

A Special Meeting of the 26th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford will be held Tuesday, May 4, 2004 at 8:00 p.m. in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives in the Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, Stamford, Connecticut.

Minutes

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:23 p.m. by President David R. Martin.

INVOCATION: By Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville

“Dear Lord, we assemble here tonight thanking You for all of Your blessings. We thank You for the sunshine, the beautiful day we had before us, and we thank You for being able to come together as a body and do the will of the people of the City, and we know if we put You first, our work will be a good thing. All good things come from You, so we are asking You to instill upon us the wisdom, the knowledge, and a caring spirit toward the taxpayers of the City of Stamford. Let us all, right now, dear Lord, become one in order to do what is the best for this city, Stamford, Connecticut. We ask for Your continued blessings upon us and this Board of Representatives. We ask all of these blessings in Your wonderful, wonderful name, and we will forever give You praise. Thank you.”

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President David R. Martin.

ROLL CALL: Conducted by Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville. There were thirty-nine members present and one member excused (Rep. Kernan).

VOTING MACHING STATUS: The machine was in good working order.

CALL OF THE MEETING: President Martin read the Call of the Meeting: “I, David R. Martin, President of the 26th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, and pursuant to Section C2-10-4 of the Stamford Charter, hereby call a Special Meeting of said Board of Representatives at the following time and place:

Tuesday, May 4, 2004

8:00 p.m.
Legislative Chambers, 4th Floor
Government Center
888 Washington Boulevard
Stamford, CT 06904-2152

to consider and act upon the following:

1. Operating, Capital, E.G. Brennan Fund, Grants and Police Extra Duty Fund, Risk Management Fund, Smith House Fund and WPCA Fund Budgets for the fiscal year 2004/2005, as transmitted by the Board of Finance on April 14, 2004, pursuant to provisions of Section C8-30-7 of the Stamford Charter; and RESOLUTIONS associated therewith.”

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

Randy Skigen, Chair

Linda Cannady, Vice

Chair

President Martin announced he had received an opinion that had been provided to all representatives from Thomas Cassone, Director of Legal Affairs, stating that the WPCA Budget was properly before this Board. The Board of Finance did not vote to reject their budget, and Corporation Counsel has subsequently ruled that it is therefore approved and properly before this Board.

President Martin turned the meeting over to Mr. Skigen, Chair of the Fiscal Committee.

BUDGET PRESENTATION: Randall Skigen, Chair, Fiscal Committee

Chair Skigen reported that the Fiscal Committee met many times during March, along with April 12, 14, 19, 26 and 28. The complete list of dates and attendance at all Fiscal Committee meetings is available in the Board Office. Chair Skigen thanked the members of his Committee: Reps. Cannady, DePina, Giordano, Loglisci, Lyons, Hunter, Mirkin, DeLuca, Figueroa and Fedeli. As always, it is a lot of work, and the Committee has worked well for the last three years. Chair Skigen also thanked Ben Barnes and Peter Privitera, who were always available to answer questions. They were forthright with their information.

President Martin introduced Mr. Privitera, the Director of OPM , and noted he is present to assist with keeping track of the cuts. The tellers, Ms. Fedeli and Mr. Lyons, are available to help with the calculations.

Operating Budget: Chair Skigen stated that it is typically the Board's policy to go through the budget page-by-page. This year, the Committee, because of a variety of circumstances, felt that this was probably not the best way to proceed and instead moved for a general operating budget reduction of \$1,060,000. Chair Skigen moved this reduction; said motion was seconded. Chair Skigen stated that this is comprised of the Office of Administration, Operations, Public Safety, Health & Welfare, Legal Affairs, Government Services, Community and Cultural Activities. In addition, included in the Committee's recommendation, debt service and contingency are included. The Committee made this recommendation based on approximately a .075 cut to the operating budget, not including debt service and contingency, however, it was the recommendation of the Committee on an 8-1-1 vote to allow the administration the discretion to use cuts in debt service and/or contingency as well as those other departments listed.

Chair Skigen stated that Mr. Barnes sent a memo to him, that all members of the Board have a copy of, regarding the Fiscal Committee's recommendation. In that memo, Mr. Barnes encourages the Board not to make such a cut, but goes on to say "that said, I believe that you and your colleagues should have a clear understanding of the administration's intentions for implementing such reduction. It then identifies the areas where those reductions will be taken. It indicates operating reductions in Administration of \$10,000; Operations, \$75,000; Public Safety, Health & Welfare, \$50,000; Legal Affairs, \$10,000. Regarding pension contributions, under this budget, they propose to make pension contributions to police and fire pensions for a total of approximately \$1.9 million; the proposed reductions there are \$275,000. Mr. Barnes is proposing a debt service contribution of \$300,000 off a total of \$32,489,751; and a reduction to the contingency account, which now stands at \$750,000 of \$340,000. Mr. Barnes is not bound by this memo in a legal sense. It is the feeling of a majority of the members of this Board that his recommendations are acceptable, and that we would expect that he would follow his own recommendations as they make these reductions to the budget.

Rep. Fahan commended the Chair, the Fiscal Committee, the administration, Ben Barnes and Peter Privitera for their efforts; they should be commended. He stated that he will vote on the recommendation tonight, however, he feels that after reviewing the budget and the memorandum received today that an additional \$250,000 can be cut from the operating side of the budget. The primary responsibility of any city is the health and public safety of its citizens – fire and police protection, maintaining roads and bridges – and he believes this budget does that. However, looking at the memo from Ben Barnes today he does accept the table where he identifies the areas where we can find reductions, however, he truly believes that looking at the numbers that on the non-city agency side of the budget, the City can truthfully cut \$200,000 in his humble opinion. Rep. Fahan added that perhaps we can do better next year, and maybe we won't have to because the general economic conditions will look better. He makes these statements in light of the current situation in Stamford with the revaluation and the tax burden. He is aware that he does not have the votes, so he won't move this reduction.

Rep. Lyons stated that as a Fiscal Committee member, he feels that the Committee came to a well-rounded, bipartisan support and a unique approach to the budget this year. Although it will definitely mean fewer city services, he believes the administration and the Board of Representatives are aware of the tax increases over the past few years and that if any time calls for a lean budget, it is this year. He believes that by going to a lump sum reduction to be determined by the administration, the Board of Representatives is in no way abdicating its responsibilities but is conveying that it is serious about budget reduction while allowing the administration the flexibility in implementing these reductions.

Rep. Mirkin stated that this year the Boards of Finance and Representatives heard loud and clear the message from constituents and that was to cut spending. He said that the some members on the Fiscal Committee had concerns about potentially making cuts that could affect head counts at the City. While he understands that concern, he believes that the Board's focus should be keeping taxes at a minimum while delivering our services in an efficient and effective manner. The Fiscal Committee, in recommending this budget reduction, was not an abdication of responsibility but having a vote of confidence in the mayor, the bureau chiefs and department managers and those who manage the City on a day-to-day basis. Rep. Mirkin stated he would have liked to see a cut of \$1.4 million, and the compromise was \$1,060,000.

President Martin stated that there would be a machine vote on the Committees recommendation of a \$1,060,000 cut to the Operating Budget including the debt service and contingency portions. The motion was approved by a vote of 39-0-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 498](#)).

President Martin asked if there were any further motions on the operating side of the budget, and no one responded that there were in fact any such motions.

Board of Education Budget: Chair Skigen reported that the Fiscal Committee recommended a cut of \$250,000 to the Board of Education Budget on a 4-3-3 vote.

President Martin stated that recently it was reported that he is prohibited from voting on this budget. It extends further, in that he cannot lobby his fellow board members on this budget. However, there is a practice of some members leaving the floor, but there is nothing that requires that practice. As president of the Board, he is required by the rules to remain non-partisan, so he will not participate in debate but will remain in place as President.

Chair Skigen stated that Rep. Clear and Rep. White have left the floor.

Chair Skigen stated that the Committee, after some discussion, voted on a 4-3-3 vote to cut \$250,000 from the Board of Education budget. Chair Skigen moved this cut; said motion was seconded.

Rep. O'Neill stated that he believes that tremendous progress has been made with the reorganization of the Board of Education and it is very important that this work continue. It would not be helpful to the process to make further cuts to the Board of Education at this time. The hiring of a grant administrator is forthcoming and he believes this is not the time to make a substantial cut to the Board of Education.

Clerk of the Board Summerville stated that it is not often that she speaks on the Board of Education budget, but she feels compelled this evening to address this matter. This year is a special year in that she is so afraid, because of past practice, that if this Board cuts one dime, we are going to lose our most valuable tools – those wonderful teachers that are out there working to education our children. She stated that she feels held hostage this year because of past practice, wherein the Board of Education cuts teaching staff in response to the Board's cuts. She has sat on the Board with others, like Mr. Boccuzzi, for a long time, and they have justified all budget cuts. Recently, they have made cuts to send a message that they are so displeased with the answers received and the way the budget is administered after the budget cuts. This year, she says to the Board of Education, that they have another shot at it. She is not going to vote to cut any monies from the Board of Education because she knows that those teachers are so badly needed.

Clerk Summerville stated that the Board's record speaks for itself. She urged all of her representatives that a \$250,000 cut from this budget, which has already been so severely cut by the Board of finance, is an insult to us as representatives. Clerk Summerville stated she sympathizes with those who, along with her, are concerned about taxes. When she looks at the impact on taxpayers, it is not that significant. She stated that when you go out and talk to teachers and sit in their classrooms, what they are saying is true. The Board of Education should get the remainder of their budget and watch what happens.

Clerk Summerville said the collaboration and cooperation between the Board of Representatives and the Board of Education, especially the Education Committee, has been strong. Structurally, the Board of Education has made progress over the past year. She asked fellow representatives, on behalf of the students and teachers, to not cut any money, especially since this will not be meaningful to most taxpayers. The Board of Representatives should strive to save every teacher it can save this year, because last year teachers were in fact laid off.

Rep. Lyons stated that he proposed and supported this cut at the Committee level. Clearly the Board of Education in the City is moving in the right direction in some regards, but clearly there is not a single segment of any society in America or the world that has shown that the more money you continually throw at problems solves them. We have had numerous issues on the educational side of this budget, and each year it is increased. While he can't argue with that and while his children attend the public school system and the reduction may affect them, he is not here to vote for his children or how this budget might affect them. He is here to vote for a fiscally responsible budget. If we are going to hold the City side of the budget accountable and hold them responsible, it

is imperative that this Board hold the Board of Education side of this budget just as accountable and responsible. He does not view a \$250,000 reduction as crippling, debilitating or paralyzing. They came in with a budget that had an 8.5% increase; it is now down to 4.4% over last year; it is still above the cost of living. He is aware of their contractual obligations, just as the city has. They have other issues, in that they are hiring a grant administrator who may receive more grants. There is some tinkering up in Hartford with the ECS formula, which is really the great tragedy of Stamford education – the lack of ECS funding from Hartford. It is not the lack of funding from the City of Stamford, but the lack of funding from the State government. He can support a \$250,000 reduction, knowing that the Board of Education will find the financial resources to manage through a tight budget year and he urges his colleagues to support this reduction.

Rep. Loglisci stated that he agrees with Clerk Summerville and that the discussion should have ended with her statements. He cannot support a cut, because going by the cost of living figures with this budget, and when you really don't know how many teachers are necessary, you don't know how many students are really going to be there, you don't know how many will have to be put out of district at tremendous expense. There are so many variables that he doesn't find it comforting to just returning to the cost of living increases, three percent. There are too many unknown factors; he believes education is our number one job, and he will not support a cut.

Rep. Shapiro stated that in talking about schools, we should look at a simple equation. This cut will hurt the students and teachers far more than it will help anyone's pocketbook. He doesn't want to be pennywise and pound-foolish. We have already shown that we are fiscally responsible on the City side of the budget, and we shouldn't damage that by making a nonsensical decision here – let's reject this cut.

Rep. Zelinsky stated that the Board of Finance has cut the Board of Education budget by the largest amount in history. The President of the Board of Education, Kim Olds, has forwarded a letter to everyone on the Board requesting that no more cuts be made to this budget because it could cost some teachers their jobs and other scenarios. He understands that cutting the budget by another \$250,000, it will amount to a savings to each taxpayer of about \$6. We shouldn't risk some teachers or having insufficient supplies for our students to save \$6 per taxpayer. He stated he will not support this cut and urged his colleagues also to not support this cut.

Rep. Coppola stated that it doesn't necessarily mean that every time you cut the Board of Education, it does not have to come out of teachers and/or the children. It is not the only place the Board of Education spends money. Perhaps, they can be a little more creative, not hurt the children or the teachers or the school supplies but still find \$250,000 worth of savings. He is going to support this cut because he firmly believes that this cut does not have to affect the teachers or the children. If it does, in fact, affect the teachers or children, he will be very upset.

Rep. Boccuzzi stated that he will vote in favor of the cut. He has sat on this Board for many years, and the issue of cutting the Board of Education budget always comes down to the fact that teachers may lose jobs. He hears this over and over again, but yet you can pick up the paper, and you find the echelon on the top, who get paid \$110, \$120 or \$150,000; they never say they will get rid of anyone on the top echelon or not hire anyone on the top echelon. Rep. Boccuzzi stated he has been at affairs with teachers, and they always end up discussing the Board of Education budget, and when he hears that a teacher has to buy supplies out of his/her own pocket, he is annoyed. How much money do the taxpayers have to give the Board of Education to keep supplies in the classroom? Rep. Boccuzzi stated they should look somewhere else to make cuts, not the school teachers. \$250,000 equals two people from the top echelon. Rep. Boccuzzi stated that we are also not cutting their budget but we are cutting their increase. The budget is still above last year's and above the City's increase. He has no problem cutting \$250,000 from their budget.

Rep. DeLuca stated that it is always the teachers that we worry about having to cut, but we never hear about the administrators. In 1967, as an example, Stamford High School had 1,800 students, 1 principal and 1 assistant principal. Today, Stamford High School has about 2,100 students, 1 principal and 5 assistant principals. We used to operate with ten guidance counselors, now we are up to eleven. The middle schools used to have 2 assistant principals, and now they have 3. After reviewing his files, in 1971, he had written a letter to the editor saying that quality education is not correlated with spending. He still says that quality education is not correlated with spending. As Mr. Boccuzzi said, we are not cutting their budget; they came in with an 8.5% increase; the Board of Finance cut it down to 4.7% and the \$250,000 is peanuts, but it is something – especially in light of revaluation and increased taxes. While it is insignificant to some people, it is a significant amount to others.

Chair Skigen stated that while he respects the opinions of all the members of the Board, he cannot support this cut. The bottom line is that the Board of Finance cut \$5.7 million from the Board of Education budget, and no one has come forward from either the Board of Finance or this Board to say where these cuts can be made. Now we are asking the Board of Education to absorb another \$250,000 in cuts. In the last two years, the City has moved a lot of expenses that the City used to pay for over to the Board of Education side. He does not have a problem with those items being moved over, but when we talk about the growth in the Board of Education budget, we should recognize that those items have been moved over. This year, that total is about \$7.3 million that used to be paid by the City that is now being paid by the Board of Education. You can say that the Board of Education should not cut teachers or supplies, but when you look at a total cut of \$6 million, it is inevitable that they will have to look at those. There are a number of us who have expressed concern about the proposed privatization of custodial services at the Scofield Middle Magnet School, and we are forcing the Board of Education to take that step. The estimate from the Board of Education is that could save between \$100 and \$150,000 per year, and we are forcing them to do something that may be detrimental to the schools.

Chair Skigen added that it is not \$6 per taxpayer, but it is \$6 per household, and he believes that the cost to our children is a whole lot higher than the cost to our taxpayers. Chair Skigen urged his fellow members to reject this cut.

Rep. Browne stated he agrees with Messrs. Boccuzzi and DeLuca regarding where the cuts were made in the past. Last year, he voted in favor of the cut because he thought it was important to send a message. He sat in a lot of meetings of the Education Committee, and he feels there has been a lot of improvement in the past year. Tonight, he is not going to support a Board of Education cut, because he wants this to be a symbol of his confidence in this new leadership and the steps that they have been taking. Rep. Browne stated that he challenges them to continue this leadership, to make the right kinds of cuts and to continue finding savings in the budget and come in with a surplus again this year.

Rep. Hunter stated that his mother was a teacher. He has been hearing the same kind of argument, that inevitably teachers, pencils, books and so forth will be lost. We have no influence of any kind on how this money will be spent by the Board of Education. They can take it all out of teachers, pencils, books or whatever else they wish. To put this amount in perspective, there are about 22 schools in the City, and the total budget amounts to about \$9 million per school. The \$250,000 cut in their increase amounts to about \$11,000 per school. Rep. Hunter stated he submits they can probably save \$11,000 per school by adjusting the heating by a degree or two during the winter or summer. This is a tenth of one percent of the average school budget. Further, the Board of Finance, in last year's analysis, the current president of the Board of Education was unaware of this report until March of this year. This does not create great confidence in their ability to analyze their budget correctly. Further, as the dollars have gone up, the scores have gone down. You can take that argument to an absurd, and you can spend an infinite amount of money on the school system and have the poorest grades in the nation – he submits this is not where we want to go.

Rep. Hunter stated that the Board of Education has made great strides – the budget is a great improvement. He believes they will receive a lot more money when the new grants person comes on, and they will manage them a lot better. However, we are facing a taxpayer revolt in this City, and the Board should approve a symbolic cut on the Board of Education budget.

Rep. Fahan stated he is not going to support this cut tonight, however, we have been spending the past couple of years discussing how and where the Board of Education should cut their budget. The Board should still support the Charter Commission's recommendation and have the mayor sit on the Board of Education.

President Martin asked Rep. Fahan to make a connection between his statements regarding the Charter Commission and the budget discussion.

Rep. Fahan stated that his discussion relates to the ECS formula; the connection is that when the Board moves forward, we will have someone who is an oversight – the Mayor

– who can oversee the budget – and perhaps we won't have to have this discussion every year.

Rep. Molgano stated that since he has been on the Board, he has had the privilege of serving on the Education Committee. From the day he started, he had doubts about the fiscal ability of the Board of Education. Today, he feels that progress is being made. One reality that is facing the Board of Education is "No Child Left Behind." The more cuts we make, the harder it will be to fulfill this. He will vote no on any more budget cuts to the Board of Education budget.

Rep. Lyons stated that the way the City of Stamford is forced to finance its public school system is heading towards financial ruin for people on fixed incomes, for senior citizens and for those who cannot afford large property tax payments. We are close to where our school budget will be \$200 million on an annual basis. It is imperative, whether this motion passes or fails, that every representative join with the other elected bodies of this City's government and the Mayor's office in making sure that substantial and legitimate ECS and reimbursement changes are made at the state level. Otherwise, the City of Stamford will not be able to financially sustain an educational system that is solely funded, 95% of revenues from local tax payments.

Rep. Pavia stated that there is great wisdom in Mr. Lyons' words. Rep. Pavia stated he is a fiscal conservative, and he sees the basic problem is how we are going to fund the education of our children with the mandates coming in, the present reimbursement structure, and he wholeheartedly concurs with Mr. Lyons. Everyone of us should pick up that gauntlet and run with it. Rep. Pavia stated he also agrees with Mr. Skigen and he will be voting against the cut tonight, as he believes that the cut taken by the Board of Finance is significant. He doesn't believe that another \$250,000 will make a positive difference.

The motion failed by a machine vote of 8-28-1 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 499](#)).

Water Pollution Control Authority: Chair Skigen stated that the Committee did not vote to make any recommendations to this budget, and ultimately accepted the budget by a vote of 10-0-0.

President Martin stated that since we are only making motions on budget cuts, the budget will be accepted by the full Board unless a motion to reject is made.

E. Gaynor Brennan Golf Course: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made.

Risk Management: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made.

Police Extra Duty: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made.

Marina Fund: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made.

Smith House: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made. Chair Skigen noted that this budget only reflects the first quarter.

Grants Budget: Chair Skigen stated no recommendations to cut this budget were made.

Chair Skigen stated that this concludes the Operating Budget. President Martin stated that this means the Board has made a \$1,060,000 cut in the general operating budget. Tellers Fedeli and Lyons concurred.

Capital Budget: Chair Skigen reported that the Fiscal Committee recommended several cuts to the Capital Budget as follows:

- p. 23-Capital-Litter Baskets; \$60,000
- p. 25-Citywide roadway; \$15,000
- P. 33-Palace Theater; \$100,000

President Martin stated we would go through the Capital Budget page by page.

Chair Skigen proceeded to review the Capital Budget.

Page 17 Public Services – Highways - No recommended cuts

Page 18 Public Services – Highways - No recommended cuts

Page 19 No recommended cuts

Page 22 Fleet Management - No recommended cuts

Page 23 Solid Waste – The Committee has recommended a \$60,000 cut to downtown litter baskets.

Page 24 Engineering – No recommended cuts

Page 25 Engineering – on the Citywide Roadway Correction Line, the Committee has recommended a cut of \$15,000.

Rep. Mirkin moved to cut \$100,000 from Cove Island Bulkhead. Said motion was seconded. Rep. Mirkin stated that there is not going to be a need for a second entrance in Phase II of the project.

Rep. McDermott stated that he also supports a \$100,000 reduction. At a public hearing regarding these improvements, a lot of members of the public were opposed to any further significant changes to Cove Island. Phase I has been appropriated, and there are adequate funds to complete this project and close it out. There is also a concern about maintaining any more changes to the park.

The motion to cut \$100,000 from the Cove Island Bulkhead Replacement account was made and seconded; said motion was approved by a machine vote of 37-2-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 500](#)).

Page 26 – No recommended reductions

Page 27 – No recommended reductions

Page 28 – No recommended reductions

Rep. Lyons moved to cut \$20,000 from the School Zone Flashers account; said motion was seconded. Rep. Lyons stated there is currently \$160,000 in the account, and last year \$100,000 was appropriated. He questions whether they will be able to spend all of these funds in the next fiscal year. This will give them close to \$250,000, and he is confident those funds should be adequate. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Page 29 – No recommended reductions

Page 30 – No recommended reductions

Page 31 – No recommended reductions

Page 32 – No recommended reductions

Page 33 – The Committee recommended cutting \$100,000 to the Palace Theater Restoration line.

Rep. DeLuca moved to cut an additional \$50,000 from the Palace Theater Restoration account; said motion was seconded. Rep. DeLuca stated there was \$100,000 left over, and they have adequate funds in the account. Said motion was approved by a vote of 20-19 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 501](#)).

Page 34 – No recommended reductions

Page 35 – No recommended reductions

Rep. DeLuca moved to cut \$25,000 from the Government Center Renovation account; said motion was seconded. Rep. DeLuca stated that there is a carryover of \$458,000 from the previous year and this has not yet been spent. There should be sufficient funds in the account. Said motion was approved by a vote of 23-16-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 502](#)).

Page 36 – No recommended reductions

Page 37 – No recommended reductions

Page 38 – No recommended reductions

Page 39 – No recommended reductions

Page 40 – No recommended reductions

Page 42 – No recommended reductions

Page 43 – No recommended reductions

Page 44 – No recommended reductions

Page 45 – No recommended reductions

Page 46 – No recommended reductions

Page 48 – No recommended reductions

Page 49 – No recommended reductions
Page 51 – No recommended reductions
Page 52 – No recommended reductions
Page 53 – No recommended reductions
Page 54 – No recommended reductions
Page 55 – No recommended reductions
Page 56 – No recommended reductions
Page 57 – No recommended reductions
Page 58 – No recommended reductions
Page 59 – No recommended reductions
Page 60 – No recommended reductions
Page 61 – No recommended reductions
Page 62 – No recommended reductions

Rep. Mirkin moved to cut \$900,000 from the Westhill Expansion Account; said motion was seconded. Rep. Mirkin stated that we don't have the true cost over the next few years, and if they needed additional funding they can come back next year. He doesn't believe they need all the funding in one year for a three-year project.

Chair Skigen stated that on Pages 2 and 3 of the Mayor's Budget Transmittal, there is a new state law that requires that we demonstrate that at least the full local share of any project for which we will be seeking state reimbursement has been appropriated before the State will accept the school building grant application. Mr. Mirkin may be right that the \$17.5 million is too much, but he would rather not put at risk any state grant money.

Rep. Pia asked whether it has to be fully funded up front or if it could be fully funded over three years.

President Martin stated that this is a crazy law in that we have to give away all authority to review the specific plans before they are willing to accept a grant application. This will be put on the list for our state legislators to deal with.

Chair Skigen stated that the Mayor's transmittal, continues: "for this reason, the budget distinguishes between our annual capital spending authorization for purposes of compliance with local state debt limit and our annual capital appropriation provided for in the City's capital budget. In order to maximize state reimbursement, the capital budget includes the full amount necessary to complete each new project. However, since in practice it will typically take several years to complete each school project, the change does not require us to modify the annual state debt limit recommendation, but rather to differentiate between the capital appropriation and the intended amount of actual drawdown for each fiscal year. The capital budget includes a drawdown schedule indicating how much will be spent in which fiscal year for the projects subject to this requirement."

Chair Skigen stated that for the Westhill project, the 04-05 drawdown is \$750,000, in 05-06, a little over \$3 million, 06-07 is \$6 million and 07-08 is \$7.7 million.

Rep. DeLuca asked that in response to the Mayor's and Mr. Skigen's comments, how did the Board of Finance reduce it by \$500,000 and we can't reduce it at all?

Chair Skigen stated that in his review the Board of Finance did not cut any funds from this account. There was a cut by the Planning Board, but the Mayor included the full request.

Rep. Lyons stated that just recently the Mayor was thoughtful and smart enough to go to Hartford to try and get \$10 million based on the increased costs of steel and construction costs related to Rippowam. He is certain that in three years, \$900,000 is going to come back, because he is convinced this project will increase in costs, not decrease in costs. When this project goes forward, a larger request will be needed.

Rep. Loglisci stated that he feels that it would still be 100% financed in the out years, even with the \$900,000 cut; the State can't say we didn't include enough funds even with the cut.

Said motion (i.e., a \$900,000 cut) was approved by a machine vote of 21-18-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 503](#)).

Page 63 – No recommended reductions
Page 64 – No recommended reductions
Page 65 – No recommended reductions
Page 66 – No recommended reductions
Page 69 – No recommended reductions
Page 70 – No recommended reductions
Page 71 – No recommended reductions
Page 72 – No recommended reductions
Page 73 – No recommended reductions
Page 74 – No recommended reductions
Page 75 – No recommended reductions

Chair Skigen read the resolution adopting the Operating Budget in the amount of \$172,828,689; said motion was seconded and approved by a machine vote of 34-5-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 504](#)).

Chair Skigen read the resolution adopting the Board of Education budget in the amount of \$185,265,181; said motion was seconded and approved by a machine vote of 36-0-3 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 505](#)).

Chair Skigen read the resolution adopting the Capital Budget in the amount of \$97,503,952; said motion was seconded and approved by a machine vote of 39-0-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 506](#)).

Chair Skigen read the resolution adopting the Special Funds Budgets as follows:
\$1,088,510.00 – E. Gaynor Brennan Fund; \$11,734,722.00 – Grants, Police Extra Duty

and Marinas Operating Fund; \$10,177,137.00 – Risk Management Fund; \$2,886,638.00 – Smith House Fund; \$11,607,404.00 – WPCA Fund. Chair Skigen noted that the Smith House budget only reflects three months of expenditures. Said motion was seconded and approved by a machine vote of 38-0-0 (See [RCS Vote Record No. 507](#)).

COMMUNICATIONS

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous voice vote at 11:07 p.m.