini: Can you restate your amended motion?

Ms. Adams: That we keep, the original motion was but to have the resident season tickets to remain the same as 2008/2009.

Mr. Primini: Is that the only exception?

Ms. Adams: Yea, just (inaudible) to keep them the same as 2008/2009 but the rest would remain as recommended.

Mr. Primini: To make this clear, we are voting on the amended motion, to amend the motion.

Ms. Adams: We are voting on the amendment.

In Favor: Ms. Adams, Ms. Duplissie, Ms. Masayda, Mr. Rinaldi

Opposed: Mr. DiFederico, Mr. Fusco, Mr. Primini, Ms. Rosa, Mr. Winn

Abstained: None

MOTION FAILED (4-5-0)

Mr. Primini: Can you restate the original motion?

Ms. Rosa: The original motion was to accept the rates as presented by the Park and Rec Commission with the specials to be Monday through Friday.

In Favor: Mr. DiFederico, Ms. Duplissie, Mr. Fusco, Mr. Primini, Ms. Rosa, Mr. Winn

Opposed: Ms. Adams, Ms. Masayda, Mr. Rinaldi

Abstained: None

MOTION CARRIED (6-3-0)

(Tape #1, Side B ended – may have missed some.)

C. Consider Bid Waivers in Connection with the School Building Projects as follows:

1. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Student Workstations through Virco under the U.S. Communities Purchase Contract in an amount not to exceed \$8,813.04 for Watertown High School.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Student Workstations through Virco under the U.S. Communities Purchase Contract in an amount not to exceed \$8,813.04 for Watertown High School.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Chairs through OFI under the U.S. Communities Purchasing Contract in an amount not to exceed \$4,736.34 for Watertown High School.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Winn) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Chairs through OFI under the U.S. Communities Purchasing Contract in an amount not to exceed \$4,736.34 for Watertown High School.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Filing Cabinets, Bookcases, Storage Cabinets, and Office Furniture through BKM under the State of Connecticut Furniture Contract for an amount not to exceed \$8,753.75 for Watertown High School.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Winn) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Filing Cabinets, Bookcases, Storage Cabinets, and Office Furniture through BKM under the State of Connecticut Furniture Contract for an amount not to exceed \$8,753.75 for Watertown High School.

Discussion: **Ms. Adams:** I can remember when we met way back there at the back of the school, the dumpster full of filing cabinets, are we going to be reusing anything that was here at the High School, or is everything going to be brand new?

Mr. Ceniccola: There is a percentage of furniture that's being reused in the project. At the end of the project we'll evaluate if there are any additional monies available to replace those items.

Ms. Adams: So we are now currently, we are reusing some of the old stuff, but come the end of the project the decision will be made whether or not to buy new and get rid of the old or keep it?

Mr. Ceniccola: Yes.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

4. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Lecterns and Coat Hooks to be purchased through BKM under the State of Connecticut Furniture Contract for an amount not to exceed \$2,896.60 for Watertown High School.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Winn) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Lecterns and Coat Hooks to be purchased through BKM under the State of Connecticut Furniture Contract for an amount not to exceed \$2,896.60 for Watertown High School.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

5. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Smart Boards to be purchased through Connecticut Business Systems under the LEARN Purchasing Contract for an amount not to exceed \$11,752.00 for the Judson Elementary School.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Winn) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Smart Boards to be purchased through Connecticut Business Systems under the LEARN Purchasing Contract for an amount not to exceed \$11,752.00 for the Judson Elementary School.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

6. A Bid Waiver for the purchase of Portable Smart Boards to be purchased through Connecticut Business Systems under the LEARN Purchasing Contract for an amount not to exceed \$3,618.00.

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Winn) I move to approve a Bid Waiver for the purchase of Portable Smart Boards to be purchased through Connecticut Business Systems under the LEARN Purchasing Contract for an amount not to exceed \$3,618.00.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Consider Charging the Public Buildings Committee with the Replacement/Repair of the Town Hall Roof

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I move to charge the Public Buildings Committee with developing a plan of action with respect to the repair/replacement of the Town Hall Roof to include a proposed design and associated cost.

Discussion: **Ms. Duplissie:** Do one of these Public Buildings people, because there is a significant problem at the Town Hall, is there some kind of an emergency plan of action that we're going to ask them to do this in a timely fashion, in a quick fashion?

Unidentified Voice: Certainly.

Mr. Primini: We have members of the Public Buildings Committee here too, if you guys want to come up to the podium.

Ms. Adams: So we're looking for like a timeframe, within 30 days?

Ms. Duplissie: Because I mean it is a potential safety hazard, is it not?

Mr. Frigon: Potential, and what you are doing here is asking the Public Buildings Committee for their expertise in evaluating it and determining whether, what urgency there is and to what extent possible that we repair the facility or the roof.

Mr. Rinaldi: I've been aware of this problem for a lot of years, I've been around for a lot of years. I know it's a historic building. As a matter of fact I was even on a committee to repair the roof, raising money, funds. I just have a couple of concerns and I think at the time the committee was formed I think they knew the concerns also. I think step one is yes, put the roof on, that's the first thing. If you're going to put slate to keep it in its original condition it was like \$1,500,000, but I think the greater issue once that roof is done, there are a lot of structural concerns throughout that building. We had a few engineering firms come in and look, they took some bricks out of the top to see if they could evaluate the wooden structure underneath the bricks, again I think for historic value of the building it should be repaired or fixed in some way, however my concern here is timing. I mean if we're going to put \$1,500,000 into the old town hall and possibly a lot more work after that, and now we're looking at Heminway Park School, how do we justify the dollars? What I mean is how do you justify the dollars you're going to put into the old town hall and then turn around and ask the taxpayers to approve several million to renovate Heminway Park School? It's a concern, something I think we really have to look at in a hard way.

Mr. Primini: That's why we want to charge the Public Buildings Committee with that, what kind of roof do we put on, put the slate, can we put another type roof on?

Mr. Rinaldi: Well it's on the Historic District and I'm aware of it, I used to be on that too, they would only approve a slate roof, they didn't want anything else.

Ms. Adams: Right (inaudible) I remember that.

Ms. Rosa: I agree with everything you said, Paul, with regards to concerns and our knowledge with regard to the fact that there are other things besides the roof that need attention. I don't know how many people are aware that in the last week or two it's become a really serious situation because the water is now running down into various offices where it was not before. And it's not just clean water that's running in, it's water that's running through the mouse droppings upstairs and the bird droppings and all of that coming down through the ceiling onto someone's desk. You're talking health hazards, you're talking safety of the ceiling collapsing, you're talking a lot of things and you can't let it go any longer. It's become a safety issue as well as a health hazard and we've got to do something immediately, that's why we're charging Public Buildings so quickly with looking at it and asking them to come back hopefully really quickly with a solution for safety.

It may not be a slate roof. I do believe if we look at the regulations under the Historic District there is a line that allows for action due to safety, and given that I think that's the situation we're in, and none of us want to be there, and none of us want to spend the money or do it differently but. . .

Mr. Rinaldi: I think the concern was if we're going to

Ms. Rosa: Bend one way and then look at any way, I understand that.

Mr. Rinaldi: No, what I'm saying is if from what I understood in the paper, and I tend to agree, if we're going to restore it, if we're going to do this thing, there has to be some semblance of its original . . .

Ms. Rosa: I don't think anybody is talking about restoring right now. I think we're talking about safety mechanisms to cover that roof, to stop further deterioration.

Mr. Rinaldi: Well even the other two options were substantially less.

Ms. Adams: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Rinaldi: Correct, but it's still going to be I think very expensive numbers, of course Public Buildings Committee can take a look at it, but eventually I would assume this would have to go out to referendum, correct?

Mr. Primini: Yes.

Ms. Rosa: Yes, so we'll get all the answers them, but now we need to charge them and get them working on it quickly.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

E. Consider Charging the Public Buildings Committee with the Conversion of Heminway School to Town Offices

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion that we also charge the Public Buildings Committee with the conversion of Heminway School to Town Offices.

Discussion: **Ms. Rosa:** I really want to address this right away given in light of some of the comments or concerns that I heard this evening. I don't think anybody stood up and said Heminway Park is the Town Hall. What we're looking at is another empty school come July 1 or sometime in August, whenever the school department turns it over to us. And while that building sits empty we're paying \$85,000 or \$90,000 over at Depot Square Mall to rent office space. Common sense would say to you use the building you own, move in there at whatever minimal costs you can to something that you already own, heat, and insure, and move out of a place where you are paying rent. So in my mind this is a way to save some money. We would also be able to move the Town Hall Annex offices into Heminway, we would save all the money we spend at the Annex and conceivably sell that building, so it's an economical step to me. It's not trying to overstep any study group that's ever been done. I've served on probably 3 over the years. I served on one when I was a Democrat and I served on 2 since I've been a Republican. I mean it doesn't matter what party you belong to or how long you've been here, it's been under study for a very long time and the conclusions are all the same, we need a town hall and all we've been doing is debating where. Well while we continue that debate we need to move into a facility and save some money and that's what, in my mind, this recommendation begins our actions to do.

Mr. Rinaldi: I know in the past yes, there was even engineering work, the only question I have at this point, have they turned the school over to us?

Mr. Primini: No, not yet but we met with Karen Baldwin about a month ago and she assured us that

Mr. Rinaldi: In the 20 years I've been here I've heard that a lot.

Mr. Primini: Yea, but they are going to be turning the school over to us

Mr. Rinaldi: I just want to make sure we have the building (inaudible).

Mr. Primini: What we are looking at is can we go over there, whatever like this and everybody would like to see a new town hall, but with our bond debt right now

Mr. Rinaldi: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Primini: Yea, I mean that's another thing, I don't really see the Town possibly affording a new town hall for probably 20 years and we're looking to see what can we do in house, what do we have to contract out, probably the mechanicals we'll have to contract out, whatever like this but our Public Works Department they may decide they want to help out with this. We're trying to do as much as we can in-house. I remember 8 years ago when the rents over at Depot Square were \$65,000, now they're \$85,000 so with my experience with rents they do nothing but go up. The Siemon Company has been very generous with us over the past years, last year they kept the rent the same price; I don't see that even happening if we stay there this year, but I believe when we first moved Park and Rec there about 15 years ago it was supposed to be temporary. I mean we're trying to see what we can do to keep the costs. That's not saying down the road we're not going to build a new town hall but I'd hate to see another vacant school. We have 2 schools that were vacant (inaudible).

Mr. Rinaldi: I'd like to see some hard numbers.

Mr. Primini: That's what we are looking for.

Mr. Rinaldi: And I want to see the disposition of, including what we pay for rent at Depot Square, I'd like to see that all accounted for, school costs less what we're selling and what we're doing. Obviously you're going to need some public hearings. What you're saying is you just want to get started.

Mr. Primini: Right.

Mr. Rinaldi: And you're going to guarantee me as a Councilman that we're going to have that school?

Mr. Primini: Yes.

Ms. Rosa: The School Department does not have Heminway Park in their budget for heat and upkeep and all that next year, so I would say that's a pretty good indication that they are giving it to us.

Ms. Adams: I can remember not that long ago that the Board of Education did turn Heminway Park School over to the Council and then I don't know, maybe 9 months later said, can we have it back for a couple of years, so just a little bit of history there too, wonder why people are saying . . .

Mr. Primini: I know with Karen, like I said, she's, they want to get out of there as soon as they can, they don't want to keep the heating budget in their budget. If we stay over at Depot Square, we're going to be assuming the heating costs over there at the same time.

Mr. Rinaldi: When we give this to the Public Buildings Committee, are they going to take all of the things you talked about into consideration?

Mr. Primini: Yes.

Mr. Rinaldi: I'm talking about costs, are they going to put a total package together that we can look at?

Robert Porter, Chairman, Public Buildings Committee

Mr. Porter: It would be our attempt to do that, yes. There are a lot of questions that need to be answered.

Ms. Duplissie: I know we're spending a lot of money on rent over at Depot Square and all that but we also have to take into consideration that Heminway Park School is an older building and it has an older structure and it has how many decades of lead paint perhaps, and the cost to remove that

Ms. Adams: (Inaudible) actually I think the tiles are asbestos, the floor tiles.

Ms. Duplissie: So there are a lot of costs involved. I'd like to see those costs, also see what the difference of costs of, I'd like to get out of Depot Square and move into so everyone is in one place, that would be wonderful, that would be just great, but I'd like to see those costs please.

Mr. Primini: One thing we're looking for too is to try and get everyone under one roof, that's been a goal for probably 40 or 50 years, but to at least get everybody out of Depot Square and the Annex at the same time because the wiring costs, they're going to start working on that, there will be much more costs (inaudible) Annex people out of there too, so and it would help.

I know right now it drives me crazy when I go over to Depot Square. You go to Zoning and the Building Inspector, and then to go to Public Works you have to come out of the building to go upstairs, then across the street for Economic Development. So if a business is interested in coming to town, they go to the Town Manager, Economic Development, everybody is right there under one, (inaudible) then down the road get the people out of the current town hall. That group has to stay together because they share a vault together so what we're hoping to do with the Public Works help, get all of these people into one section of the building and (inaudible) and then we don't have to keep moving them around.

Ms. Adams: One of my questions was, so we are not looking at this time to do anything with Town Hall, the vault, as far as moving out of Heminway or is that all part of what they're looking at?

Mr. Primini: That would be (inaudible) like that.

Ms. Adams: Okay, so that is not on the table now as far as taking care of Town Hall, the Tax Collector, and the Assessor and the Town Clerk.

Mr. Primini: It will be coming down the road, but that's what they are going to be, the Public Buildings Committee is going to be charged with.

Ms. Rosa: The Town Manager can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe, but do our leases not expire at the end of this year?

Mr. Frigon: Yes they do, at the end of November, December 1st.

Ms. Rosa: So either we renew the leases or we work really hard from the time the building is turned over to us to get our town offices in there and save that money.

Mr. Rinaldi: Just some information. On one of the proposals, I don't remember which one, but they came in here with a proposed design and stuff and the vaults were included in that design.

Ms. Rosa: There are a lot of studies and designs out there.

Mr. Primini: Hopefully (inaudible) going to be used in all these (inaudible). I agree with you, hopefully they're going to be using all of that stuff instead of reinventing the wheel.

Ms. Adams: I think that if you take out the Town Hall out of this, I think they do have to consider this because otherwise you've got to look at the best possible places to put the vault, what's going to be the least expensive way to do it. You can't just say just Depot, Public Buildings, over Depot over to Heminway. You can't do that. If this is what the Council wants to do and the people agree to spend the money you have to look at the whole picture. Okay you know what, this is where we need all of our vaults, this is the best way to do it, so I think they do have to consider maybe not necessarily moving those people at this time even though we are under court order for 50 or 60 years now on those vaults, but they really have to look at that as part of the whole picture where those would go. You don't want to relocate Park and Rec over here saying this is great and then say wait a minute, we have to move all of that out and move this down here because we need this here.

Ms. Rosa: (Inaudible.)

Ms. Adams: No, Ray said they weren't considering it.

Ms. Rosa: You're right, Elaine, it has to have an architect to plan this out (inaudible).

Ms. Adams: It needs to be laid out, yes.

Mr. Primini: One of the ideas, when these people, (inaudible) go over that's the section they're going to say, they're not going to be knocked around.

Ms. Adams: Right, but they first need to decide where everybody else would go.

Mr. Primini: That's what they are going to be doing.

Ms. Adams: Okay, I thought you said no.

Mr. Primini: I mean currently we talked about this, in the past the vault is what, 75 square feet, and I know they've been cited by the State for at least 20 years now.

Ms. Adams: No, no, no, try 50 years.

Mr. Primini: 50 years, and what they are required, I believe, is like 1,200, and I always tell people 1,200 square feet is about the size of an average ranch house, 75 square feet is about the size of a bathroom in that ranch house, so I mean that gives you a perspective of what they should have and what they do have right now. Any other discussion?

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Primini: Congratulations, Public Buildings, you have more work cut out for you. You guys have been doing a fantastic job in the past and we're looking forward to working with you.

- F. Consider an Appropriation in the amount of \$2,185 from the General Fund for the refund of the balance of fees for a Third Party Review to Watertown Woods, LLC. Funds deposited into the General Fund for the review, the appropriation is to return the balance to the developer

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion to authorize an appropriation in the amount of \$2,185 from the General Fund for the refund of the balance of fees for a third party review to Watertown Woods, LLC. Funds were deposited into the General Fund for the review, and the appropriation is to return the balance to the developer.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- G. Consider an Appropriation in the amount of \$2,855.57 from the General Fund for the Installation of Phone Jacks and Headsets Fire Company No. One. Funds will be refunded through a Homeland Security Grant

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I move to authorize an appropriation in the amount of \$2,855.57 from the General Fund for the installation of phone jacks and headsets for Fire Company No. One. Funds will be refunded through a Homeland Security Grant.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- H. Consider an Appropriation in the amount of \$5,000 from the General Fund for the Emergency Management Director Stipend. Funds to be reimbursed by a Homeland Security Grant

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion to authorize an appropriation in the amount of \$5,000 from the General Fund for the Emergency Management Director Stipend. Funds to be reimbursed by a Homeland Security Grant.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- I. Consider a Bid Waiver for emergency water main Repairs on Morro onto Davis Street for services performed by Birm I Construction Company, LLC for an amount not to exceed \$5,952.28

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. Fusco) I make a motion to approve a bid waiver for emergency water main repairs on Morro onto Davis Street for services performed by Birm I Construction Company, LLC for an amount not to exceed \$5,952.28.

Discussion: **Mr. Fusco:** This money comes out of the Sewer Fund?

Mr. Frigon: The Water Fund.

Mr. Fusco: Okay so that's just money we are moving and we'll just get it back?

Mr. Frigon: No.

Mr. Fusco: It just comes directly out of there?

Mr. Frigon: Yea, it stays in the (inaudible).

Mr. Fusco: I didn't see it in the motion, that's why I'm asking.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Public Participation

Gary Lafferty, 214 Belden Street, Watertown, CT 06795

Mr. Lafferty: I was just listening to what you were saying about the old Town Hall. I was wondering how many employees do we have working out of there right now, departments?

Mr. Frigon: 9.

Mr. Lafferty: I was thinking maybe (inaudible) the Board of Education and the Town could look into any empty classrooms or spare rooms in other town buildings, being concerned about the health and safety of all of the employees, taxpayers, and business customers that go in and out of there all day long. I can see talking about the dirty water coming through the ceiling, who is not to say that tomorrow you're going to go in there and the whole ceiling is going to come down. I think it's best we look into that before we have any more lawsuits or whatever.

Al Mickel, 95 Woodbine Avenue, Oakville, CT 06779

Mr. Mickel: I got a couple of articles from the paper I'd like to share with you. This one is from Torrington, it says manufacturing is thriving, just in case anybody wanted to know about that. The other one is more good news, the Sunday paper had an article about group buys land for plant in Watertown, the wood to energy plant which is good news. The other good news is I guess we have some award winning snow plow drivers and I thought that was pretty (inaudible) they can come down my street any time they want.

But on the other side of the coin I read at least part of the lawyer's opinion he gave you and the one part that stood out in my mind is this paragraph where it says "The obvious purpose of (§9-167a) (which is what he quotes heavily in this opinion), is to prevent a situation wherein a simple majority of voters of one party can elect all of its candidates, leaving a substantial minority of voters without an effective voice in government." That's a quote of a court case back in 1969. And (inaudible) that's exactly what you people have done. You have effectively, substantially left us without a voice in government.

Mr. Primini, Chairman, Closed Public Participation at 9:03 p.m.

11. Executive Session

- A. Bibbiana Testa versus Town of Watertown
- B. Discuss the Acquisition of Property along the Steele Brook greenway
- C. Anthony Piland, Sr. versus Town of Watertown

MOTION: (Ms. Rosa, sec. Mr. DiFederico) I make a motion to move into Executive Session at 9:04 p.m. with the 9 members of the Town Council present, the Town Manager, and Assistant Town Manager to discuss the following:

- A. Bibbiana Testa versus Town of Watertown
- B. Discuss the Acquisition of Property along the Steele Brook greenway
- C. Anthony Piland, Sr. versus Town of Watertown

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Watertown Town Council
Regular Meeting
February 1, 2010
Page 35

Present During Executive Session:

Elaine Adams
Richard DiFederico
Katherine Duplissie
Richard Fusco
Linda Masayda
Raymond Primini
Maryann Rosa
Paul Rinaldi
Tom Winn

Charles Frigon
Frank Nardelli

Mr. Primini, Chairman, Reconvened the Regular Meeting at 9:25 p.m.

No Motions Were Made; No Votes Were Taken.

12. Adjournment

MOTION: (Mr. Winn, sec. Mr. DiFederico) to Adjourn the Regular Meeting at 9:26 p.m.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Regular Meeting Adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond F. Primini, Chairman
Watertown Town Council

Approved: _____
Lynn M. LaForme, Clerk