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TOWN OF GREENWICH
BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND TAXATION BUDGET COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Cone Meeting Room
Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Committee:
Present: Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman; William R. Finger, Jeffrey S. Ramer, Leslie L. Tarkington
Board: Robert Brady, Sean Goldrick, Randall Huffman, Michael Mason, Arthur Norton
Selectmen: Peter Tesei, First Selectman; Drew Marzullo
Staff: Peter Mynarski, Comptroller; Roland Gieger, Budget Director; Caroline Baisley, Director; Deborah Flynn, Business Office Manager, Health Department; John Wayne Fox, Town Attorney; Fernando de Arango, Assistant Town Attorney; Benjamin Branyan, Managing Director of Operations, Board of Education; Robert Kick, Assistant Fire Chief; Amy Siebert, Commissioner; Alan Monelli, Superintendent, Building Construction and Maintenance, Public Works Department
Other: Joseph Ross, Chairman, MISA Building Committee

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M.

Requests for Budget Adjustments

HD-6 Health – Approval to Use $2,703

Approval to Use:
$ 600 to F40326-51490 Professional Services NOC
$ 723 to F40326-52020 Printing and Binding
$ 1,350 to F40326-52050 Postage
$ 30 to F40326-53010 Office Supplies
$ 2,703 from Additional Funds State of CT Lead Grant

Ms. Baisley gave an overview of the State of Connecticut Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program provided Grant funds, which will be used to educate homeowners and medical health care providers, conduct lead poisoning testing and case management when needed. A discussion followed regarding selection of homeowners, and public notification.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a routine application.

SE-8 Law – Additional Appropriation $161,000

Additional Appropriation:
$ 161,000 to A140-51450 Additional Funds
$ 161,000 from General Fund Balance

Meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation Budget Committee
March 13, 2012- Approved
Mr. Fox explained that this request is in order to retain expert testimony and to supply technical analysis and information, highlighting some types of cases were these services are necessary. A discussion followed regarding costs analysis, and funding.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a routine application.

ED-4  Board of Education – Transfer $56,300

Transfer:
$ 34,800 to A6501789-53700  Building & Construction Materials
$ 21,500 to A6201753-54100  Maintenance of Instructional Equipment
$ 23,200 from A6501789-54050  Maintenance of Building/Supplies
$ 11,600 from A6501789-54070  Maintenance of Air-Conditioning
$ 21,500 from A6201753-51420  Prof. Medical & Dental

Mr. Branyan explained that after reviewing accounts, part of this request will allow the Facilities Department to use in-house maintenance, instead of hiring outside vendors, and the other part is needed to service special needs student’s audio logical equipment. A discussion followed regarding BOE transfer requests.

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the transfer under the authority delegated to it by the BET.

ED-5  Board of Education – Release of conditions $250,000

Release of Conditions:
$ 50,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Drainage Redesign by DTC
$ 35,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  MEP Redesign by P&W
$ 35,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Extended Purchasing by Turner
$ 30,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Asbestos Testing by EAS
$ 20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Asbestos Testing by Lab
$ 20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Additional AECOM Reports
$ 10,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Additional Legal Support
$ 20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Miscellaneous Invoices
$ 30,000 to B6801689-59560-12149  Contingency
$ 250,000 from B6801689-59560-12149  MISA

Mr. Ross explained that this request is for (1) gaining additional information, (2) addressing known EPA issues, and (3) improving the design of the MISA project. Redesign of the drainage system was necessary due to soil contamination and must be completed and approved by the EPA in order to proceed with the project. The Committee reviewed the MISA Cost Summary as of March 8, 2012, and Project Cost Projection Update Draft as of March, 9, 2012. At Mr. Pellegrino’s request, Mr. Ross gave an overview and update of the MISA project. A lengthy discussion followed regarding revisions, soil remediation, and budgetary impact. A summary of this discussion could be stated as follows. The original project was planned at a total cost of $32,020,000. Subsequent activities have added additional costs: the need to vent the Gym (which was a capital project planned in future years but brought forward to help address MISA designs) $400,000; the need to change access to the VoTech space $300,000; the need to initiate soil testing and remediation $1,500,000, the need to build a Cofferdam to address
groundwater contamination $700,000; the need to move to the next phase of soil remediation $600,000; the need to redesign drainage and utility plans $300,000; the need to redesign in general, test and monitor $250,000; the delay for at least 3 more months to complete these redesigns $400,000; and the overall delay for the past year $860,000. When added to the original cost of the project, the estimated cost is now $37,330,000.

The Committee voted 4-0 to accept the report and release the condition on the appropriation and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

**PW-9  DPW – Additional Appropriation $200,000**

Additional Appropriation:

$200,000 to Z315-59830-12199 GHS Soils Remediation

$200,000 from Capital Non-recurring

Ms. Siebert explained that this request is to continue the soil remediation and removal project not related to MISA. Ms. Siebert also gave an overview of the project, including expenses through March 13, 2012. A brief discussion followed regarding scope of the project and funding.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

**PW-5  DPW – Release of conditions $100,000**

Release of Conditions:

$100,000 to Z345-59560-11134 Professional Fees

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the condition, “Subject to Release by the BET upon acceptance of a report for a solution to the septic system for the proposed King Street Fire Station and a determination if GEMS would be able to be stationed on this site”, has been met. Mr. Pellegrino also shared comments regarding additional information that arose since the condition was placed upon the project, questions regarding the site, the desire to find a more suitable site, the need to address the budgetary impact of a new station within the context of the Fire Department Operating budget and the need to addressing these issues in a cooperative, positive way going forward.

Mr. Tesei gave background information, an overview of the request, and shared comments regarding alternate locations and the necessity of the project. Mr. Monelli gave an overview of the current site plan and septic locations. Mr. Ramer shared comments regarding Mr. Tesei’s, as well as Chief Siecienski and Mr. Monelli’s constructive efforts concerning this proposal.

A discussion followed regarding staffing, the current site’s issues, alternative sites, current capital projects’ unforeseen costs and budgetary concerns.

The Committee voted 0-4 to the release of condition on the appropriation and recommended to forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

**OLD BUSINESS**
NEW BUSINESS

Report of Status of Current Economic Conditions

The Committee reviewed the Selected Revenues and Spending Rate, February 2012, highlighting expenses, and fund balance. Mr. Gieger gave brief summary of the revenues and expenses. A discussion followed regarding conveyance tax receipts trends.

Nathaniel Witherell Cash Flow

The Committee reviewed the Nathaniel Witherell Operating Statistics/Information for the seven-month period ending January 31, 2012.

Budget Conditions

The Committee reviewed and discussed the 2012-2013 Budget Conditions upon Department Requests.

Budget Resolutions

Mr. Ramer stated that the Law Committee will review the 2012-2013 Budget Resolutions on Monday, March 19, 2012, at 10:00 A.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Budget Committee Public Hearing, February 6, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2012, Budget Committee Public Hearing.

Budget Committee BOE Departmental & Capital Review, February 9, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2012, Budget Committee BOE Departmental & Capital Review.

Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 1, February 15, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 15, 2012, Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 1.

Budget Committee Regular Meeting, February 16, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 16, 2012, Budget Committee Regular Meeting.

Budget Committee Finance Department Presentation & Capital Review, February 22, 2012
The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 22, 2012, Budget Committee Finance Department Presentation & Capital Review.

Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 2, February 24, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2012, Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 2.

Budget Committee Consolidation Day, February 27, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 27, 2012, Budget Committee Consolidation Day.

Budget Committee Decision Day, February 29, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 29, 2012, Budget Committee Decision Day.

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Bocchino, Recording Secretary

Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman
TOWN OF GREENWICH
BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND TAXATION
BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, March 13, 2012
Cone Room, 2nd FLOOR

START TIME - 6:00 P.M.

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests for Budget Adjustments</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD-6</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$2,703</td>
<td>Approval to Use Prof. Serv., Office Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-8</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>Additional Appropriation Expert Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-4</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
<td>Transfer Bldg. &amp; Constr. Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of Instr. Equip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-5</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Release of Conditions MISA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-9</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Additional Appropriation GHS Soils Remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-5</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Release of Conditions King Street Firehouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business:

New Business:
- Report - Status of Current Economic Conditions
- Update - Nathaniel Witherell Cash Flow
- Discussion – Budget Conditions
• Vote – Budget Resolutions

Approval of BET Budget Committee Meeting Minutes:
• February 6, 2012 – Public Hearing Night
• February 9, 2012 – BOE Departmental & Capital Review
• February 15, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 1
• February 16, 2012 – Regular BET Budget Meeting
• February 22, 2012 – Finance Department Presentation & Capital Budget Review
• February 24, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 2
• February 27, 2012 – Consolidation Day
• February 29, 2012 – Decision Day
Requests for Budget Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD-6</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$2,703</td>
<td>Approval to Use Prof. Serv., Office Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F40326 &amp; various object codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-8</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>Additional Appropriation Expert Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A140 51450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-4</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6501789 53700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bldg. &amp; Constr. Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6201753 54100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of Instr. Equip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-5</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Release of Conditions MISA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6801689 59560 12149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-9</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Additional Appropriation GHS Soils Remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z315 59830 12199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-5</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Release of Conditions King Street Firehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z345 59560 11134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business:

New Business:
- Report - Status of Current Economic Conditions
- Update - Nathaniel Witherell Cash Flow
- Discussion – Budget Conditions
Vote – Budget Resolutions

Approval of BET Budget Committee Meeting Minutes:
- February 6, 2012 – Public Hearing Night
- February 9, 2012 – BOE Departmental & Capital Review
- February 15, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 1
- February 16, 2012 – Regular BET Budget Meeting
- February 22, 2012 – Finance Department Presentation & Capital Budget Review
- February 24, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 2
- February 27, 2012 – Consolidation Day
- February 29, 2012 – Decision Day
Town Of Greenwich
Request Form For Budget Adjustments

BET Meeting Date: Mar-12
Application #: HD 6

Department & Division: Health
Action Requested: Approval to Use
Date of Submission: March 5, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40326</td>
<td>51490</td>
<td>Professional Services Other</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40326</td>
<td>52020</td>
<td>Printing and Binding</td>
<td></td>
<td>723.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40326</td>
<td>52050</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40326</td>
<td>53010</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: State of CT Lead Grant

2,703.00

Justification of Request: (Set forth reasons the adjustment is required, the factors involved in arriving at costs, and the status of the account from which the transfer is made. Attach separate copy if necessary.)

This request is being made to accept State Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program funding through the Connecticut Association of Directors of Health, Inc in the amount of $2,703.00. All activities associated with this grant shall be completed by 6/30/12.

Department Head: [Signature]

Certified correct as to computations and amounts shows as appropriations to date and unencumbered balances, with any changes given.

Date: __________ Comptroller: __________________________

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

_______ Approved    Motion:
_______ Disapproved  Second:
_______ Modified as follows:

Clerk of the Board: __________________________

This form should be submitted with 35 blue copies in addition to a current Appropriation Statement.
Justification for Board of Estimate and Taxation Application HD6 March 19, 2012

The Department applied for and was accepted to receive Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control program funding from the State of CT through a subcontractor, Connecticut Association of Directors of Health, Inc. The funds in the amount of $2,703.00 shall be used to educate homeowners and medical health care providers and conduct childhood lead poisoning testing and case management when needed.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OTHER $600.00
To provide funds for an outside agency to prepare mailing materials.

PRINTING $723.00
To provide funds for the printing of literature pertaining to lead poisoning.

POSTAGE $1,350.00
To provide funds for postage to mail literature to homeowners and medical health care providers.

OFFICE SUPPLIES $30.00
To provide funds for the purchase of office supplies needed for mailing materials.

TOTAL $2,703.00
Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program
LHD Fiscal Assistance
Sub-Contract

Pursuant to Part I, Section A.1 (4), above, the Contractor and each subcontractor LHD funded under this Contract shall enter into a separate, written subcontract using the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program LHD Fiscal Assistance Sub-Contract</th>
<th>DPH Log No. 2012-1501/LEAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Subcontractor LHD: Greenwich Health Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM OF SUBCONTRACT: 7/1/11 through 6/30/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Subject to the terms, conditions, provisions and requirements of an original executed contract between the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health (the Department) and the Connecticut Association of Directors of Health, Inc. (CADH), DPH Log # 2012-1501, ("DPH/CADH Contract") CADH hereby enters into a Subcontract with: Greenwich Health Department

2. CADH hereby uses funding provided under such original DPH/CADH Contract to distribute, through this Subcontract, funding to the Subcontractor LHD named above, in the amount of $2,703. Such funding shall be used by the Subcontractor LHD only and solely for childhood lead poisoning testing, case management and intervention activities as required under this subcontract.

3. The Subcontractor LHD shall:
   a. perform the services, submit reports and comply with all requirements as described and applicable to such subcontractor LHD in Part I: Subsections A.1 and A.2 of the DPH/CADH Contract,
   b. submit Lead Surveillance System data to the Department, as required by LPPCP guidelines, for statewide lead poisoning surveillance and case management,
   c. conduct education outreach to pediatricians and parents in their local jurisdiction for towns with a blood level screening rate less than 50% for children ages 1 and 2 years old,
   d. schedule a date/time to be trained by a LPPCP staff person in the use of the Maven Lead Surveillance System,
   e. submit mid-year and final program narrative reports that describe the childhood lead poisoning case management, intervention, and prevention activities conducted under this Contract,
   f. conduct timely and thorough case follow-up response actions, and
   g. provide timely response to LPPCP inquiries.

4. A copy of the fully executed DPH/CADH Contract is attached hereto and is incorporated herein in its entirety as if fully set forth herein.

5. Subcontractor LHD’s compliance with provisions 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d above shall be monitored by the Department and shall be fully considered by the Department in subsequent decisions regarding Department funding of the LHD under other contracts, at the sole & final discretion of the Department. The Subcontractor LHD shall submit all deliverables including reports, directly to the Department; CADH shall retain administrative oversight over this and all participating Subcontractor LHDs.

6. The Subcontractor LHD acknowledges that it has full responsibility and liability for the provision of subcontracted services hereunder, and that it also hereby holds harmless the State of Connecticut and CADH and any of the officers, representatives, agents, servants, employees, successors and assigns of either the State or CADH from and against any and all claims arising directly or indirectly, in connection with this Subcontract, including but not limited to the acts of commission or omission of the Subcontractor LHD.

Acceptances and Approvals:

For the Connecticut Association of Directors of Health, Inc. (CADH):

By: Jennifer C. Kertanis, Executive Director

Date: 2/14/2011

For the Subcontractor Local Health Department or Local Health District (LHD):

Dept./District Name: Greenwich Health Department

By: Caroline C. Baisley

Print name/title: Caroline C. Baisley

Date: 12/13/2011
Town Of Greenwich
Request Form For Budget Adjustments

Department & Division: Law
Action Requested: Additional Appropriation
Date of Submission: March 5, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>51450</td>
<td>Additional funds</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: General Fund balance 161,000

Justification of Request: (Set forth reasons the adjustment is required, the factors involved in arriving at costs, and the status of the account from which the transfer is made. Attach separate copy if necessary.)

We respectfully request an additional appropriation of $161,000.00 to meet experts fees through the end of the fiscal year, specifically in the Worth Construction and DiBella lawsuits.

First Selectman: [Signature]  
Department Head: [Signature]  
Comptroller:  
Date:  
Clerk of the Board:  

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

- [ ] Approved  
- [ ] Disapproved  
- [ ] Modified as follows:  
  
  Motion:  
  Second:  

Clerk of the Board:  

This form should be submitted with 35 blue copies in addition to a current Appropriation Statement.
Town Of Greenwich  
Request Form For Budget Adjustments  

BET Meeting Date: March 13  
Application #: ED 4  

Department & Division: BOE  
Action Requested: Transfer  
Date of Submission: March 5, 2012  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6501789</td>
<td>Bldg. &amp; Constr. Materials</td>
<td>34,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6201753</td>
<td>54100</td>
<td>Maintenance of Instr. Equip</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6501789</td>
<td>Maintenance of Bldg/Supplies</td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6501789</td>
<td>54070</td>
<td>Maintenance of Air-Conditioning</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6201753</td>
<td>51420</td>
<td>Prof Medical &amp; Dental</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification of Request: (Set forth reasons the adjustment is required, the factors involved in arriving at costs, and the status of the account from which the transfer is made. Attach separate copy if necessary.)

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENTS

Certified correct as to computations and amounts shows as appropriations to date and unencumbered balances, with any changes given.

Date: ___________  
Comptroller: ____________________________

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

_______ Approved  
_______ Disapproved  
_______ Modified as follows:

Motion:  
Second:  
Clerk of the Board: ____________________________

This form should be submitted with 38 blue copies in addition to a current Appropriation Statement.
**Town of Greenwich**  
**Board of Education**  
**Budget Appropriation Transfers**  
**February 23, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer #</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>From Decrease</th>
<th>To Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>A650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54050</td>
<td>Maintenance of Bldg/Supplies</td>
<td>$ 23,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54070</td>
<td>Maintenance of Air-conditioning</td>
<td>$ 11,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53700</td>
<td>Bldg. &amp; Constr. Materials</td>
<td>$ 34,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>A620</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51420</td>
<td>Prof Medical &amp; Dental</td>
<td>$ 21,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A620</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54100</td>
<td>Maintenance of Instructional Equipment</td>
<td>$ 21,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operating Transfers for Period**  
$ 56,300.00  $ 56,300.00

**Explanation:**  
1. More skilled maintenance staff are available to do jobs that the Facilities Department would usually hire vendors for. More money needed in the 53700 line in order to fund maintenance materials purchased directly rather than through vendors performing services with their own materials. This transfer will cover money anticipated to be spent from 53700 through fiscal year end. This shift was not accounted for in this or next year's budget so a budget adjustment will be needed prior to the BOE adopting the 2012-2013 Budget.

2. To service student's audio logical equipment through the end of the school year. The 2011-2012 budget was not adjusted correctly from 2010-2011 to reflect proper need. There are also three (3) additional students receiving these services this year versus last. This shift was not accounted for in next year's budget so a budget adjustment will be needed prior to the BOE adopting the 2012-2013 Budget.
**Town Of Greenwich**

Request Form For Budget Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>MISA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification of Request:**

See attached. Additional materials will be available at the Budget Committee meeting on Tuesday, March 13, 2012.

**Board Chairman**

**Department Head:**

Certified correct as to computations and amounts shows as appropriations to date and unencumbered balances, with any changes given.

Date: __________ Comptroller: ___________________________________

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

- Approved
- Disapproved
- Modified as follows:

Clerk of the Board: __________________________

This form should be submitted with 35 blue copies in addition to a current Appropriation Statement
### MISA Release of Conditions 3/13/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Drainage Redesign by DTC</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>MEP Redesign by P+W</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Extended Purchasing by Turner</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Asbestos Testing by EAS</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Asbestos Testing by Lab</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Additional AECOM Reports</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Additional Legal Support</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Invoices</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6801689</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Amount:** $250,000.00
## GHS/ MISA PROJECT COST PROJECTION UPDATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Anticipated Cost</th>
<th>(2) Approved by RTM 2011</th>
<th>(3) B of E Request to RTM 2012</th>
<th>(4) Released by BET 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Building Program Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Budget</td>
<td>28,815,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$11,815,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased Funding Impact</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos &amp; Abatement Work Allowance</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Tree Warden Requirements</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised South Lot Drainage (Wetlands)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation due to Delayed Start</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>$30,650,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$12,215,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Affiliated Programs Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Ventilation</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased VoTech Program</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Costs</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Environmental Program Costs (MISA Footprint &amp; West Parking Lot Only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Phase Soil Testing &amp; Remediation</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Pumping Isolation (Cofferdam)</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Phase Soil Remediation</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Impacts</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Drainage &amp; Utility Runs</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Design, Testing &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$35,200,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$15,085,000</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre Construction Costs $2,130,000

Grand Total $37,330,000
## Town of Greenwich
### MISA
#### Cost Summary
as of March 8, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Encumbered</th>
<th>Lapsed</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>28079</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>29056</td>
<td>Architectural &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>2,130,000</td>
<td>1,747,064</td>
<td>288,905</td>
<td>94,031</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>12149</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>2,626,908</td>
<td>621,959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,751,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,230,000</td>
<td>4,473,972</td>
<td>910,864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,845,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approved (by BET Budget Committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Encumbered</th>
<th>Lapsed</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12,215,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>2,070,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Gym Ventilation</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Tech Ed Spaces</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,985,000</td>
<td>4,473,972</td>
<td>910,864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,845,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,215,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Encumbered</th>
<th>Lapsed</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing and Remediation</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Work</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised South lot Drainage</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Escalation</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Pumping (Cofferdam)</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Impact</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Drainage &amp; Utility Runs</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Design, Testing &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Released June | Construction | 1,800,000  |
| Released August | Remediation | 1,338,000  |
| Released November | Remediation | 162,000    |
|                |             | 3,300,000  |
Town Of Greenwich
Request Form For Budget Adjustments

BET Meeting Date: Mar-12
Application #: PW 9

Department & Division: DPW
Action Requested: Additional Appropriation
Date of Submission: March 7, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>59830</td>
<td>12199</td>
<td>GHS Soils Remediation</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Capital Non-recurring 150,000

Justification of Request: (Set forth reasons the adjustment is required, the factors involved in arriving at costs, and the status of the account from which the transfer is made. Attach separate copy if necessary.)

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED.

First Selectman: ___________________ Department Head: ___________________

Certified correct as to computations and amounts shows as appropriations to date and unencumbered balances, with any changes given.

Date: ________________ Comptroller: ___________________

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

Approved ___________________ Motion: ___________________

Disapproved ___________________ Second: ___________________

Modified as follows: ___________________

Clerk of the Board: ___________________
The Department of Public Works, in conjunction with the Board of Education, and the Department of Parks and Recreation, is requesting $150,000 in interim funding. These funds will be used to continue our work on the Greenwich High School (GHS) soils remediation project. The funds will support the services of an outside consultant for site characterization and investigation efforts during the April school break, and other pertinent critical activities to move the project forward and address both Town needs and regulatory drivers.

**Project Background:**

At this time, the BET is familiar with the issues that have arisen with respect to the Greenwich High School (GHS) fields, discovered as a result of site development activities related to the GHS Musical Instructional Space and Auditorium (MISA) project. That project uncovered soil contamination during excavation for drainage improvements. The Department of Public Works (DPW) became involved and continues to work collaboratively with the Board of Education to help plan and resolve the soils issues at this location. DPW also continues to use a third party, a qualified firm who provides staff to act as owner’s agent / project manager (PM) given that neither the BOE or DPW have the staffing nor the detailed expertise to manage this large undertaking. In addition, DPW and the BOE continue to keep the Department of Parks and Recreation Director, Joseph Siciliano informed, given Parks and Recreation’s involvement in field maintenance and operation, in conjunction with BOE athletic programs.

Significant and necessary effort and expense has been incurred as a result of site characterization efforts during both the December 2011 and February 2012 school holidays. The December 2011 results dictated more expansive sampling in some areas in February 2012. Additional sampling is needed in April 2012 to continue our work regarding site investigation and remediation evaluation in order to meet regulatory expectations and to be positioned to provide a reasonable cost estimate in Fall 2012, during capital budget season.

This will provide funding for the investigation tasks discussed with the regulators and allow us to fill data gaps as well as begin the risk assessment evaluation. Delaying the risk assessment could push out the feasibility study and associated update of the cost estimates by a few months – this would be most unfortunate for the capital budget process.

Further information will be provided as soon as possible to the BET regarding how the funds allocated in the fall have been used to date, and with additional details regarding anticipated work in April. February 2012 data, not yet available, will dictate the details of that work. We do anticipate providing this information to the BET in advance of the Budget Committee’s March 13, 2012 meeting.
Town Of Greenwich
Request Form For Budget Adjustments

Department & Division: DPW
Action Requested: Release of Conditions
Date of Submission: March 9, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>59560</td>
<td>11134</td>
<td>Prof Fees</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: 100,000.00

Justification of Request:

Request that the A&E appropriation for the King Street Fire Station be released.

Board Chairman Department Head:

Certified correct as to computations and amounts shows as appropriations to date and unencumbered balances, with any changes given.

Date: Comptroller: ____________________________

The following action was taken at a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Taxation held on:

- [ ] Approved
- [ ] Disapproved
- [ ] Modified as follows:

Second:

Clerk of the Board: ____________________________

This form should be submitted with 35 blue copies in addition to a current Appropriation Statement.
Status of Current Economic Conditions Report will be sent electronically
TOWN OF GREENWICH
BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND TAXATION BUDGET COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Town Hall Meeting Room
Monday, February 6, 2012

Committee
Present: Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman; William R. Finger, Jeffrey S. Ramer, Leslie L. Tarkington

Board: Robert Brady, Sean Goldrick, Marc Johnson, Mary Lee Kiernan, Michael Mason

Selectmen: Peter Tesei, First Selectman; Drew Marzullo

Staff: Roland Gieger, Budget & Systems Director; John Crary, Town Administrator; Dustin Anderson, Administrative Manager, Selectmen's Office; Roger Lulow, Superintendent; Stacey Gross, Assistant Superintendent; Benjamin Branyan, Managing Director of Operations; Kim Eves, Director of Communications; Joseph Siciliano, Director; Tom Greco, Assistant Director, Parks and Recreation; Amy Siebert, Commissioner, Public Works; Denise Savageau, Director, Conservation

Other: Leslie Moriarty, Chairman, Board of Education

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 P.M.

PROPOSED BUDGET FY2012-2013

Mr. Tesei presented the Town's proposed FY 2012-2013 Budget to the Committee.

Ms. Moriarty and Dr. Lulow presented the Board of Education's proposed FY2012-2013 budget to the Committee.

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing session was called to order at 6:54 P.M.

Mr. Pellegrino gave brief instructions regarding the Public Hearing session, requesting that the speakers state the part of the town in which they live and limit their comments to three minutes.

Ann Miller, Cos Cob; President, Jr. League – In support of Byram Pool Project, sharing comments regarding the history of the project, a public/private partnership, fundraising, and the Town's priorities.

Paul Pugliese, Old Greenwich; – In support of Byram Pool Project, sharing comments regarding funds needed to develop A&E and design drawings in order to begin fundraising to offset the Town's contribution to the project overall.
Dana Whammond, Old Greenwich; Chairman, Byram Pool Project – Presented a packet to the Committee for review, which included an overview of the Byram Pool Committees' efforts over the past year, and letters in support of Byram Pool Project. Ms. Whammond also shared comments regarding the community necessity, and fundraising goals.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that a letter from Karen Fassuliotis, who was unable to attend this public hearing and is opposed to the Byram Pool Project, will be distributed to the BET members for review.

Valerie Stauffer, Chairman, RTM District 7 – Shared comments urging spending restraints concerning capital projects, consideration of other locations for a public pool, is opposed to the Byram Pool Project, and shared concerns regarding maintaining the triple A rating.

Lisa Beth Savitz, President, PTA Council – In support of the BOE Budget. Shared comments regarding additional funding needed for improvements to the school lunch program, facilities, the achievement gap and early childhood education.

Anthony Medico, Glenville; Assistant Chief, Glenville Volunteer Fire Department – Offered assistance upon the BET’s review of major object code 208, Fire Department Administration Volunteer Recruitment and Retention, and shared comments concerning the support and representation of the volunteer firefighters.

Bill Gorgas, Central Greenwich; RTM District 7 – Shared concerns regarding the CIP and debt, opposing new major projects or additional borrowing. Mr. Gorgas shared comments regarding borrowing, the triple A rating, and the escalation of the operating and capital budgets.

Jennifer Meredith and Laura Erickson, Co-Presidents, GHS PTA – Shared comments in support of the BOE budget and recognized the efforts of the schools’ administration, the selectmen, and the BET.

Peter Quigley, RTM District 7 – Shared comments regarding funding Capital projects without proper vetting of the environmental hazards and contaminates in the soil, and the costs involved due to possible fines, remediation, as well as future unknown costs. Mr. Quigley suggested meeting Federal and State regulations prior to funding Capital projects.

Donald Conway, RTM District 2 – Shared comments in support of dredging the Cos Cob Marina.

Mr. Pellegrino also distributed a letter from Richard Kriskey, Chairman, Board of Assessment Appeals, to the BET members for review.

There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:27 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Bocchino, Recording Secretary
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL
Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M. He welcomed everyone to the BET Budget Committee Meeting on the Board of Education FY2012 - 2013 Operating and Capital Budget Review. Mr. Pellegrino offered his opening remarks and mentioned the Board of Education was in the process of searching for a new Superintendent and the Board of Estimate and Taxation had five new members. Mr. Pellegrino remarked that during this process he would be concentrating on the Board of Education’s goals and objectives, their vision, how much their initiatives cost the taxpayers and what was the return on our investment. In addition, Mr. Pellegrino stated that there would be a unique look at the everyday operations of the three middle schools.

Ms. Moriarty started the presentation by introducing a number of key Board of Education employees and officials in attendance.

Dr. Lulow continued by proceeding through a well-structured power point presentation. The presentation went as follows:

- Federal, State, Local, BOE, District, School – Dr. Lulow pointed out there are approximately 15,000 school districts in the United States. He stressed that the Greenwich School System is governed by mandates from various federal, state and local oversight authorities. For example, Dr. Lulow cited Federal mandates such as the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and the No Child Left Behind Act. Dr. Lulow also
pointed out that the State of Connecticut is influential in areas such as: length of school year, teacher certifications and tenure, collective bargaining, transportation of public and private school students and teacher evaluations.

Dr. Lulow informed the Committee that the school district is also influenced by local authorities such as: the Board of Education, the BET and various Town functions.

- Governance Structure of BOE (roles & responsibilities) – Dr. Lulow stated that he reports to the Board of Education whose key responsibilities are: hiring and evaluating the Superintendent, development of school district policies that govern students and employees, adoption of curricula and textbooks, approval of the annual school budget, responsibility for all property used by the district and insuring that all Federal and State educational mandates are implemented and adhered to.

- Mission, Vision of Graduate (E-000) - Dr. Lulow informed the Committee of the mission of the Greenwich Public Schools and the vision of the graduate.

- District Success System – Dr. Lulow and Ms. Moriarty explained in detail the Board of Education Success System which includes measures that are aligned with the District Mission and Vision, sets improvement targets across six (6) areas of system performance including student achievement and tracks system performance relative to similar districts and progress towards targets. In addition, the Harris Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey was reviewed and discussed at length. It was mentioned that the survey detailed in the presentation was about 2 years old and an updated survey would come out this spring 2012.

Dr. Lulow detailed a number of successes and challenges in the presentation. The successes offered were various test score improvements measured against District Reference Group (DRG) A and B Districts. The challenge areas dealt with areas such as; writing, science, primary grades (K-2), achievement gap, enrollments of less than 3 years in district and the 5th to 6th grade transitions.

Dr. Lulow offered to break for questions. Mr. Pellegrino began by asking for a more detailed explanation of the figures listed in the power point presentation slide with the Harris Survey results. Dr. Curtin explained the slide in further detail. Mr. Finger followed up with a question about the rate of responses to the survey. Ms. Eves answered that the response rate for parents was about 30%, the response rate for teachers and staff was about 75 to 85% and the student response rate was about 80 to 90%.

Dr. Lulow, in response to the apparent negative satisfaction measurements depicted by the survey, stated that over the last nine years the leadership of the District was traumatic and lacking. Dr. Lulow added that these results are what was felt and reflected two years ago and hopefully the results will be much better when released this spring. Ms. Moriarty also pointed out that the survey was taken during a period of dissatisfaction headlined with mold issues at the Western Middle School modular and a change in superintendents. Mr. Finger stated that he felt that student achievement is more important than stakeholder satisfaction and offered his opinion based on having two children go through the Greenwich School System. Mr. Finger wanted to clarify that stakeholder satisfaction is important but what is perceived and measured is the results of student achievements. Mr. Pellegrino added that he felt that both are equally important.
During the presentation, Dr. Lulow anecdotally offered the success of the North Mianus 5th grade science team, scoring second in the State of Connecticut on a science project they had worked on. Mr. Finger, following up on Dr. Lulow’s reference to the success of this unit asked why it is working in North Mianus and not someplace else. Dr. Lulow answered that in North Mianus, this group used the “Data Team Approach” at a more advanced level setting science as a major goal for success.

Ms. Tarkington asked a question in the area of challenges and asked if the 6th grade should be moved back into the elementary schools. Dr. Lulow firmly answered no and stated that this issue had been addressed over the last twenty five years with no desire to revert to the previous arrangement. He added the current style works.

Mr. Pellegrino asked, if there are over 15,000 school districts in the country, how big is Greenwich relative to this group and where does Greenwich fit relative to similar districts for purposes of benchmarking. Dr. Lulow stated it is hard to answer that question. For example, he stated Florida has 80 districts and Ohio has 612 districts, but in Florida they are countywide districts. Dr. Lulow stated Greenwich is large relative to communities in the State of Connecticut. Dr. Lulow offered, in his experiences, a typical district would consist of one high school, one middle school and two or three elementary schools. Mr. Pellegrino asked if we should compare Greenwich to communities like Palo Alto, California and Austin, Texas. Ms. Moriarty answered by saying the standard for comparisons should be standardized tests scores measured against other Connecticut towns and we should be concentrating on looking at improving what we deliver. Mr. Finger stated that a large percentage of Greenwich students attend private schools and that would complicate benchmarking.

Ms. Tarkington inquired as to which are the top three or five school districts in the United States. Dr. Lulow answered by saying it is hard to determine who the best is. He added that the people in the community determine what is best for their respective communities.

Mr. Pellegrino asked how much do federal and state mandates cost the Town. Dr. Lulow answered he didn’t have that number available.

Mr. Finger asked if teacher evaluations are mandated by the State of Connecticut. Dr. Lulow answered the evaluations are designed locally with certain requirements coming from the State. Mr. Finger asked about the evaluation process and Dr. Lulow explained how the process works.

- Delivery Model for Mission, Vision of Graduate – Dr. Lulow gave a quick walk through of the District Organizational Chart. Dr. Lulow proceeded to explain a series of charts included in the presentation such as;
  - Elementary Attendance Areas
  - Actual and Projected Enrollment
  - Elementary Facility Utilization
  - Percentage of Minority Enrollment by Race
  - Percentage Students Qualifying For Free or Reduced Price Lunch
  - English Non-Dominant Students and English Language Learners
  - Percentage Students Receiving Special Education Services
Students Assessed on Connecticut Mastery Test

Dr. Lulow presented and discussed two slides that detail mandated programs and those programs that exceed mandates.

At this point, Mr. Branyan and Dr. Lulow presented the district staffing table of organization presented on a 2011-12 budget, 2011-2012 actual and 2012-2013 budget basis. They explained the variances from year to year. In addition, they detailed the characteristics of the teaching facility which shows a break down by education level and also a chart showing teacher years of service in the Greenwich system. Mr. Branyan and Dr. Lulow expanded the discussions by discussing GOSA staffing variances, staffing modes for teachers, administration and other staffing categories, labor contracts, evaluations (Teacher Evaluation, Professional Development Plans) and teacher’s support.

Dr. Lulow offered to break for questions. Mr. Pellegrino started by referring Dr. Lulow back to slide number 19, Elementary Facility Utilization. Mr. Pellegrino asked at what point do you start discussing the closing of a school in light of future underutilization. Dr. Lulow responded by saying that when projected optimal utilization levels fall below 80% you start to hold discussions. He added that the school most in danger of approaching that level is Parkway School. However, Dr. Lulow cautioned the Committee that there are a large number of vacant backcountry residences for sale in Greenwich due to the economic and housing downturn in recent years. His concerns centered on a “what if” scenario if people start occupying these residences and student enrollments in Parkway School don’t reach the projected levels in the chart and we’ve closed a school. Mr. Lulow also strongly cautioned that discussion on closing Parkway School could be a public relations or media negative. In addition, Dr. Lulow stated that closing Parkway School could cause an extremely disruptive restructuring by redeploying these affected students from Parkway into other adjacent schools that could also have a rippling effect. Mr. Pellegrino informed Dr. Lulow that there was no mention of closing Parkway School by either him or the other Committee members and his charts are merely showing a trend that requires addressing.

Mr. Pellegrino called attention to an “Elementary Building Utilization” chart showing Parkway School going from 64.9% utilization in 2011-2012 to potentially 45.2% in 2015-2016. Referencing this chart, Mr. Pellegrino asked what the savings would be if you closed Parkway School and channeled the students to other school locations. Mr. Branyan offered that the calculated cost is about $1.3 million. However, Dr. Lulow cautioned that increased transportation costs have to be taken into account. Mr. Finger followed with a question about declining enrollment at Parkway. He asked at which point does it reach, whereas, children aren’t getting sufficient attention. Dr. Lulow answered that the Board of Education is already looking at the Parkway enrollment situation. Mr. Pellegrino concluded the Parkway discussion by stating that this is a future topic for discussion on how we build budgets.

Mr. Finger asked about the Advanced Learning Program and what qualifies students into the program. Ms. Gross gave the Committee a detailed description of the program and the process.

The questioning turned to slides 30 to 32, which dealt with the staffing table of organization, characteristics of teaching faculty (e.g. education levels) and teacher’s years of service. Mr. Pellegrino questioned the statistics in the staffing table of organization, specifically the GEA-Evolve headcount. Dr. Lulow started by stating that a number of variances could be attributed to the Greenwich High School restructuring last spring that affected budget to actual numbers. An extended discussion ensued about trying to understand education levels and teacher’s years of service. Dr. Lulow, in response to Mr. Pellegrino, explained that the teachers listed on the charts
without higher teaching degrees are simply just starting out and are new to the system. He added, mandates require teachers to ultimately attain higher degrees.

Dr. Lulow attempted to further explain the chart showing teacher’s years of service. Dr. Lulow stated he was startled to learn how the teacher staffing in Greenwich contained an uncharacteristically younger staff. He further added that the school system loses about 40 to 45 teachers each year; two thirds to retirement and one third are processed out. Dr. Lulow stressed to the Committee not to misinterpret the data presented in the teacher’s years of service chart and jump to conclusions. Mr. Ramer quickly countered that he strongly feels the chart presents certain conclusions. Mr. Ramer stated he didn’t like the findings from the chart that indicate that teachers are not being adequately retained. Mr. Pellegrino pointed out that the chart should be views as a cumulative distribution from left to right, and that perspective would address Mr. Ramer’s observation. A discussion followed on the variances of how tenure works. The Committee members questioned whether the teacher evaluation system is working and whether or not we are getting an adequate applicant pool. Dr. Lulow offered that a high turnover rate can either indicate a poor selection process or a tough evaluation system.

Mr. Finger asked about the Board of Education’s role in the labor contracts process. Dr. Lulow and Ms. Moriarty stated that the Board of Education negotiates contracts with teachers and administrators, but does not get involved in the other employee groups such as: LIUNA, Teamsters, GMEA and AFSCME.

- Budget – Dr. Lulow offered to the Committee that the budgetary portion of their presentation had been covered earlier in the week and Mr. Branyan would proceed quickly through the slides, unless the Committee had questions.

Mr. Branyan pointed out the 2012-2013 Operating Budget request was $139,807,220 which represents a 2.56% increase over the previous year. Mr. Branyan further explained the breakdown of the 2.56% increase by major object code. Mr. Branyan stated that the fixed costs/utilities budget increased only by 0.05% budget to budget. He added that the transportation contract ends this year and a new contract was reached with a zero percentage increase in the first year. Mr. Pellegrino asked about safety training for bus drivers and if the Town is required legally to provide transportation to students. Mr. Branyan and Dr. Lulow answered that extensive safety training is required and provided to bus drivers. Also, the Town is not required to provide bus transportation to students per State mandate. However, Dr. Lulow pointed out that the school district is required by State Law to provide bus transportation to private school students who live in Town if it provides bus transportation to public school students. Mr. Pellegrino asked how much the transportation contract was and Mr. Branyan answered $4.5 million.

Dr. Lulow described the per pupil allocation, by school, to the Committee members.

At this point, Ms. Gross was invited to the table and a lengthy discussion was held on district programs. The Committee had a number of questions regarding program coordinators, district programs and pupil personnel services. Dr. Lulow was asked as to why the school district has so many administrators. Dr. Lulow broke his answer into four segments:

- There was a commitment to have a Principal and Assistant Principal in every Elementary School.
- There was a commitment to build one high school instead of two, and break it into individual houses requiring additional administrators.
- The School District wanted a much higher teacher to student ratio in Special Education.
- There was a decision to have Program Coordinators manage curricula.

Dr. Lulow was asked if he felt that it was necessary to have an Assistant Principal in every Elementary School. He answered that in his experiences he didn't see it.

There was a final slide showing that the Town of Greenwich provided in-kind services or fringe benefits totaling $31,793,145. Mr. Pellegrino asked if those figures were in the per pupil costs. Mr. Branyan answered that they were.

There was a break and the next session dealt with a presentation from the three Middle School Principals. Mr. Ralph Mayo, Ms. Shelley Somers and Ms. Terry Starr-Klein presented to the Committee their roles as Instructional Leaders, Operations Managers and Community Collaborators.

The principals methodically went through a series of anecdotal and real situations they are confronted with on a daily basis generating a lengthy discussion with a variety of questions.

After the conclusion of the middle school principal presentations, Mr. Branyan held a short discussion on the finances of the Public School Lunch Fund and announced that the negative fund balance situation has been rectified.

The Board of Education presentation now proceeded into a review of Board of Education Capital Projects, and Ms Chipouras joined Mr. Branyan and Dr. Lulow. Mr. Branyan stated that the total Capital Project request for fiscal year 2012-2013 was $22,452,900.

Mr. Pellegrino proceeded to go through each BOE Capital Project request as follows:

Technology - $658,700 – The Committee discussed the technology request and Mr. Pellegrino asked if the Information Technology (IT) Departments for the Town and Board of Education work together in collaboration. Mr. Branyan answered that the two IT Departments do talk and there is some collaboration. Mr. Pellegrino questioned the request for the district phone system and referenced the work done by the previous BET Audit Committee in this area. Ms. Chipouras responded and justified the request for the Committee members. Mr. Pellegrino asked how the 311 system played out for the school district. Ms. Chipouras offered no comment indicating they were totally unaware of the Town's efforts in this area.

Interiors - $147,000 – This is a request for district wide school furniture replacement and to replace shades and blinds at the International School of Dundee. Mr. Pellegrino questioned whether Board of Education officials could find saving throughout their current request and replace the seats in the Central Middle School (CMS).

Building Envelope & Structure – Abatement - $315,000 – The Committee asked what this item was. Ms. Chipouras responded it was simply district wide asbestos abatement and repair consistent with the current District Asbestos Management Plan.

Consultant Fees for Next FY Capital Projects - $500,000 – This is a normal reoccurring request to start school construction projects when school ends. The funds are needed to have construction documents prepared and bidding completed prior to the availability of the remaining capital projects funding each year.
Interiors – Bathroom Renovations - $578,800 – This request is for renovations of existing bathrooms at Old Greenwich and Riverside Schools.

Interiors – Finishes - $622,800 – The Committee asked what this request was for. Ms. Chipouras responded by stating that it is to meet the painting needs of the district. When asked how many painters the school district has, Ms. Chipouras responded that there are two full-time painters at the high school. The remaining schools utilize custodians to do the painting, mainly during school breaks.

Interiors – Carpentry - $547,300 – This is a request for carpentry work, mainly at Western Middle School with some hardware replacement district wide.

Building Envelope & Structure – Life Cycle Replacements - $1,455,100 – This request is for the replacement of exterior doors and windows at Western Middle and Old Greenwich Schools.

Mechanical System Upgrades - $3,157,400 – This request is for work on mechanical systems including heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems at a variety of schools.

Building Envelope & Structure – Capital Maintenance – $173,400 – This request is for code upgrades at Central Middle School and Havemeyer.

MEP & Utilities – Electrical System Upgrades – $789,300 – This request is for existing electrical systems including fire alarms, egress lighting, lighting, security systems and electrical distribution systems at Central and Western Middle Schools. There is a component for security work district wide which prompted an extended discussion of the existing security at the high school and the need to extend it to the middle schools.

Specialty Space – GHS Music Instructional Space and Auditorium (MISA) - $12,215,000 – This is the second phase of the funding for the MISA project. The first phase was funded for $17 million last year. When asked if additional security cameras to link into the GHS system were included, Ms. Chipouras answered yes. There was a discussion about the $400,000 added to the cost of the project anticipating the cost of phasing. Also, $800,000 which had been budgeted to be appropriated in FY'13/'14 was moved forward. Ms. Chipouras and Ms. Moriarty informed the Committee that school construction reimbursements had not been authorized by the State of Connecticut yet. These reimbursements are for the construction phase only and due not include the cost of the parking lots and drainage improvements which were previously appropriated. Ms. Chipouras added that the reimbursements are contingent on the full authorization of the project and no conditions being placed on the project.

Specialty Space – MISA – Soil Contamination - $2,070,000 – This request is made up of two parts. Part 1 is to return $1,470,000 of the MISA contingency that was used to assess and address the soil contamination last summer and currently. Part 2 is for an additional $600,000 to address the additional cost of the removal of contaminated soil within the MISA footprint.

Specialty Space – Technology Education – $300,000 – This request is for renovation of the Technical Education spaces including the Transportation and Construction Shop areas. This request supplements an additional amount included in the MISA Construction budget.

Exterior Projects – $50,000 is the remainder for miscellaneous courtyard repairs.
The meeting adjourned for a lunch break at 12:42 P.M. and reconvened at 1:11 P.M.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary

______________________________
Joseph Pellegrino, Chairman

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL
Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

SPEAKERS

1. Fleet Department – Mr. Pellegrino stated that he felt the salaries line was off for the Fleet budget. Mr. Domeseck agreed that salaries were off by about $15,000, due to a calculation error and this would also include overtime calculations. Mr. Pellegrino directed Mr. Gieger to add this adjustment to the list of “adds and deletes” of budget adjustments. In addition the following other areas were covered:

   • Number of Vehicles – Mr. Domeseck distributed a number of materials about the number of vehicles serviced by the Fleet Department and the amounts of miles driven. There was an extended discussion about the maintenance of the vehicles including the hybrid vehicles purchased by the Town. Mr. Lalli offered that the hybrid vehicles were partially grant reimbursable. Mr. Pellegrino requested that Mr. Domeseck provide the Committee with additional materials relative to the vehicles and their usage.

   • Fuel Increase – Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Domeseck about fuel increases. Mr. Domeseck indicated that as of July 2011 diesel fuel was selling at $2.39 per gallon. He stated the price of diesel fuel went up to $3.27 per gallon in September 2011. Mr. Domeseck also noted that the Town was locked into a one
year contract for diesel through September 2012. Mr. Domeseck indicated that they were paying $2.70 per gallon for gasoline in December 2011 and they are working on a cost plus market basis. Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Domeseck how he budgeted for fiscal year 2012-2013 if you don’t know the future price of fuels. Mr. Domeseck stated that they estimate the prices. Mr. Crary informed the Committee that Purchasing does all of the bidding for fuels and they are constantly monitoring market conditions.

Ms. Tarkington asked about supplying fuels to external entities. Mr. Domeseck answered that they supply fuels to the American Red Cross and the Transportation Association of Greenwich (TAG). He also stated that they get reimbursed through a charge back system for the fuels used by those entities.

- GPS System – Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Domeseck for an update on putting GPS units into Town vehicles. Mr. Domeseck answered that the Town went through a trial period with four units and will be requesting funds through the Capital Improvements Projects process to equip Town vehicles, excluding public safety vehicles. Mr. Domeseck also told the Committee that there was $70,000 budgeted in line item #380-54210 (Maintenance – Data Word Processing) to monitor the units.

- Status of New Fleet Maintenance Software – Mr. Domeseck distributed an illustrative document regarding the use of the Fleet Maintenance software and said the product was working well.

Other – Mr. Pellegrino asked about the increase in line item #380-54220 (Maintenance of Machinery, Tools) of $35,000. Mr. Domeseck answered that the increase was attributed to one time purchases consisting of a tire changing machine and a press for the shop.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Domeseck if he wanted to comment on the achievements of the department. Mr. Domeseck answered that he is most proud of the fact that more vehicle maintenance work is being done in-house saving money. He also informed the Committee that employee vacancies are hurting the department. Mr. Domeseck offered that they are experiencing difficulties recruiting capable mechanics. Mr. Finger asked if the pay scale was adequate. Mr. Domeseck answered that the compensation and benefits were good.

2. Nathaniel Witherell – Mr. Pellegrino started the discussion by saying he wants the Nathaniel Witherell budget page to be restructured. He referenced the two contributions of $1 million each and directed that they be taken out of the revenue section since they are not revenues and simply transfers. The Committee members concurred and Mr. Gieger agreed to restructure the page.

Mr. Augustine began by saying that construction is scheduled to start in September 2012 and should take 17 to 19 months to complete. He offered that if that schedule is held the Nathaniel Witherell budget, as presented, would be the same as the one submitted and reviewed by the Health Dimensions Group.
• Census Data – Budget Sensitivity – There were a number of budgetary documents distributed and Mr. Bankson directed the attention of the Committee members to one particular document indicating census data was down through December 2011. He indicated that it was primarily due to less private pay patients entering the nursing facility creating a year-to-date shortfall of $678,190. In addition, Mr. Bankson strongly objected to the inclusion of fringe benefits in the Nathaniel Witherell budget and asked for some relief from the Committee. Mr. Pellegrino agreed to schedule Al Cava, Town Labor Negotiator, to a future budget meeting to discuss benefit issues.

• Fund Raising – Mr. Bankson introduced Mr. Scott Neff, an employee of the Friends of Nathaniel Witherell, to the Committee. Mr. Bankson stated that Mr. Neff was in charge of fund raising for the Nathaniel Witherell facility and was preparing for several fund raising functions to support the nursing home. The short-term goal being $1,000,000 in contributions for Nathaniel Witherell in fiscal year 2012-2013.

• FY 2012 – 2013 Budget vs. Long Range Plan – Mr. Pellegrino indicated that in his opinion the Nathaniel Witherell was looking at a potential $600,000 deficit for the current year based on the materials distributed by Nathaniel Witherell officials. Mr. Bankson again referenced declining census as a contributing factor along with the inclusion of high fringe benefit reimbursements back to the Town as reasons for the shortfall.

3. Health Department – Mr. Pellegrino asked for an historical perspective on the funding for the Emergency Preparedness full-time new position request. Ms. Baisley started by saying that this is a three-year grant commitment and the job is currently being done by part-time personnel. She also added that it is hard to have control over these personnel because they work for other jurisdictions. Ms. Baisley told the Committee the funding for the position started in 2003 as a result of a perceived need caused by the September 2001 terrorist attacks. She said that there have been multiple people in this position over the years.

Mr. Pellegrino asked for an explanation of what is missing without a full-time position. Ms. Baisley reminded the Committee that the Health Department has lost three and one half positions since the spring of 2009 layoffs. Ms. Baisley stated these former employees would assist her with this function but this assistance has been lost due to those layoffs. Mr. Pellegrino asked if this function could be done by a consultant as opposed to a union employee. Ms. Baisley offered that they did previously attempt to do this through the use of a consultant through the Greenwich Emergency Medical Services, Inc. (GEMS), but it did not last.

Mr. Gieger was asked about the full cost of the new positions, to which he answered that it would cost about $110,000 or $66,000 more than the grant reimbursement portion.

Mr. Ramer asked if emergency preparedness could be centralized in light of its functions partially existing in a number of different Town departments. Mr. Tesei responded by saying that we work in a decentralized environment and fortunately the collective departments work well together.

As a closing comment, Mr. Finger wondered if the grant would still be available after the three year commitment period and if not, what action we would take relative to keeping the position.
• Information Technology Department – Mr. Hutorin informed the Committee that the Information Technology (IT) Department had been impacted by the CityView and Document Imaging capital projects over recent years regarding increased work load demands. Mr. Hutorin also referenced a recent study requested by the Human Resources Department to study the IT Department that suggested the department is over worked and under staffed. He stated that for these reasons, that is the basis for his request for an additional full-time position. Mr. Pellegrino asked if a part-time employee would work. Mr. Hutorin responded no. Mr. Pellegrino recommended putting together a working group to study the Town wide IT working environment. He stated that we have individual pockets of IT groups in a number of different areas such as; Police Department, Library and Board of Education as examples.

• GIS Refresh – Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Hutorin when the last aerial photo session occurred. Mr. Hutorin stated that the last fly over was five years ago. Mr. Hutorin informed the Committee that the $500,000 CIP request was not an IT request. He said the request was coming from the Land Use Departments. Mr. Pellegrino directed Mr. Gieger to schedule the Land Use Departments to come in at a future budget meeting to discuss the request. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the GIS produced any revenues and Mr. Hutorin answered about $20,000 per year.

Ms. Tarkington asked about the cost for the new website. Mr. Hutorin answered it cost $50,000 for the consultant to create a new website.

Ms. Tarkington asked Mr. Hutorin about his views on departments, like Nathaniel Witherell, going off and creating their own websites. Mr. Hutorin stated he had a negative view on such actions and that in his mind, they were not justified. However, Mr. Orfary stated that in this particular case, he felt the Nathaniel Witherell was justified in developing their own website because they needed to compete in the larger community of health care facilities.

4. Parks and Recreation Department – Mr. Siciliano gave the Committee an update on the status of the Town’s tree crews. He stated that since Mr. Jim Lash, previous First Selectman, started trying to privatize the tree crews, they are down five people. He added that as of December 2011, the Town does not have an outsourced agreement with the Teamsters. Mr. Finger asked about emergencies. Mr. Siciliano answered that the Town can override the contract for contracting outside tree services in emergency situations. Mr. Siciliano added that there is a misconception about how many tree crews the Town has. He offered that the Town originally had five, three man crews, and the Town currently has two, five man crews. He also stated that when emergencies arise, the department can deploy existing current staff creating 3 crews. Mr. Pellegrino suggested that prevention of accidents may be considered grounds for declaring an emergency and that the Town may wish to proceed with contracting outside services and proceed with addressing the backlog of trees on public property that need to be addressed.

• School Ground Maintenance – Mr. Siciliano told the Committee that Parks and Recreation took over school field maintenance in 1998. He stressed that they maintain the fields and not the associated landscaping around the school buildings. Mr. Siciliano offered that they do target certain schools each year for extra work with additional funds.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Siciliano what he thought about the conditions of the Town’s fields today. Mr. Siciliano stated that the overall conditions of the Town’s fields were
good. However, he added that a number of fields were improperly engineered and there are irrigation issues with those fields.

Ms. Tarkington asked about the Organic Turf Program and whether it should be in the operating budget or capital budget. Mr. Siciliano answered it is a tough call and it could go either way. Mr. Siciliano used the analogy of painting in Town and School buildings, stating they could be considered either operating or capital expenses. Mr. Siciliano stated that it is discretionary and can go either way.

- Water Runoff Testing – Mr. Pellegrino asked for an explanation of what this testing was. Mr. Siciliano answered it was a State of Connecticut mandated program to test water runoff at the marinas in five locations. Mr. Pellegrino asked if we could quantify the list of state mandated programs and how much they cost. Mr. Tesei answered the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities routinely questions state mandates and tracks their costs to Towns.

The Committee recessed at 12:21 P.M. for lunch and reconvened at 12:38 P.M.

5. **Fire Department** – Fire Chief Siecienski started the discussion by informing the Committee that the Town has gone six consecutive years without a fire fatality. He credits this to safety awareness and fire alarms.

- Volunteers – Fire Chief Siecienski briefed the Committee on the status of the Recruitment and Retention Coordinator and how it is being put under the direction of the Training Officer. He also stated the position is currently under review with Ali Cava, the Town’s Labor Negotiator. Fire Chief Siecienski was asked about how the Paid and Volunteer staff were working together. He responded that it has its peaks and valley but overall it works well. Mr. Pellegrino inquired about the Volunteer Insurance review and if there was a policy, as requested by the BET, in place and whether it was working. Chief Siecienski responded that we will know after March 1st when we implement the new policies. He added the we now have accurate monthly records and a full evaluation of the those eligible will be assessed after March 1st. Mr. Pellegrino asked as to when we will see reductions in the costs for volunteer insurance coverage. Chief Siecienski answered after March 1st.

Chief Siecienski was asked to explain account #208-51420 (Professional Medical and Dental) – He responded that the account was for physicals for volunteers.

Chief Siecienski was asked to explain account #208-51490 (Professional & Other Special Services – NOC) – He responded it was for stipends for call outs and fire watches. Mr. Pellegrino asked who is responsible for the accuracy of such reporting. Chief Siecienski responded that the district chiefs are responsible for the accuracy of call outs.

- Need for Two New Pumpers – Assistant Chief Kick distributed a number of materials on the Fire Department vehicle inventory, including volunteer vehicles. There was an extended discussion about the need for the two additional pumpers requested in the capital projects budget and which equipment they would be replacing. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the distributed materials could be reformatted. Assistant Chief Kick answered that it would not be a problem since they already have that information now and promised to supply the Committee.
Assistant Chief Kick informed the Committee that account #205-53950 (Supplies and Materials) had been unexpectedly zeroed out and there was a need to restore $11,550 to that account.

- **Public Works Department** – Ms. Siebert distributed a document that explained the single stream process and a discussion ensued on the process. Mr. Ramer asked about out of towners dumping illegally at the facility and if there is adequate enforcement. Ms. Siebert stated there is a dedicated waste checker and there is also a notification program in place.

- **Staffing for Capital Projects** – Ms. Siebert stated that the department will go into greater detail during the BET Budget Reviews for Capital Projects.

- **Utility Costs** – Ms. Siebert deferred to Ron Lalli and the Purchasing Department. She stated that they are not responsible for the bidding of the utilities. Mr. Pellegrino acknowledged that this was covered earlier in the day. Mr. Pellegrino asked Ms. Siebert about the snow removal budget. Ms. Siebert informed the Committee that they had budgeted $400,000 for overtime and the actual spent to date was $515,000. However, she added that the account had been replenished with a supplemental appropriation.

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary

Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman
EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Upon a motion by Mr. Ramer, seconded by Ms. Tarkington, the Committee voted unanimously to enter into executive session at 6:31 P.M. to discuss litigation matters.

In attendance were:
Peter Mynarski, Comptroller; Roland Gieger, Budget Director; John Crary, Town Administrator; James Heavey, Chief; Mark Kordick, Captain, Operations Division; Greg Hannigan, Director, General Services Division, Police Department; Allen Brown, Executive Director; Ray Augustine, Director of Financial Operations, Nathaniel Witherell

The committee voted unanimously to leave executive session at 6:45 P.M. to discuss litigation matters.

SE-7  First Selectman – Additional Appropriation $15,000

Additional Appropriation:
$ 15,000 to P935-57350 Settlement – Kelsey vs. TOG
$ 15,000 from Risk Fund Balance
The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a routine application.

**PD-2 Police – Additional Appropriation $600,000**

Additional Appropriation:
$ 600,000 to F2138-59250-12199 Patrol Boat

This item was withdrawn after Town Council, Mr. Wayne Fox, advised the Committee that there was no need for this item to go before the RTM a second time.

**PD-6 Police – Approval to Use $54,860**

Approval to Use:
$ 29,944 to F2139-53070 Data/WP Supplies
$16,526 to F2139-53550 Mech. Supplies/Small Tools
$  8,390 to F2139-51460 Professional Services
$ 54,860 from F2139-43493 911 Grants/Municipal

Captain Kordick explained that these Grant funds are specifically for public safety communications, and will be used to install videotaping and archiving equipment in order to monitor police interviews and interrogations. A discussion followed regarding the IT Department, the equipments’ specifications, product research and customer support.

**PB-1 Probate Court – Transfer $13,000**

Transfer:
$ 13,000 to A120-53010 Office Supplies
$ 13,000 from A120-52190 Document Imaging

This item was withdrawn.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Nathaniel Witherell Building Committee Request for Release of Conditions**

In November, the BET approved funding for Nathaniel Witherell’s Project Renew subject to several conditions. Mr. Pellegrino explained that one of the subject to release conditions that was placed by the BET was to change the relationship with the construction Manager (Turner Construction Co.) from the current At Risk Contract to an Agency Contract. The Committee proceeded to review a letter regarding this Subject to Release, dated February 6, 2012, from Mr. H. Andrew Fox, Chair, Nathaniel Witherell Building Committee.

Mr. Fox gave an overview of the request, highlighting the pros, cons, and fees associated with the Construction Manager as Contractor, Agency, and a suggested Cost Plus Hybrid Solution. A lengthy discussion followed regarding the differences between the types of contracts, contract requirements, Nathaniel Witherell operations, comparisons to other Town projects, and costs.
Ms. Tarkington stated that when the format was developed there was the opportunity to have an owners’ representative, and although the Building Committee has come with an alternative that apparently can be done, it does not mitigate, in terms of the overall risk, some of the risk that might otherwise be mitigated by Turners’ changing their role to be an Agent, and therefore she would like to see some type of owners’ representative support.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ramer, seconded by Mr. Finger, the Committee voted 3-1-0 (Ms. Tarkington opposed), to recommend to the BET to release the condition subject to the Nathaniel Witherell Building Committee proceeding by eliminating the guaranteed maximum price and enter into the Cost Plus Hybrid solution that they proposed in their correspondence to the Budget Committee, February 6, 2012.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Report of Status of Current Economic Conditions

The Committee reviewed the Selected Revenues and Spending Rate, January 2012, highlighting expenses, and fund balance. Mr. Gieger explained that the increased expense due to the H.S.A. healthcare contributions, which should be offset by the lower healthcare premiums at year-end.

Approval of the July 1, 2011, Retirement System of the Town of Greenwich Actuarial Review and Analysis

The Committee reviewed the July 1, 2011, Retirement System of the Town of Greenwich Actuarial Review and Analysis. Mr. Mynarski gave an overview of the three options on pp. 1. A, discussion followed regarding assumptions, the options, prior years’ contribution and forecast, and the current budget.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ramer, seconded by Ms. Tarkington, the Committee voted 4-0 to approve the July 1, 2011, Retirement System of the Town of Greenwich Actuarial Review and Analysis, Option #2, which was to reduce the assumed rate of return from 8.0% to 7.75% and to reduce the assumed rate of inflation from 3.50% to 3.25%.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Budget Committee Regular Monthly Meeting, January 18, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the January 18, 2012, Budget Committee Regular Monthly Meeting.

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 P.M.
Respectfully submitted,

Maria Bocchino, Recording Secretary

Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL
Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M. He welcomed everyone to the Capital Budget Review on the 2012–2013 Budget.

Department Speakers and Topics Covered

FINANCE DEPARTMENT – REVENUE AND FIXED CHARGES PRESENTATIONS – Mr. Mynarski distributed two power point presentations to the Budget Committee covering revenues and fixed charges cost for the fiscal year 2012-2013 budget. During the presentation, Mr. Mynarski answered questions relative to the two presentations.

FIRE DEPARTMENT – Review of Apparatus Usage – Fire Chief Siecienski and Assistant Chief Kick were asked to return from a previous budget meeting to further explain the Fire Department’s capital request for two rescue pumpers for $600,000 each. Mr. Pellegrino asked Chief Siecienski if the department could get by with one rescue pumper. Chief Siecienski reminded the Committee that the replacement of Engine #4 was deferred from last year and it takes almost a year from order date to replace the apparatus being requested. Chief Siecienski further explained in great detail that the two pieces of apparatus being requested are necessary. Chief Siecienski, in response to questions, explained the replacement sequence over the next couple of years. Chief Siecienski explained that the first apparatus request was for two rescue...
pumpers to replace Engine numbers 4 and 8 in fiscal year 2012-2013. He further explained that the next request would be to replace Engine numbers 5 and 3 in fiscal year 2013-2014. Finally, Chief Siecienski offered that there would be a request for another rescue pumper in fiscal year 2014-2015 that would be a new request for the King Street Fire Station and not a replacement. Mr. Finger asked about call out statistics on the equipment at the Glenville Fire Station. Assistant Chief Kick responded by referencing the "Career Staffed Apparatus and Volunteer Apparatus Town Owned" statistics sheets distributed to the Committee members. He stated that there were 1,137 calls for Engine #4 in calendar year 2011 and 51 calls for Engine #41 for calendar year 2011 from the Glenville Fire Station.

GIS – Discussion by Stakeholders – Based on comments from Mr. Hutorin at a previous Budget Committee meeting, Mr. Pellegrino requested that the stakeholders to the $500,000 GIS capital request for an aerial flyover be present to answer questions. Panelists consisting of Diane Fox, Denise Savageau, Greg Sullivan and Boris Hutorin appeared to answer questions. Mr. Pellegrino asked who is responsible in explaining the request and who could give a short historical perspective on the project. Mr. Hutorin volunteered by stating it is an event that usually occurs every five years with an aerial flyover. The remaining panelists explained the value of the updated GIS data to their respective departments. Mr. Pellegrino asked if there would be a parallel state or federal flyover that the Town could take advantage of. Mr. Boris responded that no one knows for sure. Mr. Sullivan countered by stating the State of Connecticut is doing a flyover but the resolution of the aerial photography is not in complete compliance with the Town’s requirements for resolution clarity. Mr. Sullivan also offered that the Southwest Regional Planning Agency (SWRPA) was doing a regional flyover. SWRPA represents a number of Fairfield County Towns. Mr. Finger inquired as to how many firms provide this type of service of aerial photography. Mr. Sullivan responded that about half a dozen firms perform the services. Ms. Tarkington offered that the Assessor’s office is dependent on the GIS data and utilizes the property information to provide additional revenue to the Town though the discovery process.

Mr. Ramer asked the panelists if there was collaboration with neighboring communities on aerial photography. Mr. Sullivan responded yes, absolutely that the towns work together.

The Committee, upon further discussions, learned that the capital request could be lowered and the aerial flyover costs were only about $25,000 of the total costs. Mr. Sullivan was directed to give Mr. Gieger a lower estimate of the costs.

PUBLIC WORKS – Holly Hill Master Plan – Amy Siebert and James Michel appeared to answer questions relative to the $2,000,000 Holly Hill Master Plan capital project. Ms. Siebert offered that the improvements needed at the Holly Hill Transfer Station include the separation of residential operations from commercial operations for safety, the construction of a solid waste office building and highway garage, storm water improvements, dredging of the pond on the site and landscaping improvements. Ms. Siebert stated that the initial phase of the project would include replacing the scale, the scale house and relocating the sewer line and that these were high priority items.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Ms. Siebert on how the department was doing regarding the management of the overall capital projects workload. Ms. Siebert responded that they are managing the workload well but were held back a little by the sewer consent decree requirements.

There was a limited discussion on the following capital projects; the Town Hall Roof, the Grass Island Restrooms and the Town-wide Restroom Rehabilitation capital projects.
There was an extended discussion on Sewer Projects. Mr. Feminella distributed a presentation on the status of Sewer Division Sewer Projects and answered the Committee questions relative to the review.

After the Sewer Projects review, Mr. Pellegrino proceeded to go through each sewer capital project request listed in the Selectman's Capital Budget for Fiscal Year July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. The question came up about which projects are Sewer Maintenance and which are Sewer Improvement projects. Mr. Gieger explained the difference and alerted the Committee members to impending large tax increases in the Sewer Maintenance Fund. For illustrative purposes, Mr. Gieger and Mr. Mynarski pointed out in the budget book the large increase in the mill rate for the next fiscal year being at 17.65% and they would continue to be large due to the large capital requests in this area.

**Greenwich Emergency Medical Service, Inc. (GEMS) —** Ms. Tufts distributed a power point presentation regarding the GEMS operations and history. Ms. Tufts started to discuss the presentation. Mr. Pellegrino reminded Ms. Tufts that the BET Budget Committee and other BET members had already witnessed the presentation and preferred a question and answer session in lieu of repeating the previously observed presentation.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Ms. Tufts to explain what the $250,000 capital request was for. Mr. Tesei responded for Ms. Tufts by answering that the request was to put GEMS at the Boy Scout Reservation. A discussion ensued whereby the Budget Committee was informed that GEMS did not have an agreement with the Boy Scouts regarding the use of Boy Scout property.

Mr. Finger expressed his concern that this request was before the Committee without a definite site to build on being identified.

Mr. Pellegrino offered as a suggestive alternative to fund this project initially through fund raising. Mr. Pellegrino also asked that a comprehensive plan including GEMS vision for a headquarters be presented.

Mr. Ramer asked if Ms. Tuft thought the present site where GEMS Medic # 4 is being stationed was a suitable location. Ms. Tufts expressed that the Town has been working on seeking a site location for a year and a half and there is still no resolution to this matter. Ms. Tuft in further response to Mr. Ramer stated that the King Street site is adequate but could be more ideal.

Mr. Ramer also asked if the $250,000 request is partially to find a site for GEMS. Mr. Kriskey answered yes.

Mr. Finger asked if GEMS can’t move forward on finding a site if the King Street location is ok. Mr. Monelli then proceeded to describe the King Street building in various degrees of disrepair and strongly does not recommend it for GEMS.

**Senior Center Renovation —** Mr. Pellegrino asked for an explanation of the $400,000 capital request for the Senior Center Interior Upgrade Program. Mr. Monelli gave the Committee members an update and reasons for the capital request.

**LED Street Lights Cost Savings —** Mr. Crary spoke to the $295,000 capital request for the Purchase and Maintenance of Street Lights. Mr. Crary started by saying there are 2,907 streetlights currently in town. In addition, Mr. Crary stated that the Town pays the Connecticut Light and Power Company $470,000 annually for the costs to maintain those streetlights. Mr.
Crary's suggestion is to buy the streetlights on behalf of the Town and maintain them through a third-party vendor. Mr. Crary added that the cost would be approximately $289,000 saving the Town about $170,000 annually.

**Town Hall Space Utilization** – Mr. Pellegrino asked for an explanation for the $200,000 request for town hall projects. Mr. Monelli responded that the current plan calls for the space currently occupied by Retirement Administration on the first floor to be occupied by Administrative Services. He added that people in Administrative Services on the ground floor would move up to the first floor and the Health Laboratory would be renovated. Mr. Pellegrino asked if he needed the entire $200,000. Mr. Monelli answered that he would need the $200,000 to finish the job already started this year with prior year space utilization monies and a grant from the State of Connecticut.

**Temporary Fire Station** – Mr. Pellegrino asked about the status of the temporary fire station at the Horse Neck Lot. Mr. Monelli responded that the appropriation was for $1,225,000. Mr. Monelli informed the Committee that the bid came in for $989,000 by Wernert Construction and there were additional costs of about $170,000 for the project. Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Monelli if he had enough funds to complete the job. Mr. Monelli responded that he had about $70,000 left and yes he had enough funds to complete this phase of the project. Mr. Monelli also answered that the job was on schedule and he expected the general contractor to start construction about June 2012. He then added that they would concentrate on demolition of the Central Fire House after completion of the temporary fire station at the Horse Neck Lot.

The Budget Committee recessed for lunch at 1:01 P.M. and reconvened at 1:31 P.M.

**PARKS AND RECREATION** – Dredging (Permit Status) – Mr. Pellegrino asked about the $1,000,000 request to dredge the Cos Cob Marina. Mr. Siciliano informed the Committee that the Cos Cob Marina had not been dredged in about 20 years and they were experiencing severe silting from the Mianus River. Mr. Siciliano offered that they had reduced the costs down from the original request of $1,800,000.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if there would be a Request for Proposals for the project. Mr. Freidag responded that the project would be competitively bid and that three or four firms would bid.

At this point, Mr. Pellegrino requested an update on the capital request of $150,000 for the Byram Pool Master Plan. Mr. Siciliano started by saying the Byram property was purchased in the 1970’s. He added that 27,000 people frequent the beach and pool location each year and overall 49,000 people frequent the entire park each year. Mr. Siciliano stated the pool is leaking and they are unable to determine its origin. Mr. Pellegrino asked about the annual cost associated with the water leakage and Mr. Siciliano answered about $4,000 per year.
Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Siciliano to describe what he is proposing for the additional total cost of $7,500,000. Mr. Siciliano stated the plan calls for a new pool, pool support building, beach entry structure which will include beach restrooms, ticketing and concession stand and increased parking to support park and ADA requirements. In exchange, the existing pool, pool house, concession, ticket booth, locker building and beach restroom will be removed.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if there are any potential limitations to this plan. Ms. Siebert responded first by saying there are sewage capacity limitations that could impact this project. Mr. Monelli added that there is a further limitation regarding parking availability. Mr. Monelli explained that additional parking spaces would be needed. Mr. Monelli clarified his statements by saying that the parking area would have to accommodate 300 people per day. The increased attendance would be attributed to the increased size of the pool. Mr. Monelli stated the request would be to build a 6,000 square foot pool up from the current size of 1,675 square feet. When asked about the cost, Mr. Monelli said it is premature to estimate the cost.

Ms. Tarkington asked about the increase in cost from a previous request of $6.5 million to $7.5 million. Mr. Monelli answered that the increase in cost was attributable to the expansion of parking space needs.

Ms. Tarkington asked about increased operational costs. Mr. Siciliano answered there will be no request to increase full time staff, but there will be an increased need for more lifeguards and seasonal part time staff. Mr. Siciliano stressed that the pool would be for recreational use only and there would be no competitive use for the pool for non-recreational users.

Mr. Pellegrino asked about the status of last year’s appropriation of $100,000. Mr. Siciliano answered that there was a contribution of $45,000 from the Town Pool Committee and about $25,000 of the $100,000 had been spent to date.

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

__________________________________________
Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary

__________________________________________
Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman
SPEAKERS

Healthcare – Mr. Crary started the discussion by stating he has been the acting Human Resources Director since the departure of the previous director, Maureen Kast. Mr. Crary informed the Committee that there would be a new full time director on March 5th.

Mr. Crary explained that working on controlling healthcare costs for the Town of Greenwich was a priority and a team effort. He described the team as consisting of Alison Graham, Al Cava, Larry Simon and the Town healthcare vendor and consultant Ovation Benefits. Mr. Crary stressed that current Town healthcare costs are trending negatively. He added fortunately we are locked into a favorable contract with Cigna, the current provider. Ms. Graham added that the town recently switched healthcare providers to Cigna from Aetna on December 31, 2012. Ms. Graham distributed several documents relative to the Healthcare Budget for the 2012-2013 Fiscal Year and costs of the plan by category. Ms. Graham stated that healthcare costs were down because of the large migrations of Town and Board of Education employees over recent year to Health Savings Accounts (HAS).

Mr. Pellegrino asked what the Town is currently doing to curtail future healthcare costs. Ms. Graham offered that through labor negotiations they are trying to reduce costs by changing the plan designs and are offering wellness programs. Ms. Graham offered to the Committee that the Town vendor, Ovation Benefits, has stated that the Town of Greenwich is a trailblazer in the area of healthcare innovations.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Ms. Graham how the Town stays current in the area of healthcare. Ms. Graham answered she stays current by reading, receiving mailing updates and is also provided educational assistance from the consulting vendor, Ovation Benefits.
Mr. Pellegrino asked about the future governmental excise tax regarding our healthcare plan. Ms. Graham informed the Committee that the Town could be subject to the “Cadillac Plan Tax” if changes were not made to the impending healthcare legislation. She added that Dustin Anderson and Al Cava are currently doing research in this area.

At the conclusion of the healthcare discussion, the Committee had additional time before the next speakers and Mr. Crary gave the Committee an update on several contracts out for bid. Mr. Crary reported that the news was good with large anticipated savings in the electricity and natural gas contracts in future years.

Police – Greg Hannigan, Captain Kordick and Police Chief Heavey appeared before the Committee to discuss the Radio System Evaluation and Design Study for the planned upgrade of the Town’s existing 800-MHz radio communications system to be budgeted in fiscal year 2013-2014.

Captain Kordick started the discussion by informing the Committee that the current system is about 20 years old. Captain Kordick added that 20 years ago all Town communications were bundled into one system and because the Police Department was the largest user they oversaw its daily operations. Besides the aging component of the system, Captain Kordick told the Committee that the current vendor, Motorola, could not guarantee replacement parts after December 31, 2012. Captain Kordick did concede that they had enough backup parts to last a few years with Motorola.

Mr. Pellegrino asked about the annual cost and what would happen if the system went down. Captain Kordick answered the current annual contract cost with Motorola was $124,000. He added that in the event of a system failure, the operations revert to a car to car communications system. Chief Heavey added that there have been brief failures in the past and the department has gone to a mobile unit backup system. Chief Heavey cited, as an example, how Greenwich helped the City of Norwalk, CT when their system went down.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if other municipalities are in a similar predicament with Motorola. Chief Heavey offered that the State of Connecticut was currently upgrading its system. Captain Kordick added that the current system has been taken to the end of its useful life and with the ever changing technologies and we need to adapt.

Mr. Pellegrino asked how the Town stays knowledgeable in this area of communications technology. Captain Kordick responded that there are vendor training opportunities that he and others in the department take advantage of.

Mr. Ramer asked for a further more detailed explanation of the $155,000 capital request. Captain Kordick answered that we are developing an implementation plan for the Town to find consultants who can develop an adequate Request for Proposal to meet our needs for this system.

Ms. Tarkington asked why the Police Department has taken the lead on this project and if the Town’s Information Technology Department (I.T.) had been consulted. Captain Kordick explained that there are approximately 600 pieces of radio and related communications equipment and the Police Department uses two thirds of the equipment and used this as a rational basis for the Police Department to take the lead. He added that the Town’s I.T.
Department was not consulted because they do not use the system and lack a familiarity with the system.

Mr. Huffman asked if there were any alternatives to Motorola. Captain Kordick stated there are many alternatives to Motorola. In addition, he offered that although Motorola may have an expensive product it has been a very reliable vendor over the years.

Mr. Finger asked if there are any grant monies available. Captain Kordick responded there are grant monies available but the State of Connecticut is keeping most of the available funds for themselves.

Mr. Finger restated a previous question about policeman running a communications system. Captain Kordick revisited the history of the communications systems. He stated that 20 years ago a different police chief felt the need to control the system for security purposes. Since that time, the Town has tried to civilianize it. Currently, there is only one policeman assigned to the predominantly civilian operation. Chief Heavey added that he felt that since the majority of the needs are with the Police Department it makes sense to oversee its operations by the Police Department.

Mr. Pellegrino offered his concerns regarding I.T. He stated he is not comfortable with current I.T. capabilities and the Town needs to develop a strategy toward I.T. town wide.

Mr. Ramer asked if the $88,000 request for the Public Safety Portable Radio Deployment Program Phase II capital request could be reduced and Captain Kordick answered yes, that it could be phased over two years.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if the $165,000 request for Storage Area Network (SAN) Upgrade is necessary and Captain Kordick answered yes it is needed at this time. Mr. Finger asked what this purchase was. Captain Kordick replied it is adding capacity to the current system.

The conversation turned to Police Compensatory Time. Chief Heavey explained the police compensatory time process to the Committee. He explained that currently a policeman can build up to 340 hours per state statute. However, he added that some police personnel are grandfathered in and there are also additional exceptions for certain police categories like the dog handlers. Chief Heavey stated that he had met previously with Mr. Finger and Mr. Mason on this subject and he was doing his best to reduce the outstanding amount owed to police personnel.

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the Town needs to build this into the budget and pay down the balance. In addition, Mr. Pellegrino requested the Chief to provide the BET with a monthly report on the progress toward reducing the liability. Chief Heavey agreed and reported the most current figure was down to about $890,000.

Mr. Pellegrino turned the Committee's attention to the overall Police Department budget and asked for explanations on several variances. Mr. Hannigan and Captain Kordick explained the variances to the Committee.

Labor Relations – There was a motion to go into executive session by Mr. Finger to discuss Labor Relations issues, seconded by Ms. Tarkington at 11:49 A.M. The motion carried by a vote of 4 to 0.
There was a motion to come out of executive session by Mr. Finger, seconded by Ms. Tarkington at 1:07 P.M. the motion carried by a vote of 4 to 0.

King Street Firehouse and the Location of GEMS Headquarters in the Western Sector of Town - First Selectman Tesei and Fire Chief Siecienski appeared to present their views on the location of a new firehouse and also the location of deploying GEMS personnel in the northwest part of Greenwich. First Selectman Tesei started by saying that there is a need for staffing additional firefighters on King Street. He also stated that he didn't think the Round Hill location is a viable alternative to staffing and meeting the needs of the northwest part of Greenwich. He also offered that he and his staff had looked at a number of alternatives to finding another location for a firehouse that included the Audubon and a number of properties on both Riversville Road and King Street.

First Selectman Tesei asked the Committee members to individually offer their opinions to solving this problem.

Ms. Tarkington responded first by stating the problem must be addressed immediately. Ms. Tarkington offered a solution to staff Glenville with four full time staff and two people at the Round Hill Fire House.

Mr. Ramer responded by saying he would like to initially look at each of the 21 locations researched by First Selectman Tesei staff as an alternative to the King Street site before deciding on the King Street location.

Mr. Finger offered that things have changed over the last six years. He stated that he would not rush into King Street until the 21 previously mentioned alternative sites were vetted further. Mr. Finger also responded that we need a full staffing model illustrated and wants to hear from Chief Siecienski on his plan for staffing the Town's fire departments.

Mr. Pellegrino stated we need comprehensive solutions. Mr. Pellegrino felt that looking at the 21 mentioned properties would not be fruitful but was willing to entertain reviewing their potential. Mr. Pellegrino said that he recognized the need for additional fire staffing in northwest Greenwich and the real issues need to be addressed. He also firmly stated that he won't support 16 more firefighters without operating offsets.

Mr. Mason strongly stated that we need to get back to the process. He directed the Committee members to vote on the release of conditions and to vote either yes or no. Mr. Mason then stated if you vote no, be prepared to offer a solution. He added that the King Street Fire House is taking up space in the capital model and the current dialogue is not helping. Mr. Mason stressed making a decision on this matter.

Mr. Pellegrino then asked Chief Siecienski to offer his staffing model to the Committee. Chief Siecienski started by saying that the King Street location is very close to the New York State border and half of the radial coverage is in New York. Chief Siecienski stated that a better and preferred location would be the site at John Street and Riversville Road near the Audubon.

When asked about the availability of grant funds to increase firefighter staffing, Chief Siecienski responded that he is not in favor of applying for the grant and doesn't feel that adding 48 grant funded positions is necessary to the needs of Greenwich. He added that his long-term goal is to have five fire stations responding to fire related emergencies.
Chief Siecienski then proceeded to provide the Committee with a variety of staffing scenarios involving the King Street and Glenville locations. He added that the Round Hill staffing suggestions were not viable and rejected them as a solution.

Mr. Tesei commended the Committee for its work on the budget this year and stated that he would direct his staff to send letters to the previously mentioned Riversville and King Street property owners to see if they want to sell their properties to the Town. He also requested the Committee to grant him and staff some more time to finalize a proposal to the Committee.

Mr. Pellegrino concluded by thanking everyone for coming and for all of their hard work.

The meeting adjourned at 3:08 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary
TOWN OF GREENWICH  
BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND TAXATION  
BUDGET COMMITTEE  
CONSOLIDATION DAY FY13 BUDGET  
MINUTES  
Cone Room, 2nd Floor – 9:00 A.M.  
Monday, February 27, 2012

Present:  
Committee:  Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman; William Finger, Jeff Ramer, Leslie L. Tarkington  
Staff:  Peter Mynarski, Comptroller; Roland Gieger, Budget Director;  
Board:  Michael Mason, Chairman, Sean Goldrick, Mary Lee Kiernan, Art Norton, Marc Johnson, Robert Brady  
Other:  John Crary, Town Administrator, Dustin Anderson, Executive Assistant to the First Selectman, Amy Siebert, Commissioner of Public Works, Dave Thomson, Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, James Michel, DPW Chief Engineer, Al Monelli, Superintendent, DPW Building Maintenance, Joseph Siciliano, Parks and Recreation Director, Thomas Greco, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director, Leslie Moriarty, BOE Chairwoman, Ben Branyan, BOE Managing Director of Operations, Dr. Roger Lulow, Superintendent of Schools, Anne Miller, Junior League President

Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

TOPICS

The BET Budget Committee and BET members in attendance were provided with a list of consolidation topics for today and any items requiring further action on Wednesday, February 29, 2012 at the BET Budget Committee Decision Day meeting. The topics generally covered revenues, expenses, and capital projects in a number of different areas.

Mr. Pellegrino welcomed members of the Junior League on a discussion regarding the funding for the Byram Beach/Pool Master Plan capital project. Representing the Junior League were Anne Miller, President, Dana Whamond, Chair of the Greenwich Pool and Byram Park Committee, and Sue Rogers. Alan Monelli of DPW also joined the group during this discussion. Mr. Pellegrino brought the members of the Junior League up to date on the status of the previously approved $100,000 capital request for the pool and park. Mr. Pellegrino stated the Town had received about $45,000 in private donations so far. He also informed the members that about $25,000 of the $100,000 had been spent to date. Ms. Miller spoke on the need to have updated visual materials and information detailing the total cost for the project. Ms. Miller stressed that these materials would be essential during their donation solicitation campaign. Mr. Pellegrino told the Junior League representatives that members of the Budget Committee supported the project but would like to spend the outstanding monies available first and have Mr. Monelli come back in the fall with an updated scope of the project with an estimated project cost. Mr. Pellegrino also stated that the BET would also have a better understanding of not only the cost of the Byram Beach/Pool Master Plan project but a better understanding of the costs...
associated with the Greenwich High School remediation project by then. Ms. Miller assured Mr. Pellegrino and the other Committee members that the Junior League and Byram Pool Committee members were on board with the way the Budget Committee was preceding as outlined by Mr. Pellegrino and her only concern would have been if the project came to a full stop.

Mr. Pellegrino asked Mr. Monelli if he was in agreement with all that was stated at this meeting and Mr. Monelli responded yes and that he would come back in the fall with an updated scope of the project and its associated estimated costs.

Mr. Finger asked Mr. Monelli what the $150,000 capital request would have accomplished. Mr. Monelli stated it would get you a survey of the property, prepare more detailed drawings and get the project through the approval process. Mr. Finger and Pellegrino indicated that they wanted to establish the scope of the project for review and a firm estimate of the cost of the project. They did not see the need to seek money for the approval process at this time so long as the Town and League were able to obtain the necessary information and materials each needed to move to the next step with the Pool and Park project. Ms. Miller repeated that she would want to have a packet of materials for potential private donations. Ms. Miller also stated that she would like to know the ultimate cost of the project to determine if it is cost prohibitive regarding their fund raising efforts. Mr. Monelli reiterated to the Committee and the League that with current funds available, and the offer of continued pro bono services by Mr. John Conte, he would be able to provide such information and materials.

Mr. Ramer asked Mr. Monelli how long it would take to determine the scope and cost of the project. Mr. Monelli responded six months.

Mr. Tarkington asked about the marginal operating costs attributed to this project. Mr. Monelli responded that he would obtain those costs and would use the Western Glenville Community Center as a model to estimate operating costs.

Subsequent to the Byram Pool review session, Mr. Pellegrino gave an overview of what he wished to accomplish during the ensuing budgetary review process. They were as follows:

1. Address the Hillside Road soil contamination issues with regard to funding the Town's liability.
2. Address the Police Department Compensatory Time issue regarding the funding of the liability.
3. Address the lack of adequate fire coverage in the Northwest Quadrant of the Town of Greenwich.

Mr. Pellegrino also suggested setting a mill rate target increase of no more than 2.75%; maintain compliance within the BET Fund Balance Policy range and enforcement of the BET Debt Limit Policy.

Mr. Pellegrino distributed a three page outline covering all topics he wanted the Budget Committee to address for Consolidation Day. The outlined detailed the following and each category was discussed by the members:

1. Setting a goal of 7.5% Fund Balance as a % of the Projected Budget
2. Attaining a Projected Mill Rate Increase of 2.75%, which currently requires $244,000 in either revenue or expenditure adjustments to attain.
3. Setting aside $7.0 million for Hillside Road Soil Remediation. Mr. Pellegrino stated that if $7 million was taken out of Projected General Fund Balance, the adjusted total fund balance would become 5.6% of the Projected Budget for all three funds (e.g. General Fund, Risk Fund and Capital Non-Recurring Fund).

4. Mr. Pellegrino suggested the following negative adjustments to the budget:

- Increase Fixed Charges Account # 901-57010 (Pension Contribution), the Annual Required Contribution to the Pension Plan by $800,000.
- Increase Fire Department Account # 205-53950 (Supplies and Materials) by $11,550. The monies were inadvertently cut from the budget.
- Increase Fixed Charges Account # 901-57940 (Special Accounting) by $53,750. This adjustment was due to the retirement of the Retirement Administrator. The position was not funded thereby reducing fringe benefits for the unfunded position.
- Increase various Land Use Department accounts by $1,989 that was inadvertently cut from the budget.
- Increase the budget by $50,000 for Nuisance enforcement. The account to be determined by Roland Gieger, Budget Director.
- Increase the Fixed Charges account for Police Compensatory Time. The account number to be determined by Roland Gieger, Budget Director.
- Increase the Finance Department Account # 130-53070 (Data/Word Processing Supplies) by $10,000. This funding is for the Board of Estimate and Taxation technology upgrades.
- The amount needed to balance the budget to a 2.75% mill rate increase would be $244,000 at this time.

At this time, there was a discussion on how to fund the different Fire Department alternatives for enhanced fire protection for the Northwest Corridor in Greenwich.

The Committee continued and Mr. Pellegrino further suggested the following positive adjustment to the budget, which were discussed by Committee members:

1. Increase State of Connecticut Sales Tax revenues by $397,000. The account to be determined by Roland Gieger, Budget Director.
2. Increase revenue for Single Stream recycling by $100,000. The account to be determined by Roland Gieger, Budget Director.
3. Decrease various accounts by $200,000 for savings for the upcoming electric utility contract. The various accounts to be assigned will be determined by Roland Gieger working with Ron Lalli, Special Projects Manager.
4. Decrease Purchasing Temporary Salaries by $2,331. The adjustment was due to a calculation error.
5. Decrease Fleet Salaries and Overtime by $15,292, due to calculation errors.
6. Decrease Human Resources Department Salaries by $20,724, due to calculation errors.
7. Decrease the request for a new position in the Information Technology Department by $70,898.
8. Decrease the request for a new position in the Health Department by $80,722.
9. Reduce the Board of Education budget by $520,000. The reduction is to the bottom line of the total BOE Budget only.

Mr. Pellegrino suggested adding the following Capital Items back into the budget:
1. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Refresh
2. Human Resources Software Upgrade
3. Fleet GPS

In order to increase the Capital Non-Recurring Fund, the following Capital Project requests were suggested for elimination from the budget:

1. Fire Department Rescue Pumper = $560,000
2. John Street Bridge = $1,700,000
3. GEMS Medic Station # 4 = $250,000
4. All-Wheel Drive Tractor = $194,000
5. Byram Pool and Park = $150,000
6. Diesel Crack Sealer = $61,000
7. Various BOE Capital Projects = $500,000. Roland Gieger was directed to work with Ben Branyan to determine which capital projects make up the $500,000.

There was unanimous consensus on all of the aforementioned items and topics listed in Mr. Pellegrino's outline with one exception. Mr. Ramer expressed a reservation to cut the $150,000 appropriation for the Byram Pool and Park.

Mr. Pellegrino greeted BOE officials to discuss the capital project cuts of $500,000. Dr. Lulow expressed a concern that the BOE has a well-defined process they go through when preparing their capital budget requests. Dr. Lulow added that cuts such as this only negates the process. However, Dr. Lulow conceded that he will work with the BOE and Ben Branyan and prepare a list of cuts by Decision Day.

Mr. Pellegrino suggested that the BET and the BOE need to work closely together in the future in crafting Budget Guidelines and budgets. Dr. Lulow agreed.

Ms. Tarkington asked for an update on the Greenwich High School Auditorium MISA fund raising efforts. Ms. Moriarty responded that the funding comes from a 501(c)(3) set up for such purposes, not the BOE. Ms. Moriarty stated they have pledges, but no money in the bank. She added that the private contributors are waiting for the construction to begin since the monies cannot be returned after they are donated.

The Budget Committee, led by Mr. Pellegrino unanimously agreed to the following adjustments to the budget:

- Purchasing Department – Account # 106-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – subtract ($2,331).
- Human Resources – Account # 109-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – subtract ($20,724).
- Finance Department – Account # 130-53070 – (Data/Work Processing Supplies) – add $10,000.
- Information Technology – Account # 134-51980 – (New Positions) – eliminate the request for a new position = $70,898. Mr. Finger, Ms. Tarkington and Mr. Pellegrino all expressed their concerns about the productivity of the I.T. Dept. and wished to wait until the Blum and Shapiro strategic study was completed before evaluating the need for an additional union position. Mr. Ramer stated he is not supportive of the cut. Mr. Ramer recognized the need for an additional position based on the supportive statements from
Mr. Crary. He suggested filling the position and then reshape the department subsequent to the completion of the strategic I.T. study.

- Board of Assessment Appeals – Account # 136-51300 – (Temporary Salaries) – subtract ($4,000). There was a discussion to cut the Professional Services line due to the perceived drop off in workload after a revaluation year. As a compromise, the Committee decided to reduce the temporary services line.

- Planning and Zoning – Account # 161-51490 – (Professional Services) – add $30,000 for Nuisance Enforcement.

- Conservation Commission – Account # 172-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – add $982.

- Inland Wetlands – Account # 173-51300 (Temporary Salaries – add $989.

- Fire Department/Fire Fighting Force – Account # 205-51010 (Salaries) – there were discussions to add monies to this account under different staffing scenarios. There was also a discussion on lapsing the capital request for a Fire House at King Street if adequate staffing was available. No action was taken at this point.

- Fire Department – Account # 205-53950 – (Supplies and Materials) – add $11,500. The money was inadvertently taken out of the budget.

- Fire Department – Volunteers # 208-57100 (Healthcare Costs) – subtract ($40,000).

Amy Siebert and David Thompson were invited to discuss the John Street Bridge as a potential reduction in the capital budget. The request was for $1,700,000. Ms. Siebert and Mr. Thompson convinced the Committee members that it was essential that the project proceed next year and not be delayed.

The Committee continued with its budget adjustments as follows:

- DPW/Building Construction and Maintenance – Account # 345-51070 (Other Salary Expense) – add $18,000. Longevity payments to long-term employees were inadvertently left out of the budget.

- DPW/Building Construction and Maintenance – Account # 345-52220 – there were discussions about favorable contract negotiations for electric services. The amount to be reduced was not determinable at this point.

- Fleet Department – Accounts # 380-51010 (Salaries) and # 380-51100 (Overtime Services) – subtract $15,292 in the salary and overtime accounts due to calculation errors.

- Health Department – Account # 3401-51980 (New Positions) – eliminate the request for a new position = $80,722.

- Board of Education Budget – there was a discussion to reduce the BOE budget by $520,000 tying the cut to the BET Budgetary Guideline staffing model. It was decided to further discuss this item on Decision Day.

- Libraries – Account # 701-54210 (Maintenance – Data/Word Processing) – Mr. Finger wanted to know what this item represented. Mr. Pellegrino directed Mr. Gieger to get an answer from the Greenwich Library.

- Parks and Recreation/Marine – Beaches – Account # 833-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – there were questions about the Ranger Program at the beaches. Mr. Siciliano was invited to the meeting to discuss the Ranger Program. Mr. Siciliano reported that there were nine rangers last year, at a cost of $60,140. The rangers were deployed at Byram Park, Greenwich Point, Great Captain Island, Island Beach and the Island Beach docking area. Mr. Siciliano also reported that the temporary salary account paid 78 budgeted seasonal positions during the last summer beach season. While Mr. Siciliano was available, Mr. Finger took the opportunity to question him on the dredging capital
project request. Mr. Siciliano stated that there was about 23,000 cubic yards of silt presently in need of dredging at the Town owned Cos Cob Marina area abutting the Mianus River connected to the Long Island Sound. Mr. Siciliano further reported that if the total exceeded 25,000 cubic yards, it would require another level of permitting.

- Mr. Pellegrino led the Committee through the Fixed Charges section and three items were discussed. In the Employee Benefits section of Fixed Charges it was reported that any additions to cover police compensatory time would be budgeted here. Secondly, there was a discussion to supplement the Risk Fund through a transfer from the Transfers From/To Other Funds section of Fixed Charges. After a discussion, it was decided to increase the Risk Fund transfer from $500,000 to $599,000 reaching a level of $3 million in the Risk Fund. Finally, there was a discussion on the $2 million shortfall in the Nathaniel Witherell Fund. Mr. Pellegrino reported that Nathaniel Witherell agreed to supply the BET with monthly update figures on how their operations were doing financially.

- Mr. Pellegrino directed the Committee members to the Salaries tab in the budget book and asked Mr. Gieger for an update. Mr. Gieger reported that with the two budgetary cuts and the elimination of the Retirement Administrator position, the headcount would be reduced by a net three positions on the Town side.

- Mr. Finger questioned the use of $100 million in Board of Assessment Appeals as a valid reduction in the Grand List in light of past performance. Mr. Finger informed the Committee he would obtain additional information from the Assessor's Office.

The final portion of Consolidation Day was devoted to Capital Project items. The following projects were discussed and if applicable, acted upon:

- A Geographic Information Systems (GIS) capital project request for an aerial flyover was inadvertently left out of the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) process. The Committee accepted a request for $350,000.

- A capital project request for a Human Resources Software Upgrade was left out of the CIP process. The Committee agreed to accept a request for $300,000.

- The Committee discussed the $155,000 request for the Police Radio System Evaluation and Design Study. This request would be the precursor to a subsequent request for an additional $16,200,000 in fiscal year 2013-2014. The Committee members collectively continued to express their concerns over the lack of accountability and control over the Information Technology function town wide. As a result, the Committee recommends establishing a “User Group” to oversee this project and move it out of the Police Department budget and put it into the First Selectman’s capital budget. Mr. Crary concurred with the decision.

- Police Department - Public Safety Portable Radio Deployment Program Phase II – the request for $88,000 was reduced to $44,000.

- Public Works – Diesel Fire Melter – for Crack Sealing of Roadways – the Committee eliminated the $61,000 request.

- Public Works – Trackless Four Wheel Drive articulated Municipal Tractor – the Committee eliminated the $194,000 request.

- Parks and Recreation – Road and Parking Lot Maintenance – there was an extended conversation about the need to maintain the Eastern Greenwich Civic Center driveway and parking areas. Mr. Ramer volunteered to observe the site and report back to the BET. No action taken.
• Public Works - John Street Bridge Replacement – the Committee discussed the project and no action was taken.
• Public Works – Holly Hill Transfer Station – Improvement Project – Construction – the Committee invited Amy Siebert and Jim Michel back to discuss project. Mr. Finger asked about a balance of $370,000 previously authorized and still not spent. Mr. Michel confirmed there was still $370,000 not spent. It was mutually agreed to cut the $2 million request to $450,000, leaving $820,000 left to continue the project. Ms. Siebert and Mr. Michel conceded that they could complete the initial phase of the project with $820,000.
• Public Works – Central Fire Station – Public Safety Complex – the Committee met with Mr. Monelli. The Committee requested that Mr. Monelli come back to the BET with final design and cost figures and an update on any concerns with the Historical Preservation. Mr. Finger added that they would like to be apprised of any environmental issues with the existing building if they are detected.
• Public Works – Town Wide Roof and Siding Replacement - Mr. Finger asked Mr. Monelli about the need to repair the roof at the Cos Cob Fire Station.
• Public Works – Emergency Generator Upgrade – there was a request for three generators at the Sound Beach Fire Station, the Animal Shelter, and the North Street Maintenance Shed. The Committee decided to cut the funding for the generator at the Animal Shelter for $175,000.
• Public Works – Byram Beach/Pool Master Plan – the Committee decided to cut the funding for $150,000 based on enough available funds to continue the project. Mr. Ramer objected.
• Fleet Department – the Committee added $112,000 for a GPS System for Fleet. This item was not included in the CIP process.
• GEMS – Greenwich Emergency Medical Space Planning – the Committee deferred the request for $250,000 until a permanent location has been found for a fire house or a location for GEMS in the northwest quadrant. In addition, the Committee wishes a comprehensive plan for GEMS in regards to its headquarters location going forward.
• Libraries – while reviewing various capital projects, the Committee questioned why they were voting on library projects. Mr. Gieger provided an old BET agreement with the libraries that was considered non-binding. Mr. Mason recommended bringing library personnel in and conditioning the projects.
• Parks and Recreation – Dredge Cos Cob Marina – there was a discussion over the Cos Cob Marina dredging project with no action taken.

This concluded the capital projects review portion of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary

Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman
Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 9:06 AM.

Mr. Pellegrino explained to the Committee the process he would be following for Decision Day. Mr. Pellegrino stated that the Committee would vote on positive items to the budget first, followed by negative items to the budget and then ending with adjustments to the Capital Project items. All items were moved by Ms. Tarkington, seconded by Mr. Finger, unless otherwise noted. All of the following items were unanimous with 4 to 0 positive votes unless otherwise noted. The actions of the Committee were as follows:

**Positive Items to the Budget**

- Purchasing Department - Account # 106-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – reduce by $2,331.
- Human Resources Department – Account # 109-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – reduce by $20,724.
- Fleet Department – Account # 380-51010 (Salaries) and #380-51100 (Overtime) – reduce combined accounts by $15,292. Roland Gieger to determine proration.
- Health Department – Account # 401-51980 (New Positions) – reduce by $80,722.
- Information Technology Department – Account # 134-51980 (New Positions) – reduce by $70,898. The vote was 3 to 1, Mr. Ramer voting no. Mr. Ramer felt the new position was a good request which he stated was recommended and supported by Mr. Crary. Mr. Finger, Ms. Tarkington and Mr. Pellegrino voted yes to eliminate the budget request, citing the need to perform a strategic study of the department by Blum and Shapiro before adding this position.
- Board of Assessment Appeals – Account # 136-51300 (Temporary Salaries) – reduce by $4,000.
• Fire Department – Volunteers – Account # 208-57100 (Healthcare Costs) – reduce by $40,000.
• Reduce Town and Board of Education Electric Accounts by $200,000 – Account # 345-52220 (DPW Electric) – reduce by $95,000, Account # 650-52220 (BOE Maintenance of Plants – Electric) – reduce by $105,000.
• Reduce the Board of Education Budget by $450,000.
• Increase revenue for Single Stream Recycling by $100,000. Account to be determined.
• Increase revenue for State Sales Tax reimbursement by $397,000. Account to be determined.

Negative Items to the Budget

• Fixed Charges – Employee Benefits - Account # 901-57010 (Pension Contribution) – increase by $800,000.
• Fire Department – Fire Fighting Force - Account # 205-51100 (Overtime) – increase by $700,000. There were supportive comments from the Committee members stressing the need to enhance staffing at the Glenville Fire Station to increase response time for emergencies.
• Fire Department – Fire Fighting Force – Account # 205-53950 (Supplies and Materials) – increase by $11,500.
• Department of Public Works – increase various accounts by $18,000 for longevity payments to employees.
• Fixed Charges – Employee Benefits - Account #9 01-57040 (Special Accounting) – increase by $53,750.
• Land Use Departments – increase Planning and Zoning by $100, Conservation Commission by $982 and Inland Wetlands and Watercourses by $907 to various accounts.
• Planning and Zoning Department – Account # 161-51490 (Professional Services) – increase by $30,000.
• Fixed Charges – Employee Benefits - : Police Compensatory Time – increase by $150,000 – Account to be determined.
• Fixed Charges – Account # 999-57122 (Contribution to Risk Financing) – increase by $99,000.
• Finance Department – Account # 130-53070 (Data/Work Processing Supplies) – increase by $10,000.

The Committee voted on the following Capital Project items:

• Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Refresh – add $350,000. This item was left out of the CIP process.
• Vehicles – Fire Department Rescue Pumper – reduce ($560,000). The request was for two pumpers. One pumper was eliminated.
• Police Department – Public Safety Portable Radio Deployment Program Phase II – reduce ($44,000). This request was cut in half.
• Public Works – Holly Hill Transfer Station – reduce ($1,550,000). This is a partial reduction. Mr. Finger reported that there is $370,000 left from a prior appropriation and $450,000 will be left from this request. Mr. Finger pointed out that the $820,000 would be spent in the following fashion; $75,000 for a trailer, $365,000 for a new
scale house, $320,000 for engineering costs and $60,000 for design for the sewer line relocation.

- Public Works – Trackless Four Wheel Drive Articulated Municipal Tractor – reduce by ($194,000).
- Public Works – Diesel Fire Melter for Crack Sealing of Roadways – reduce by ($61,000).
- Public Works – Emergency Generator for Animal Shelter – reduce by $175,000.
- Public Works – Byram Beach/Pool Master Plan – reduce by $150,000. This item was moved by Ms. Tarkington and seconded by Mr. Pellegrino. The vote was 3 to 1 in favor of reducing the request, Mr. Ramer voting no. The Committee members voting to cut the funding stressed that they are in favor of the project proceeding. The reason for the cut in funding was due to the availability of funds to keep the project moving forward until a more defined scope of the project and better estimate of the costs of the project are available.
- Fleet Department – GPS system – add $112,000. This item was left out of the CIP process.
- GEMS – Greenwich Emergency Medical Space Planning – reduce by ($250,000).
- Board of Education Capital Projects – reduce by ($500,000). The reductions were as follows: Mechanical System Upgrades ($300,000); Building Envelope & Structures – Life Cycle Replacements ($44,000); Interior – Finishes ($106,000); Consultant Fee for Next FY Capital Projects ($50,000).

Other Funds: The Committee proceeded to act on the following funds:

- Recommendation to accept the Sewer Maintenance Fund as submitted for an amount of $9,991,847.
- Recommendation to accept the Sewer Improvement Fund as submitted for an amount of $9,175,000.
- Recommendation to accept the Nathaniel Witherell Fund as submitted for an amount of $24,108,559.
- Recommendation to accept the School Lunch Fund as submitted for an amount of $3,860,741.
- Recommendation to accept the Parking Fund as submitted for an amount of $4,226,088.
- Recommendation to accept the Griffith E. Harris Golf Fund as submitted for an amount of $2,020,459.
- Recommendation to accept the OPEB Fund as submitted for an amount of $9,575,000.

On a motion by Ms. Tarkington, seconded by Mr. Finger, the Committee voted 4 to 0 to accept the final budget, as amended.
Mr. Pellegrino referred everyone to a “Fund Balance Summary” document distributed at the meeting and pointed out that with a $7 million reserve for Hillside Remediation taken out, the total unreserved Fund Balance stood at 5.1% of the final Total General Fund budget for fiscal year 2012-2013.

Mr. Pellegrino called on his fellow Committee members to make closing remarks.

Mr. Ramer congratulated the Chairman and his fellow Committee members on a job well done. Mr. Ramer pointed out that the 2.75% increase in the mill rate was the lowest in decades and was proud of this accomplishment.

Ms. Tarkington noted the increase in funding for enhanced fire staffing in the northwest part of Greenwich, specifically the increased staffing at the Glenville Fire Station, as a highlight of this budget session and thanked everyone.

Mr. Finger echoed the sentiments of Mr. Ramer and Ms. Tarkington and thanked the Chairman. In addition, Mr. Finger stated that two issues need to be addressed in future budget deliberations. Mr. Finger stressed the need to improve the CIP process and to develop budget guidelines that are more consistent, particularly in dealing with the BOE budget.

Mr. Pellegrino thanked everyone including; the First Selectman, Dr. Lulow and the BOE, the Finance Department staff and department heads. Mr. Pellegrino pointed out that he was proud to have the BOE bring three middle school principals in for a unique approach to presenting the BOE budget. He noted it was the first time this approach had been taken. Mr. Pellegrino took the time to especially thank his fellow Budget Committee members.

Mr. Pellegrino also took the opportunity to properly reflect on addressing the budget drivers that the Committee took head-on this year and included the following:

- Addressing the Hillside Road Soil Remediation Issue
- Addressing the Pension Contribution, specifically reducing the interest rate assumption
- Addressing the fire staffing issue in the Northwest Quadrant of Greenwich
- Addressing the Police Compensatory Time Issue

Mr. Pellegrino also pointed that there are difficult choices that lie ahead that the BET will have to address in future budgets such as:

- The Nathaniel Witherell Nursing Facility and the subsidizing of Project Renew
- The Central Fire House construction project
- The Hay Study Project Team and implementation of its recommendations
- Getting a handle on Information Technology issues
- Police Compensatory Time
- Shared Services – specifically the first floor in Town Hall
- Labor Negotiations

Mr. Pellegrino closed by thanking everyone again.
The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Mynarski, Recording Secretary

Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL
TOWN OF GREENWICH
BOARD OF ESTIMATE AND TAXATION BUDGET COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Cone Meeting Room
Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Committee:
Present: Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman; William R. Finger, Jeffrey S. Ramer, Leslie L. Tarkington
Board: Robert Brady, Sean Goldrick, Randall Huffman, Michael Mason, Arthur Norton
Selectmen: Peter Tesei, First Selectman; Drew Marzullo
Staff: Peter Mynarski, Comptroller; Roland Gieger, Budget Director; Caroline Baisley, Director; Deborah Flynn, Business Office Manager, Health Department; John Wayne Fox, Town Attorney; Fernando de Arango, Assistant Town Attorney; Benjamin Branyan, Managing Director of Operations, Board of Education; Robert Kick, Assistant Fire Chief; Amy Siebert, Commissioner; Alan Monelli, Superintendent, Building Construction and Maintenance, Public Works Department
Other: Joseph Ross, Chairman, MISA Building Committee

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M.

S U B J E C T  T O  A P P R O V A L

Requests for Budget Adjustments

HD-6 Health – Approval to Use $2,703

Approval to Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 600</td>
<td>F40326-51490</td>
<td>Professional Services NOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 723</td>
<td>F40326-52020</td>
<td>Printing and Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>F40326-52050</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>F40326-53010</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,703</td>
<td></td>
<td>State of CT Lead Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Baisley gave an overview of the State of Connecticut Lead Poisoning Prevention and Control Program provided Grant funds, which will be used to educate homeowners and medical health care providers, conduct lead poisoning testing and case management when needed. A discussion followed regarding selection of homeowners, and public notification.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a routine application.

SE-8 Law – Additional Appropriation $161,000

Additional Appropriation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 161,000</td>
<td>A140-51450</td>
<td>Additional Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 161,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Fox explained that this request is in order to retain expert testimony and to supply technical analysis and information, highlighting some types of cases were these services are necessary. A discussion followed regarding costs analysis, and funding.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a routine application.

ED-4  Board of Education – Transfer $56,300

Transfer:

$34,800 to A6501789-53700 Building & Construction Materials
$21,500 to A6201753-54100 Maintenance of Instructional Equipment
$23,200 from A6501789-54050 Maintenance of Building/Supplies
$11,600 from A6501789-54070 Maintenance of Air-Conditioning
$21,500 from A6201753-51420 Prof. Medical & Dental

Mr. Branyan explained that after reviewing accounts, part of this request will allow the Facilities Department to use in-house maintenance, instead of hiring outside vendors, and the other part is needed to service special needs student's audio logical equipment. A discussion followed regarding BOE transfer requests.

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the transfer under the authority delegated to it by the BET.

ED-5  Board of Education – Release of conditions $250,000

Release of Conditions:

$50,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Drainage Redesign by DTC
$35,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 MEP Redesign by P&W
$35,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Extended Purchasing by Turner
$30,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Asbestos Testing by EAS
$20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Asbestos Testing by Lab
$20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Additional AECOM Reports
$10,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Additional Legal Support
$20,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Miscellaneous Invoices
$30,000 to B6801689-59560-12149 Contingency
$250,000 from B6801689-59560-12149 MISA

Mr. Ross explained that this request is for (1) gaining additional information, (2) addressing known EPA issues, and (3) improving the design of the MISA project. Redesign of the drainage system was necessary due to soil contamination and must be completed and approved by the EPA in order to proceed with the project. The Committee reviewed the MISA Cost Summary as of March 8, 2012, and Project Cost Projection Update Draft as of March, 9, 2012. At Mr. Pellegrino’s request, Mr. Ross gave an overview and update of the MISA project. A lengthy discussion followed regarding revisions, soil remediation, and budgetary impact. A summary of this discussion could be stated as follows. The original project was planned at a total cost of $32,020,000. Subsequent activities have added additional costs: the need to vent the Gym (which was a capital project planned in future years but brought forward to help address MISA designs) $400,000; the need to change access to the VoTech space $300,000; the need to initiate soil testing and remediation $1,500,000, the need to build a Cofferdam to address
groundwater contamination $700,000; the need to move to the next phase of soil remediation $600,000; the need to redesign drainage and utility plans $300,000; the need to redesign in general, test and monitor $250,000; the delay for a least 3 more months to complete these redesigns $400,000; and the overall delay for the past year $860,000. When added to the original cost of the project, the estimated cost is now $37,330,000.

The Committee voted 4-0 to accept the report and release the condition on the appropriation and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

PW-9  DPW – Additional Appropriation $200,000

Additional Appropriation:
$ 200,000 to Z315-59830-12199 GHS Soils Remediation
$ 200,000 from Capital Non-recurring

Ms. Siebert explained that this request is to continue the soil remediation and removal project not related to MISA. Ms. Siebert also gave an overview of the project, including expenses through March 13, 2012. A brief discussion followed regarding scope of the project and funding.

The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the request and forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

PW-5  DPW – Release of conditions $100,000

Release of Conditions:
$ 100,000 to Z345-59560-11134 Professional Fees

Mr. Pellegrino stated that the condition, “Subject to Release by the BET upon acceptance of a report for a solution to the septic system for the proposed King Street Fire Station and a determination if GEMS would be able to be stationed on this site”, has been met. Mr. Pellegrino also shared comments regarding additional information that arose since the condition was placed upon the project, questions regarding the site, the desire to find a more suitable site, the need to address the budgetary impact of a new station within the context of the Fire Department Operating budget and the need to addressing these issues in a cooperative, positive way going forward.

Mr. Tesei gave background information, an overview of the request, and shared comments regarding alternate locations and the necessity of the project. Mr. Monelli gave an overview of the current site plan and septic locations. Mr. Ramer shared comments regarding Mr. Tesei’s, as well as Chief Siecienksi and Mr. Monelli’s constructive efforts concerning this proposal.

A discussion followed regarding staffing, the current site’s issues, alternative sites, current capital projects’ unforeseen costs and budgetary concerns.

The Committee voted 0-4 to the release of condition on the appropriation and recommended to forward it to the Board of Estimate and Taxation as a non-routine application.

OLD BUSINESS
NEW BUSINESS

Report of Status of Current Economic Conditions

The Committee reviewed the Selected Revenues and Spending Rate, February 2012, highlighting expenses, and fund balance. Mr. Gieger gave brief summary of the revenues and expenses. A discussion followed regarding conveyance tax receipts trends.

Nathaniel Witherell Cash Flow

The Committee reviewed the Nathaniel Witherell Operating Statistics/Information for the seven-month period ending January 31, 2012.

Budget Conditions

The Committee reviewed and discussed the 2012-2013 Budget Conditions upon Department Requests.

Budget Resolutions

Mr. Ramer stated that the Law Committee will review the 2012-2013 Budget Resolutions on Monday, March 19, 2012, at 10:00 A.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Budget Committee Public Hearing, February 6, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2012, Budget Committee Public Hearing.

Budget Committee BOE Departmental & Capital Review, February 9, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2012, Budget Committee BOE Departmental & Capital Review.

Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 1, February 15, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 15, 2012, Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 1.

Budget Committee Regular Meeting, February 16, 2012

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 16, 2012, Budget Committee Regular Meeting.

Budget Committee Finance Department Presentation & Capital Review, February 22, 2012
The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 22, 2012, Budget Committee Finance Department Presentation & Capital Review.

**Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 2, February 24, 2012**

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2012, Budget Committee Departmental Reviews Day 2.

**Budget Committee Consolidation Day, February 27, 2012**

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 27, 2012, Budget Committee Consolidation Day.

**Budget Committee Decision Day, February 29, 2012**

The committee voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the February 29, 2012, Budget Committee Decision Day.

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

_____________________________
Maria Bocchino, Recording Secretary

_____________________________
Joseph L. Pellegrino, Chairman
Requests for Budget Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD-6</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$2,703</td>
<td>Approval to Use</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F40326 &amp; various object codes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Serv., Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE-8</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>Additional Appro.</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-4</td>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bldg. &amp; Constr. Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance of Instr. Equip.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-5</td>
<td>MISA BUILDING COMM.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Release of Cond.</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6801689 59560 12149</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-9</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Additional Appro.</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z315 59830 12199</td>
<td></td>
<td>GHS Soils Remediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW-5</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Release of Cond.</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z345 59560 11134</td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street Firehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Business:

New Business:
- Report - Status of Current Economic Conditions
- Update - Nathaniel Witherell Cash Flow
- Discussion – Budget Conditions
- Vote – Budget Resolutions

No Action
Approval of BET Budget Committee Meeting Minutes:

- February 6, 2012 – Public Hearing Night 4-0-0
- February 9, 2012 – BOE Departmental & Capital Review 4-0-0
- February 15, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 1 4-0-0
- February 16, 2012 – Regular BET Budget Meeting 4-0-0
- February 22, 2012 – Finance Dept. Presentation & Capital Budget Review 4-0-0
- February 24, 2012 – Departmental Reviews Day 2 4-0-0
- February 27, 2012 – Consolidation Day 4-0-0
- February 29, 2012 – Decision Day 4-0-0