

*The Special Meeting of the 27<sup>th</sup> Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on **Monday, May 14, 2007** in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives in the Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Stamford, Connecticut.*

## **MINUTES**

Chair Martin called the meeting to order at 9:10 p.m. Chair Martin read the call of the meeting:

I, David R. Martin, President of the 27<sup>th</sup> Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, and pursuant to Section C2-10-4 of the Stamford Charter, hereby call a Special Meeting of said Board of Representatives at the following time and place:

Monday, May 14, 2007  
8:00 p.m.  
Legislative Chambers, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Government Center  
888 Washington Boulevard  
Stamford, CT 06904-2152

to consider and act upon the following:

1. [LR27.047](#) - RESOLUTION; amending the conveyance tax rate.  
04/24/07 – Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
2. [F27.248](#) – RESOLUTION; providing for a five-year phase-in of the 2006 revaluation.  
05/07/07 – Resubmitted by President Martin, Rep. DeLuca
3. [Operating, Capital, E.G. Brennan Fund, Grants and Police Extra Duty Fund, Risk Management Fund, Smith House Fund, WPCA Fund and Parking Fund, and WPCA \(WPCA Capital\)](#) Budgets for the fiscal year 2007/2008, as transmitted by the Board of Finance on April 10, 2007, pursuant to provisions of Section C8-30-7 of the Stamford Charter; and RESOLUTIONS associated therewith.

## **AGENDA**

INVOCATION: Led by Rep. Molgano

“Let us bow our heads and pray to God. Heavenly Father, it is written ‘you have great wealth if you fear God and you do what is pleasing to the Lord, your God.’ We come together this evening to discern, deliberate and decide the wealth of this great city of Stamford. We ask You, Father, to bestow upon us Your wisdom, Your understanding and Your compassion as we earnestly strive to do what is best for Your children, the people we serve and is in accord with Your divine will. Amen.”

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

ROLL CALL: Conducted by Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville. There were thirty-eight members present and one member absent/excused: Rep. C. Young. Rep. Pia arrived shortly after roll-call.

President Martin stated that this been a particularly difficult budget season. There are a lot of issues that have been changing and moving. The Fiscal Committee has spent countless hours in countless meetings and people on all sides of all issues have been spending a lot of time working on the various issues that we face; there have been some very heated and pointed points of view and discussions and opinions. President Martin thanked all for doing what we are supposed to do as representatives, extending his sentiments to everyone, whether they are on the Fiscal Committee or not.

President Martin stated that he had asked the Fiscal Committee to take a look at the conveyance tax situation and determine whether or not they felt the full Board should vote on the conveyance tax resolution. The Committee did suggest the full Board take action on the conveyance tax.

COMMITTEE/BUDGET PRESENTATION: Randall Skigen, Chair, Fiscal Committee

1. [LR27.047](#) - RESOLUTION; amending the conveyance tax rate.  
04/24/07 – Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy

Chair Skigen stated the Fiscal Committee met and discussed the conveyance tax issue at length. The Committee did believe that the Board should discuss this. The Committee did not vote specifically on the resolution that is on everyone’s desk tonight. Chair Skigen moved to adopt the resolution increasing the local real estate conveyance tax rate.

Chair Skigen moved to amend the resolution, in the second to last paragraph, the last sentence should read: "In order to maintain this total real estate conveyance tax rate of 35/100 of one percent, the option tax shall automatically increase or decrease to the extent allowed under state law without further action by this Board.

Mr. Mirkin confirmed with President Martin that the Law Department wrote the resolution. Mr. Mirkin stated that it is his understanding that the point of this is to protect the city regarding the current .25 conveyance tax in the event that the State Legislature allows the statute (which put us to .25) to expire and which would reduce the city portion of the conveyance tax to .11. Mr. Mirkin would be supportive of something that keeps us whole. He is not clear if this would increase it to .35 without a provision to bring us back to .25 should the State allow us to keep it the same.

President Martin stated that the way this resolution is prepared right now, the conveyance tax would go immediately to .35 and whether the sunset provision sunsets or not, it would stay at .35.

Rep. Mirkin stated he wanted to amend the resolution but did not have the exact wording. He wants this resolution, should the conveyance tax legislation sunset (which would reduce it from .35 to .11) to automatically go back to .25, in essence keeping the City whole from where it would be if it had not sunsetted. Mr. Mirkin would like to protect the City at .25.

President Martin stated that the correct amendment should be that everywhere it says .35, it should say .25. Rep. Mirkin made a motion to amend the resolution to a tax rate of .25; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Lyons stated that he shares some of the same concerns that were mentioned in Committee. He asked if a subjective resolution could be written where if the State did let the tax revert back to the old basis points, we could automatically be covered. He is comfortable with the amendment as proposed, and he is opposed to the increase in the resolution. This is a single user tax, it is going into the general fund, not a dedicated fund and it is discerned upon basically only home sellers. It is not a broad-based municipal tax for people who receive broad-based municipal services. So, he supports the amendment, and he hopes we keep it at .25.

Rep. Diamond stated that he is going to support the amendment. He would like to see the rate remain the same and opposes an increase in the conveyance tax. There are people who have counted on this tax being the same, and he would be very, very surprised if the State legislature allowed it to expire altogether. There are people who are planning retirements, who are counting on certain tax rates, and to increase the tax would be unfair to them mostly in a year where real estate taxes are expected to increase as well. Further, the residential real estate

market is obviously depressed and therefore, this is a disincentive for further sales. He will support the amendment, and he opposes increasing the real estate conveyance tax.

Rep. Zelinsky stated that he is in favor of the amendment. It is unfair to increase it to .35; many of the residents that have been selling their houses or who will be selling their houses are doing so because they possibly cannot afford to pay the high property taxes. Young families with young children and possibly senior citizens who are downsizing, who may be selling a larger home, but moving into a smaller one, and again, they are living on a fixed income. He would like to remind his colleagues that in addition to what we do here tonight, the State of Connecticut still has the .5 percent for properties under \$800,000, 1.0 for properties over \$800,000 and 1.0 for commercial properties, so this would be a good amendment and he urges his colleagues to support it.

Chair Skigen stated that he opposes the amendment. What we are going to do later tonight is hopefully pass a budget for the City, and the reality is that we have to pay for that budget. The State does not give us a whole lot of options in terms of how we pay. There is no local income tax, there is no refund to the municipality of any sales tax; we used to get hotel taxes and we don't get those anymore. Basically what we have are real estate taxes, and if we pass an increase in the conveyance tax, it will have a resultant reduction in the mill rate. It is not going to be a huge reduction, but what we are talking about is whether we tax people while they are in their homes or whether we tax people when they sell their homes. The reality that we face is that when a person sells a home, for let's say, \$500,000, what they pay to the City currently on the real estate conveyance tax, is \$1,250. What they pay to the State is \$2,500. What they pay to their real estate broker is \$25,000 to \$30,000. By increasing this tax, we allow every homeowner who stays in their home a small reduction in their mill rate. The calculation that OPM gave today on a \$500,000 home is that it would probably, and these are moving targets tonight because of everything that we are doing, save about \$58 per year. The increase that people would pay when they sell their home would be about \$550. And, that happens only when you sell your home. So, the question we have to ask is do we want to charge a higher mill rate or do we want to charge a higher conveyance tax? What we have to realize is if we vote to keep the conveyance tax where it is, what we are doing is telling the Board of Finance when they set the mill rate to set the mill rate higher than they would if we raise the conveyance tax. He would rather see that tax collected at the time of sale rather than throughout the term of ownership of a home. He will vote against the amendment.

Rep. Day stated he has always opposed these conveyance taxes, but given where we are right now, he agrees with Rep. Skigen. He is trying to do everything possible to keep the property tax burden down. This is an occasional tax, and the property tax is an ongoing tax that we ought to do everything we can do to reduce it. Given the special circumstances facing us right now, he will

oppose the amendment and support the .35. He added that Stamford is the only municipality that never did enact the optional conveyance tax as a result of being an enterprise zone. This would bring us in line with the other municipalities that have done that.

Rep. Boccuzzi stated that he is going to vote against the amendment, and he agrees with Messrs. Skigen and Day.

The motion to amend the resolution to set the tax at .25 failed by a vote of 12-27-0 (Reps. Coppola, DeLuca, Diamond, Franzetti, Greenberg, Layton, Lyons, Mallozzi, Mirkin, Molgano, Munger and Zelinsky in favor; Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Day, DePina, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Lodato, Lombardo, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville and White in favor (See [RCS Vote Record No. 819](#)).

Rep. Lyons moved to amend the resolution by providing for a sunset provision at June 30, 2009 to coincide with the legislative calendar and the budget set by the legislature in Hartford. Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Zelinsky asked if Rep. Lyons would accept a friendly amendment to expire the resolution at the end of one year rather than two years. Rep. Lyons stated that the enabling language is generated from Hartford, so they control what we do. This is a 2-year budget cycle coming up, so we are probably better off going with two years and he declined to accept the friendly amendment.

Rep. Boccuzzi stated he would vote against the amendment and he is still in favor of the .35.

Said motion failed by a machine vote of 14-25-0 (Reps. Coppola, Fedeli, Franzetti, Greenberg, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lyons, Mirkin, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Rauh and Zelinsky in favor; Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Figueroa, Giordano, Heaphy, Lodato, Lombardo, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Pia, Skigen and White opposed (See [RCS Vote Record No. 820](#)).

Chair Skigen moved to amend the resolution, to help make it more workable from the Town Clerk's perspective. As it is drafted, it becomes effective tomorrow, and he is concerned about their ability to implement it immediately. He moved to make the resolution effective May 28, 2007. Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 38-0-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor (See [RCS Vote Record No. 821](#)).

The main motion, as amended, was approved by a machine vote of 31-8-0. (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Lodato, Lombardo, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Molgano, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville and White in favor; Reps. Diamond, Greenberg, Layton, Lyons, Mallozzi, Mirkin, Munger and Zelinsky opposed (See [RCS Vote Record No. 822](#)).

2. [F27.248](#) – RESOLUTION; providing for a five-year phase-in of the 2006 revaluation.  
05/07/07 – Resubmitted by President Martin, Rep. DeLuca

President Martin stated that a draft of the resolution was mailed to everyone last week. This resolution has been reviewed by both the law Department and the Director of Administration. Rep. Diamond moved to approve the phase-in resolution; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Mirkin moved to amend the resolution to provide for a 3-year phase-in from a 5-year phase-in was made; said motion was seconded. Rep. Mirkin stated there has been a lot of discussion about the impact the 2006 revaluation would have on neighborhoods across the city. Many representatives have talked about wanting to provide relief for those that would be looking at tax increases and in some cases, significant tax increases. The other side is there is a group of homeowners that are also looking for relief, and there are those that have been paying more taxes than they should have, and that takes us back to the year 1999, which was the last year that we had a fully implemented revaluation. There is a precedent in the City for conducting a phase-in of the revaluation, in 1993, and we made a decision to try to spread it out and ease the pain over three years. So, he makes this motion based on the fact that it was three years long in the earlier decision; three years helps to bring property values in line with what they actually are, and he asked his colleagues to remember that a five-year phase in means that it will take us to 2012 to actually get property values in line with the 2006 revaluation and that again, the last revaluation was 1999. He is hoping that everyone will support this amendment where it brings relief for those who will be getting tax increases but also recognizes that many people have been paying more taxes than they should have, and in effect, there has been a phase-in of zero since 1999.

Rep. Boccuzzi stated he is against the amendment and is in favor of the five-year phase in, and just because they elect for five years does not mean we have to wait five years for another revaluation. We can have another revaluation this year.

Rep. Day stated that this has been a very difficult issue. He favors the proposed amendment and starts from the position of not favoring any phase-in at all, but believes three years is a good compromise because it means that you get half way between 1999 and 2006 in the year 2007. Nobody is arguing at all that the 1999 assessments are an accurate depiction of where we are. Most people would grant that the 2006 revaluation is more accurate than 1999. A five-year phase in however, obviously depends more on 1999 as a basis than it does 2006. A three-year phase-in at least splits the difference; it helps nullify arguments that certain neighborhoods are subsidizing other neighborhoods; it leaves us poised to do a revaluation in 2007 that will get us up to date. This is fair to everybody, and it is a solution that would enable all 40 representatives to come together and unite and support an outcome rather than have a divided board, which in turn, probably leaves the city divided. Of all the issues we have confronted in the last several years, this is one that the Board ought to aspire to be united.

Rep. DeLuca stated that this item has appeared on four different steering agendas, four different times was rejected, yet this evening it is before us. In recent months, he has listened to several representatives holler and moan about the Intervale Road people saying why should they get the sewers and pay only 40% rather than 100%, why should the rest of the city subsidize these people. Fortunately, the people that were complaining about Intervale residents paying 40% did not prevail, and the people are getting 40%. And yet, many of these same people that talk about subsidizing, that's what we are going to be doing this evening by not going along with the phase in. By going along with a five-year phase in, all that we are doing ... there are other parts of Stamford that these people should have got a reduction in their taxes in 1999 and didn't get it, so from 1999 on they have been subsidizing others. In 2006, they had another opportunity where their taxes go down because of the revaluation, but yet we hear the cry that revaluation is flawed, we have to go with a five-year phase-in to help out the people. What the Republicans are trying to do is cut a compromise, as Mr. Day said, let's do it as a compromise. But, it doesn't look like this is going to prevail.

Rep. DeLuca continued saying he went on line to look at some field cards and it is interesting to note that one address in Shippan, the 2005 valuation was \$488,000, but the new revaluation, it is up to \$1.8 million, which gives it a fair market value of \$2.6 million, and this house is on the market for \$2.2. That is a substantial increase, and heaven forbid, by phasing it in, the figure of \$488,000 will be maybe about \$700,000 or \$800,000, and it is still on the market for \$3.4 million. There are several other houses in the same range, where even with the new revaluation, for what they are looking to sell it for, they gain, over and above the fair market value based on the latest revaluation, ranges anywhere from \$600,000 to \$1 million. To do this over five years and to continue to subsidize other people who have been getting a break since 1999, it is not fair to the people that are refusing to give them their just due that they are entitled to.

Therefore, he is in favor of the amendment; we owe it to these people who have been paying for others since 1999. Rep. DeLuca stated his taxes are going to go up, but he is willing to bite the bullet. He is against the phase in, but he is willing to compromise on a three-year, but unfortunately, the votes are not there, and the five year phase-in is just not fair We will do another revaluation in 2007, and if the people don't like it, we will throw that one out.

Rep. DeLuca continued saying that this reminds him of a story years ago where the CEO called in his various vice presidents, and he asked the vice president of manufacturing, how much is 2 and 2? The vice president of manufacturing stated that it was 4. He asked the engineer the same question, and he pulled out a slide ruler and said, "it could be 3.9." He asked his vice president of finance, who said, "as far as I know, 2 and 2 is 4." He asked his marketing person, "what's 2 and 2?" His marketing person replied, "sir, I can make it anything you want." And that is what we are doing this evening. Revaluations that we don't like ... certain areas because the values have gone up which is justified ... we are saying that okay if you don't like it, we'll do another one. Some of the commercials are undervalued, and everybody is talking about this \$830 million sale. But that sale hasn't even gone through yet; all we have heard was the numbers that the mayor threw out because of the sale of property of \$830 million. When we look at the hole in the ground, that was supposed to be a big deal, but they didn't get the financing, so that just sits there. Highgrove has been sitting there for two years, and they finally got the financing. Rep. DeLuca stated he is willing to bet anyone that when we do a 2007 revaluation, the numbers are not going to be any different than what they are now. And, if they are, they are going to be so minute that it is pathetic what we are doing this evening.

Rep. Lyons stated that in either 04, 05 or 06, the legislature changed the statute to allow for 5-year phase-ins for municipalities from 3 years, so he believes it makes sense that we afford ourselves every opportunity given to us under the statutes to use on the local level.

Rep. Layton stated that there is nothing in this resolution mentioning a 2007 revaluation, 2008 or 2009. He suggests that once this is done, there will be great pressure that we meet the state statute minimum requirements for doing revaluations ... that there will never be a revaluation done. There is nothing in this resolution requiring one, and there will be great pressure to not bother with it again because of the fear that the values would be increased and get negatively impacted. Rep. Layton suggests that if we pass this resolution, he fears we won't do another revaluation until 2012.

Rep. Zelinsky stated that 1) regarding the vote at Steering Committee over the three or four times this item came up, they were close votes, and the last vote was by a mere vote that made the difference; 2) he is in support of the 5-year clause instead of the 3-year, and 3) because of the sale of the commercial/industrial properties if a new revaluation is done, which we are under

the impression might be, by the end of this year, that it will affect and put more of a burden on the industrial and commercial property owners as opposed to the residential. Finally, he received many calls from his own constituents asking him to support a phase-in, and he actually received calls from residents from other parts of Stamford also requesting him to support the phase-in, so that is what he will be doing.

The motion to amend the resolution from a 5 to 3 year phase in failed by a vote of 16-23-0 (Reps. Aposporos, Berns, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, Fedeli, Franzetti, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Mirkin, Molgano, Munger, Pia and Skigen in favor; Reps. Adams, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Figueroa, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Neary, Rauh, Summerville, White and Zelinsky opposed (See [RCS Vote Record No. 823](#)).

Rep. Lodato moved to amend the resolution to add a fifth WHEREAS clause as follows: WHEREAS, it has been determined that it is in the best interest of the City of Stamford to perform and implement a property revaluation for the 2007 grand list thus discontinuing the term of the phase-in after one year. Rep. Lodato further added a new paragraph 3 under the main body of the resolution, titled *Discontinuance of the Five-Year Phase-In*, to read: Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Board of Representatives hereby approves the discontinuance of the five-year phase-in hereinabove, effective at the conclusion of the first year of the term of such five-year phase-in, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 203, Section 12-62C(a)(2) of the Connecticut General Statutes, as provided for below. The Legislative Body may approve the discontinuance of a phase-in of real property assessment increases resulting from the implementation of a revaluation at any time prior to the completion of a phase-in term originally approved, provided such approval shall be made on or before the assessment date that is the commencement of the assessment year in which such discontinuance is effective and the assessment year following the completion or discontinuance of the phase-in, assessments shall reflect the valuation of real property established for such revaluation, subject to additions for new construction and reductions for demolitions occurring subsequent to the date of revaluation and on or prior to the date of its completion or discontinuance and the rate of assessment applicable in such year as required by Section 12-62A.

Rep. Lodato added a new paragraph 4 to the resolution titled, *Implementation of the 2007 Revaluation*, to read as follows: The City of Stamford shall perform a property revaluation for the 2007 grand list which revaluation shall become effective upon the discontinuance of the five-year phase-in as provided hereinabove.

President Martin stated he does not want to inject himself into the debate, and he is very much in favor of the WHEREAS clause. Regarding the changes to the body of the resolution, after spending many hours with people at OPM and the

Attorney General and our attorneys, he believes this language would have the unintended consequence of actually creating a potential legal quagmire. Essentially, you do not have to discontinue a phase-in to implement a new revaluation, and, in fact, it is a good idea not to. So, if you want to have a separate resolution that says we are going to do a new revaluation, he would be happy to support that on Steering and is fully in favor of it, but his intent, with regard to the legal language would be like a boomerang. Having said all that, President Martin asked if Rep. Lodato objected to just including the WHEREAS clause at the top. Mr. Lodato replied that this was acceptable. Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Lodato re-read the WHEREAS clause with a slight change suggested by President Martin: WHEREAS, it has been determined that it is in the best interest of the City of Stamford to perform and implement a property revaluation for the 2007 grand list thus replacing the term of the phase-in after one year.

Rep. Boccuzzi stated he is not in favor of this, he believes this is something that should be brought up in Steering, put on the agenda and worked on from there.

Rep. Lyons stated he agrees with the Majority Leader, and he supports the WHEREAS clause up until “thus replacing the phase-in.” He wants to talk with the City’s legal counsel, OPM in Hartford and Attorney General Blumenthal’s office to determine whether that language jeopardizes any of our rights.

Rep. Berns stated that WHEREAS clauses have no effect whatsoever unless there is a case of ambiguity. Essentially, this is a statement of what we intend to do without actually doing anything, so he can’t imagine what there is to object to.

Rep. Day stated that he agrees with Rep. Berns. This is not a binding clause, so it doesn’t run afoul of our steering agenda rules. It is acknowledging an intent that is important in this resolution, but in itself is not binding.

Said motion failed by a vote of 14-25-0 (Reps. Aposporos, Berns, Day, DeLuca, Franzetti, Greenberg, Heaphy, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Mirkin, Molgano, Munger and Pia in favor; Reps. Adams, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Giordano, Hunter, Larobina, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Neary, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky opposed (See [RCS Vote Record No. 824](#)).

The resolution, approving a five-year phase-in, was approved by a vote of 31-8-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Molgano, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor; Reps. Day, DeLuca, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Mirkin, Munger and Skigen opposed (See [RCS Vote Record No. 825](#)).

3. [Operating, Capital, E.G. Brennan Fund, Grants and Police Extra Duty Fund, Risk Management Fund, Smith House Fund, WPCA Fund and Parking Fund, and WPCA \(WPCA Capital\)](#) Budgets for the fiscal year 2007/2008, as transmitted by the Board of Finance on April 10, 2007, pursuant to provisions of Section C8-30-7 of the Stamford Charter; and RESOLUTIONS associated therewith.

Rep. Skigen reported that the Fiscal Committee met numerous times for numerous hours to go over the City Budget, the Board of Ed budget, the Special Revenue Funds, the Capital Budget and as a number of people have noted already, this has probably been the most difficult year that we have faced on his twelve years on the Board and certainly in his six years as Chair of the Fiscal Committee. The attendance for all meetings are on file in the Board Office. He is pleased to report there is a unanimous committee report tonight. The Committee has recommended the following:

#### **Operating Budget**

Chair Skigen moved a \$35,000 cut to the fireworks account on Page 77, Special Events; and an additional \$265,000 to the bottom line of the City budget; said motion was seconded.

President Martin stated that in some prior years, private sponsorship of the fireworks has been achieved. Chair Skigen stated that the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee is that the administration seek funding from private sources in order to put on the fireworks, but in view of the fact that we are talking about eliminating recycling or backyard garbage pickup, that we are talking about people being laid off, that we are talking about serious cutbacks in city services, that fireworks, nice as they may be, just don't need to be in this budget. As for the \$265,000, Chair Skigen stated that he believes there are some savings that can be achieved in utility accounts, in perhaps pension fund contributions and some other items throughout the budget. This is being left to the managers of the various departments and the administration to make that determination. It was the feeling of the committee that the cuts that came from the Board of Finance were significant, and in some cases, and that there will be service reductions even though people will be paying higher taxes. This \$265,000 is an attempt by the committee to say that we think they can go a little deeper, a little further, but we do recognize that there will be pain associated with it.

The motion was approved by a vote of 39-0-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin,

McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor (See [RCS Vote Record No. 826](#)).

### **WPCA Budget**

Chair Skigen stated that the Committee moved to reject the WPCA Budget and reduce it by \$500,000. Chair Skigen moved this reduction; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Boccuzzi asked that Chair Skigen read from the ordinance what the next steps the WPCA can do if they reject the \$500,000 reduction. Chair Skigen read from Ordinance No. 1044, Section 200-31(a), in relevant part:

“The Board of Representatives may reject or reduce the proposed WPCA budget as transmitted by the Board of Finance or may approve an operating budget in an amount up to the amount submitted by the WPCA. However, approval of an amount greater than that recommended by the Board of Finance, up to the amount submitted by the WPCA, shall require a 2/3 vote of the Board of Representatives present and voting. If the Board of Representatives does not act on the WPCA operating budget in accordance with the annual budget schedule, the WPCA operating budget shall be considered approved at the amount recommended by the Board of Finance. In the event that the Board of Representatives approves a total operating budget that is reduced from the proposed WPCA budget, the WPCA may accept the reduced total operating budget, or may resubmit a revised budget to the Board of Representatives. This process shall continue until either the Board of Representatives approves a revised total operating budget submitted by the WPCA or the WPCA accepts a reduced total operating budget approved by the Board of Representatives. If the Board of Representatives does not act within 45 days after receipt of a revised WPCA operating budget, said revised budget shall be considered approved.”

President Martin stated that the essence of which is a \$500,000 reduction, and for all intents and purposes, we are going to treat as an approval of the WPCA budget that is \$500,000 less than what was sent to us by the Board of Finance. The WPCA can either accept that number or they can come back to us with a budget amendment.

The motion, for a \$500,000 reduction to the WPCA budget, was approved by a vote of 38-0-0. (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor (See [RCS Vote Record No. 827](#)). (Mr. Mirkin voting in favor.)

### **Board of Education Budget**

(Note: President Martin and Rep. White left the floor.) Clerk of the Board Summerville took over chairing the meeting at this point.

Chair Skigen stated the Committee looked long and hard at the Board of Education budget, they took into account the \$4.8 million reduction by the Board of Finance as well as the \$1.6 million reduction from the original budget proposal by the superintendent. In view of all of this and in view of some potential energy savings and additional savings that the Committee believes can be found, and once again recognizing this is a tight year and that there will be some pain associated with this, the Committee recommended a \$300,000 reduction to the Board of Education Budget. Chair Skigen moved the reduction; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Zelinsky stated that the Board of Finance drastically cut the Board of Education's budget. He is concerned with the plight of residents already paying high property taxes and they will be paying a lot more. He understands from a resident that the \$300,000 will cost our residents about \$10 more per year. After speaking with a Board of Education member today, he learned that if we cut another \$300,000, it would cost teachers and teachers' assistants their jobs which will directly affect the students in the classroom. He asks his colleagues to consider the consequences if we cut another \$300,000, and he will vote against this motion.

Said motion was approved by a vote of 32-5-0 (Reps. Adams, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Pia, Rauh, Skigen and Summerville in favor; Reps. Aposporos, Berns, Greenberg, Neary and Zelinsky opposed). (See [RCS Vote Record No. 827](#)).

### **Resolutions**

President Martin returned to chair the meeting at this point.

Chair Skigen moved [Resolution No. 3152](#), authorizing an operating budget in the amount of \$401,061,519 (including the Board of Education Budget). Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 38-1-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor; Rep. Greenberg opposed) (See [RCS Vote Record No. 829](#)).

Chair Skigen moved [Resolution No. 3153](#), authorizing the Funds Budgets. Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 38-1-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca,

DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor; Rep. Greenberg opposed) (See [RCS Vote Record No. 830](#)).

Chair Skigen moved [Resolution No. 3154](#), authorizing the WPCA Capital Budget in the amount of \$6,760,000.00. Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 39-0-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor) (See [RCS Vote Record No. 831](#)).

Chair Skigen moved [Resolution No. 3156](#), authorizing the WPCA Capital Budget in the amount of \$6,760,000.00. Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 39-0-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Greenberg, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor) (See [RCS Vote Record No. 832](#)).

Chair Skigen moved [Resolution No. 3155](#), authorizing the Capital Budget in the amount of \$42,388,508.00. Said motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 38-1-0 (Reps. Adams, Aposporos, Berns, Blackwell, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Coppola, Day, DeLuca, DePina, Diamond, Esposito, Fedeli, Figueroa, Franzetti, Giordano, Heaphy, Hunter, Larobina, Layton, Lodato, Lombardo, Lyons, Mallozzi, C. Martin, D. Martin, McCullen, Mirkin, Mitchell, Molgano, Munger, Neary, Pia, Rauh, Skigen, Summerville, White and Zelinsky in favor; Rep. Greenberg opposed) (See [RCS Vote Record No. 833](#)).

**ADJOURNMENT:** Upon motion duly made and seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.