



**City of Derby
Board of Alderman
Joan Williamson Aldermanic Chambers
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY MAY 4, 2015**

Barbara L. DeGennaro
Stephen M. Iacuone
Felicia Monaco

Joseph DiMartino
*Arthur T. Gerckens
Ronald M. Sill

David J. Anroman
Carmen T. DiCenso
Peter M. Olenoski, Jr.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Gerckens, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call

Present were Ms. DeGennaro, Mr. Iacuone, Mr. DiMartino, Mr. Gerckens, Mr. Sill, Mr. DiCenso and Mr. Olenoski, Jr.

Absent was: Ms. Monaco, and Mr. Anroman was excused...

Public Portion

No one from the public spoke. A motion was made and seconded to close the public portion. Motion Carried.

Recommendations fro Derby Parking Authority regarding Future Operation

Mr. Gerckens said the Board had received a memo about six weeks ago from the Parking Authority recommending that the Parking Authority be turned over to the City of Derby, and that is the purpose of this Special Meeting.

Mr. Gerckens asked Mr. Anthony Dulla to address the Board.

Mr. Anthony Dulla said that the Parking Authority had met to discuss what happens with the garage whether to rebuild, or do needed large repairs to the structure. Our recommendation is that we repeal the Parking Commission/Authority, as we would have to come to the city for financing at that point. Obviously the Parking Authority cannot handle that expense of or the rebuilding. There are many issues. If we were to rebuild, the last estimate given was over 10 million dollars, If one large slab, or the entrance way should give way, you are talking about half a million dollars of repairs, and we would have to come to the city for financing. Under that recommendation, we came to the decision what cost savings there would be if we brought it back under the city. As an example, one of the largest expenses is the snow removal and maintenance handled by Mr. DiGiovanni which was \$10,000. These costs would go back to the city under Public Works, Payroll and bookkeeping would go back to the city, as well as the general maintenance that Public Works would be able to handle. At this point, the building is over 40 years old and the repairs may be major, and if we have any thoughts about the structure, we would have to go to the city for funding so that is where we are coming from. If we had to do any of this, we would have to go to the citizens of Derby with a referendum. Also, the possibility of selling the garage, of which we had a lot of input from the former board. So, this is where we stand, not expanding the authority.

The question was asked if anyone was contacted regarding the purchase of the garage, and Mr. Dulla said he was told by the former board that they did speak with someone about the possibility of selling it, but in the end they did not want to buy it.

The question was asked how financially solvent is the garage. Mr. Dulla said their budget is \$250,000, and to date we have spent about \$230,000. We're on track, but instead of having an income of \$20,000, we may only have around \$5,000 because of some repairs regarding the electricity. We are solvent, between the \$20,000-\$30,000 range, however one large repair, and that would go very quickly.

Mr. Olenoski asked what is going to happen down the road, can we get any cost savings if the Public Works has to take care of snow removal, etc. Ms. DeGennaro said the Board of Aldermen have not seen and financial reports in months, and that was one of the items we asked for months ago when we met. We still haven't seen any reports. You are telling us you are solvent, but we have no reports to look at. Mr. Dulla said he would look into that and get copies to them.

Mr. Sill asked if the authority is still in effect, and the answer was yes, but the recommendation was that any potential for rebuilding, the authority cannot handle. We still are meeting on a regular basis

Mr. Gerckens asked what the revenue was for the parking meters per month, and that his understanding was that the meters were leased. Mr. Dulla said the meters had been leased, however, that loan has been paid off, and the meters are paid for. He will verify that.

Attorney Welch said he needed some historical data. Your board is referred to as the Parking Division, not the Parking Authority. State statute makes a distinction between Parking Authority and Parking Division. My understanding is that you are referred to as the Parking Authority. The last I have refers to it as Parking Division which is obviously not a Parking Authority. So, if anyone has any historical knowledge, as my book dated 8/12/1999 refers to it as a Parking Division, the only difference is a composition that was updated on 3/9/06 where the Parking Division is written as a Parking Authority but it certainly isn't. The entities are different. Ms. DeGennaro said we are bound by State Statute or doesn't it matter. There are two difference types, made by ordinances, an entity which is establishing a Parking Division is always referred to as a Parking Authority. Mr. Dulla said their contracts and checks say Division. He will check this also.

Mr. Dulla then said that for the month of March, \$7,000 was collected from the parking meters, but some months are as low as \$4,000. The prior authority had it budgeted for \$60,000 per year,

Mr. Gerckens asked how many paid employees does the Authority/Division have? Mr. Dulla said, 1 custodian, 1 meter reader, 4 booth collectors and 1 director for a total of 7 paid employees. The question was asked if they are union employees, and Mr. Dulla said they are non-union and there are not under contract.

Mr. Sill pointed out that 3 years ago, the authority pulled the payroll from being done here at city hall, and the reason was they wanted to do it themselves. Mr. Dulla said they now use Datapay for their payroll. They have a bookkeeper, who works per diem. The question was asked why the bookkeeper can't do the payroll.

Ms. DeGennaro wanted to know how many contracts does the authority have for people to park in the garage. He passed out the list of people that park by contract. Some of which include, State of Connecticut, Team, Derby Manor, and US Post Office. Also the company that does the ticketing has a year to year contract. Seniors pay a flat rate, and they pay \$300 per month.

Mr. Gerckens asked if we were to go down this afternoon, and take over the bookkeeping and treasury, would we have to establish a system. Mr. McLiverty stated that we already have a set up in our system for the Parking Authority, and we would just have to activate it. However, we would have to have someone like Marci does with the WPCA expenses, where we pay the bills and we debit that fund. The question was asked if anyone has health benefits and the answer was no.

The recommendation of the Parking Authority is to return the authority to the city until that time when we choose to accept or not, you will be still running the authority, and the respond was yes.

Mr. Iacuone stated that if we kept the board in place, but switched the finances to the City, such as payroll, general maintenance and director, there would be some cost savings.

Ms. DeGennaro said that in section 7-111, the makeup, it says that the city would become the employer of the personnel, and the authority can employ who they want. Mr. Welch added that the title is Parking Division, but where you read it, it says Parking Authority which is a body corporate in politic, created by a legislative body that's where that autonomy comes from, and it is truly a separate entity. The Parking Division is any existing division, bureau or authority under the umbrella. The ordinance I have says Parking Division, and it reads the powers and by giving it back, leaves it as Parking Division and leaves the same people, leaving it under the umbrella of the city, basically leaving them on their own, making it a separate commission. Someone has to be the director to keep track of the finances, which would be part of the city's expenses.

Mr. Dulla said there would still be cost savings, we still need personnel, and public works would have to keep the top floor clean of all snow in the winter.

Mr. McLiverty asked what the long term would be, and Ms. Monaco added that the operation should be put into City Hall, and we should be actively trying to sell it. We need more information on the day to day expenses.

Ms. DeGennaro asked do we own the land. Months ago she had asked Attorney Blake and he was going to check. With redevelopment, do we still own the land, the building; we still need to know if we as a city still own this property.

Mr. Sill pointed out many expenses and Mr. Dulla said there would be a cost savings if the city took over.

Mr. Gerckens said that PRIME did a site visit, and said there were no signs of any visual problems at the present time. A full inspection is needed to really tell if it is safe. Mr. Iacuone said that is where we have to decide, replace or renovate. This is outside of the scope. Mr. Dulla said this is the reason for our recommendation for the city to take over.

Mr. Gerckens asked if there were any more questions, and we had basically discussed #6, Employees, and #7 Contractual obligations. Ms. DeGennaro said that as far as #7 of the agenda was concerned, we have nothing in writing regarding the expenses. Mr. Dulla said the rest of the bills included the U.I. Co, Telephone bills which are not contractual.

Mr. Gerckens said there was no need for any executive session. Attorney Welch said he would like to do research on the Parking Authority or the Parking Division, checking back minutes, etc.

Mr. Sill said we are making progress, but Ms. DeGennaro said she still wants to see the numbers.

Mr. Sill said we should discuss this at our next regular board meeting, and that we still need salaries and finances.

Mr. Dulla said we can then start talking about a new building, renovation or selling it. Ms DeGennaro said if a private company comes in, they will not be giving the seniors any discounts. Parking is very expensive. Mr. Dulla said if a private company buys it, they would be doing a lot of modernization, and Ms. DeGennaro said they would not pay more than it is worth. It is too bad for the downtown businesses and jurors that use it.

Mr. Dulla will work on all the financials and get that information to the board.

Adjournment

Mr. Mr. Gerckens asked if no one had any more questions, for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made and seconded. Motion Carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Louise Pitney

Recording Secretary

*** These minutes are subject to the approval by the Board of Alderman
at their next regular meeting.