

Board of Finance  
Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, October 19, 2016  
Town Hall Auditorium

Present: Chairman Ronald Fedor, John W, Sheehan, Norman Glidden,  
Elizabeth Sabilia

Absent: Anthony Jessuck Jr., Cheryl Larder, James Reid

Elected: Daniel M. Steward, First Selectman

RTM: Thomas Dembek, Moderator (7:29 p.m.)

Staff: Maryanna Stevens, Director of Finance  
Gail Miller, Secretary

RECEIVED FOR RECORD  
WATERBURY, CT  
16 OCT 20 AM 8:34  
ATTEST: *Ronald L. Cooper*  
TOWN CLERK

1. Establishment of a quorum and call to order  
A quorum was established and the Regular Meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Public Comment – There were no comments from the public.

3. Approval and acceptance of minutes:  
Regular Meeting on September 14, 2016

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2016 Regular Meeting as presented.

**Vote: Unanimous Motion Passed.**

4. Approval and acceptance of minutes:  
Special Meeting on September 27, 2016

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2016 Special Meeting as presented.

**Vote: Unanimous Motion Passed.**

5. Review and approval of Budget Guidelines for FY 2017/18

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to approve the FY2017/18 Budget Guidelines as presented with a budget due date of December 16, 2016.

**VOTE: Unanimous Motion Passed.**

6. Review and approval of Budget Review Schedule for FY 2017/18

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to approve the FY2017/18 Budget Review Schedule as presented.

**VOTE: Unanimous**                      **Motion Passed.**

7. Review and approval of 2017 Board of Finance Regular Meeting Schedule

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to approve the 2017 Board of Finance Regular Meeting Schedule as presented.

**VOTE: Unanimous**                      **Motion Passed.**

8. Old Business

- a) Informational Presentation of the Municipal Complex Project

Consider and act upon the removal of this item from Old Business as an updated presentation was completed at the Special Meeting held on September 27, 2016.

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to remove the above item from Old Business as the updated presentation was completed at the Special Meeting held on September 27, 2016.

**VOTE: Unanimous**                      **Motion Passed.**

9. New Business

Mr. Sheehan inquired about the Cohanzie Property Redevelopment. Mr. Steward advised there is a new offer pending for 60-80 units. A zoning change is needed by November 8, 2016 in order to move forward. There will be a public hearing for the residents in the area to voice any concerns.

Mr. Glidden inquired if Recreation & Parks had complied with the employee vs. contractor requirements. Mr. Steward and Ms. Stevens advised; they are in compliance.

Mr. Glidden also inquired about the Youth Service building windows and doors. Mr. Glidden noted it was difficult to open and close the new windows. Mr. Steward will go to Youth Services to check into it.

**10. Liaison Reports**

Ms. Larder submitted a written report on the Municipal Complex Building Committee, see attached.

Mr. Jessuck submitted a written report on the Long Range Fiscal Planning Committee, see attached.

Ms. Sabilia reported on the Board of Education, see attached.

**11. Correspondence**

a) 9/21/16 Letter from Roz Rubinstein, Library Director Re: FY17 Budget Shortfall

b) 9/30/16 Email Re: WHS Ineligible Costs

c) 09/13/16 Status of General Fund Unassigned Balance – Town Accountant

d) 09/12/16 Periodic Financial Statements (08/31/16) - Town Accountant

e) 10/03/16 Public Health & Wellness Nursing Report FY2016 from VNA

f) Board of Education Regular Meeting Agenda for 09/22/16

**12. Adjournment**

**Motion** by Mr. Sheehan and **seconded** by Ms. Sabilia to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Board of Finance at 7:30 p.m.

**Vote: Unanimous**

**Motion Passed.**

Respectfully submitted,



Gail R. Miller, Secretary

The Board is aware of the Municipal Complex Building Committee's (MCBC) continued efforts to keep the architect for the project on task to produce the documents necessary to bring the project to Town boards for possible approval.

As was explained at the special meeting on September 27th, the Committee had just received (on September 20<sup>th</sup>) 126 pages of plans and over 1700 pages of specifications placed in a drop box by the architect that only staff had access to. It was represented to the Committee by the architect that these plans were 90%, and in some instances 100% complete and in a condition for us to obtain Board approvals for the project. As was also explained at our meeting, because of the effort it required to get us to that point, the Committee felt strongly that we should obtain a third-party independent review of the plans and specifications to support a decision to move forward with the project with the documents as provided. Also because the RTM only meets every two months, the Committee thought it prudent to obtain the funds for this review now in the hope that it could occur before the end of the year. The RTM approved the funding for a third party review on October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

The MCBC met on October 4th with the intent of reviewing a draft RFP to seek the third party review. Kate Rotella was with us and provided the Committee with a basic template to work from and guidance for moving forward.

Our October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting was the first opportunity the Committee had the full set of plans and specifications printed and laid out on the table before us. With the assistance of committee members Ray Valentini and Bruce Kruszewski, who work with these types of documents on a regular basis, the Committee determined that the documents we had received were, in fact, not to a level of completion where it would be prudent to proceed with the third party review with the documents provided.

The Committee reviewed the plans and specifications in some detail and prepared a list of examples of specific items that were clearly agreed upon yet not included in the plans and specifications provided by the architect. The Committee, through its chair, again sought the assistance of Attorney Avena to reach out to the architect regarding what the committee saw as deficiencies in the documents provided. A special meeting was scheduled for October 12th, a Wednesday, when the architect could attend, to address the Committee's concerns with the architect. Attorney Avena was to confirm the architect's attendance at the meeting.

The Committee met with the architect on October 12th and addressed the deficiencies in the plans and specifications. The Committee specifically addressed the concern expressed by more than one individual on the BOF/BOS/RTM regarding the newly adopted building codes. It was represented to us that any changes to the code would not have a significant impact on our plans and that many up the updates relate to builds of a different size, configuration or use. (For example multi story buildings with elevators.)

The architect represented that he would respond to Attorney Avena by Friday, October 14th to confirm that he could produce a complete set of plans and specifications with any outstanding updates for our next meeting.

The next MCBC meeting is on Oct 26th to review what is produced by the architect, to review and reach an agreement on the language for an RFP for the third party review and to proceed to obtain one.

Jim Reed had some questions regarding the project after the joint BOS/BOF special meeting on September 27th and he attended the MCBC meeting on October 4th. Maryanna was present at both the October 4th and 12<sup>th</sup> meetings. Either of them may be able to offer insight into any other questions you may have in my absence.

Thank you.

Cheryl Larder  
MCBC Liaison  
10/14/16

**From:** Jessuck Jr, Anthony  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2016 3:38 PM  
**To:** [ronald\\_r\\_fedor@sbcglobal.net](mailto:ronald_r_fedor@sbcglobal.net)  
**Subject:** LRFP Report

Ron,

As you know the long range fiscal planning committee met last night. There was representation from the RTM, BOF and the BOE as well as the First Selectman and the Finance Director. There was a lot of discussion on rising taxes and how we can as a town do a better job of saving the taxpayer money. There was agreement that 80% of the budgets are contractual and as a result it's difficult to achieve savings. There was talk of cutting services as a way of savings and also consolidation of jobs as a cost saving measure. These were just comments and nothing else. The other item that was discussed at length was the budget guideline put forth by the BOF. There was also discussion as to whether or not this committee should put forth a number for the departments to adhere to when preparing budgets. The committee determined that according to the charter the LRFP committee is not required to do so. There was also talk that the BOF has a formula to determine what if any percentage increase should be made when preparing budgets. The finance director commented that the BOF does not put forth a formula regarding budget preparations.

The first selectman commented that the department heads understand that there is always a zero percentage increase to adhere to when preparing the budgets. Further if departments need additional funding then there is a process to show that there is a need. The LRFP committee determined that since they are not legally bound to put forth a number they will not do so. Per the first selectman the budget guidelines are understood by the department heads.

*Anthony W. Jessuck, Jr.  
Associate Vice President  
Financial Advisor  
Wells Fargo Advisors  
860.572.7011  
800.677.7011  
860.572.7079 (fax)  
[anthony.jessuckjr@wellsfargoadvisors.com](mailto:anthony.jessuckjr@wellsfargoadvisors.com)*

**Gail Miller**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Sabilia [beth@sabilialaw.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2016 7:34 PM  
**To:** Gail Miller  
**Subject:** Information for Liaison Report  
**Attachments:** TFS and Magnet summary sheet for E Sabilia 081516.pdf

Gail,  
Here is the information I relied upon in my report about the BOE. The information in blue is from the Superintendent (also see the attached) to me in response to some questions. Thanks, Beth

Since we spoke in August, the state has rolled back the cuts on magnet transportation so we are not losing the \$102,000 in magnet transportation which is great news. We continue to be told there is 6.5% cut to the magnet school per pupil grant which at this point LEARN tells us they will eat and not pass on to us. Only time will tell on that one.

--



**Elizabeth A. Sabilia, Esq.**  
Sabilia Law Firm, LLC  
P.O. Box 774, Waterford, CT 06385  
Tel: 860-444-0144 x 112 |  
Fax: (860) 201-1112 |  
Mobile: 860-444-0144 x 212  
[beth@sabilialaw.com](mailto:beth@sabilialaw.com) |  
[www.sabilialaw.com](http://www.sabilialaw.com)

Contact me:  [beth@sabilialaw.com](mailto:beth@sabilialaw.com)

*This Electronic Mail (e-mail) contains confidential and privileged information intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is sent. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or telephone.*

The Friendship School and Magnet Funding Summary  
August 15, 2016

The Friendship School

- The BOE voted on June 23 to terminate the agreement as a participating district for July 1, 2017.
- Waterford will be a full participating district for the 2016-2017 school year.
- The Governing Board of the school will likely be reconstituted during the course of the year.
- Building:
  - o Built with 100% state funds.
  - o If the building remains a school, there are no repercussions.
  - o If the building remains for public use but not a school, with special exemption from the state, there are no repercussions.
  - o If the building is closed entirely and is not used as a school or for public use, repercussion include paying what remains on the 20-year amortization schedule and the building reverts back to the state.

Magnet Funding Issues for 2016-2017 School Year

- Statewide Magnet funding is cut by \$18M.
- According to LEARN, the \$7900 per pupil funding that goes directly to RESC to offset the cost of educating a student has been cut by nearly 7%.
- The state magnet school transportation grant that goes to local school districts for reimbursement for transporting students to magnet schools has been eliminated for the 2016-2017 school year. This is a loss to Waterford Public Schools of approximately \$102,000.