



**COMMON COUNCIL
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT**

**HEALTH DEPARTMENT COVID-19 UPDATE REPORT
AND
QUESTIONS TO DIRECTORS WORKSHOP**

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2022
6:00 PM**

MINUTES

A Special Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Middletown, Questions to Directors, was held on Monday, February 7, 2022, beginning at 6:00 PM. This meeting was held remotely via WebEx. The meeting was also livestreamed on the City's Facebook page.

Present:

Councilwoman Jeanette Blackwell	Councilman Anthony Mangiafico
Councilwoman Meghan Carta	Councilman Edward McKeon
Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr. (Arrived 6:08 PM)	Councilman Eugene Nocera
Councilman Darnell Ford	Councilman Philip Pessina
Councilman Anthony Gennaro, Sr.	Councilwoman Linda Salafia
Councilman Vincent Loffredo	

Mayor Benjamin D. Florsheim, Chair
Daniel Ryan, Esq. Corporation Counsel
Linda Reed, Clerk of the Common Council

Absent: Councilman Edward Ford, Jr.

Also Present:

Assessor – Damon Braasch, CCMA II
City & Town Clerk – Ashley Flynn-Natale, CCTC
Communications – Wayne Bartolotta, Director
Equal Opportunity & Diversity Management – Faith Jackson, Director
Finance & Revenue Services – Carl Erlacher, CPA, Director
Fire Department – Jay Woron, Fire Chief
General Counsel – Brig Smith, Esq.
Health Department – Kevin Elak, Acting Director
Land Use – Marek Kozikowski, Director
Library – Ramona Burkey, Director
Mayor's Chief of Staff – Barbara Knoll Peterson
Police Department – Chief Erik Costa
Public Works – Christopher Holden, PE, Acting Director
Recreation & Community Services – Catherine Lechowicz, Director
Technology Services, Bryan Skowera
Water & Sewer Department -- Joseph Fazzino, Director

Absent: Economic & Community Development – Joseph Samolis, Director;
Human Resources – Justin Richardson, Director

Public: on: unknown WebEx: 1 Facebook: unknown

1. Call to Order

Mayor Benjamin Florsheim calls the meeting to order at 6:02 PM. He welcomes everyone to the Special Meeting of the Common Council, Questions to Directors, The Chair asks Councilman Philip Pessina to lead the Common Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Clerk of the Common Council reads the Call of the Meeting and the Chair declares the call a legal call and the meeting a legal meeting.

The Chair notes that this meeting will include the Common Council Questions to Directors as well as the monthly Covid update from the Acting Health Director. The Chair asks for a motion to that effect.

Councilman Eugene Nocera moves to waive the Common Council *Rules of Procedure* to receive the current Covid-19 Update Report and, if needed, ask questions about this report, an item which is not on the Common Council's Regular Meeting agenda. Councilman Vincent Loffredo seconds the motion.

There being no discussion, the Chair calls for a voice vote. The motion is approved unanimously by a vote of 11-0 (AYE: Councilmembers Blackwell, Carta, Faulkner, D. Ford, Gennaro, Loffredo, Mangiafico, McKeon, Nocera, Pessina, and Salafia; ABSENT: Councilman E. Ford). The matter is approved

The Chair asks Acting Health Director Kevin Elak to present the monthly report, advising the Council that the Questions to Directors will follow.

2. Health Department Covid-19 Update Report

Acting Director Elak states that, as people probably know from the Governor's press conference earlier today regarding the statewide mask mandate for schools, that mandate will be ending at the end of the month on February 28th. There will be a lot of discussion on that over the next few weeks between the Health Department the Mayor's Office and the Superintendent of Schools, and the medical advisor to be sure that we carefully consider all factors. We are all anxious to get back to where things were pre-pandemic; however, they also want to be sure that they are not doing something too early, putting kids at risk. There will be a lot of discussion over the next two (2) weeks.

The good news in Connecticut and Middletown is that the numbers are coming down quite nicely looking at the data, mid-December. The numbers in early January for case rates and positivity rates are dropping. In the past two (2) weeks, the case rate is 8.5 per 1,000, a 42% decrease over the past two (2) weeks. That is promising news. We are still in the "red risk level, so still a ways to go. They expect the numbers to decrease rapidly in the next weeks to come. As far as cases in Middletown by age, it is still the 18-44 year old group that has the most cases. There are still cases in the 45+ group and the young age, including those only a few months old.

In terms of data on vaccination rate, he notes that they have done extremely well in Middletown getting people vaccinated. About 82% have at least initiated vaccination. Almost 76% are considered fully vaccinated. They lag a bit, like most communities in the State, is for boosters, noting that about 36% of the population have received a booster. This is the area where we need to get the message out. The data show that there is significant more protection getting the booster over a single dose or two doses. We still have robust vaccine providers in town at the pharmacies, providing vaccination, as well as the Community Health center and the clinic at Cross Street Church every Wednesday. They also have Griffin Hospital there, vaccinating kids ages 5 to 11.

The numbers from the State Department of Public Health are still eye-opening. Being vaccinated, compared to not being vaccinated. Being unvaccinated, the relative risk is still 15x at a higher risk of dying from Covid and seven (7) time higher being hospitalized. This is another great reason to get vaccinated.

In terms of testing, the Wren Lab testing site is still open at Cross Street Church. They are going back to the hours that they started with since the demand for testing has gone down. They will still be at the Church three (3) days a week: Tuesdays - 3PM to 6PM; Thursdays – 9AM to noon; and Saturdays – 1PM to 4PM. That will remain for the foreseeable future.

Acting Director Elak welcomes any questions.

There being no question, the Chair thanks Acting Director Elak for the report, with hope that they will continue to move in the right direction.

3. Questions to Directors Workshop Opens – Question of Regular Meeting Agenda Items

The Chair opens Questions to Directors at 6:14 PM. The Chair states that this meeting is for the purpose of asking Directors questions for items on the agenda. For efficiency, he asks that Councilmembers ask all questions of a given Director when that individual is asked to respond to questions.

The Chair calls on Councilman Eugene Nocera.

Councilman Nocera has questions for two department on bid waivers. He asks for Water & Sewer Director Joseph Fazzino for the Pamecha Avenue sewer separation bid waiver. Councilman Nocera states that he was at both the Water & Sewer Authority meeting and the Finance & Government Operations Commission meeting. He fully understands the rationale and supports it; however, some Councilmembers need an explanation of this bid waiver.

Director Fazzino replies that the Pamecha Avenue sewer separation CSO project has been long in the making. It actually went out to bid in 2002 with a different design. The bids came in over budget, so they had to do a redesign and get approval from the DEEP (Connecticut Department of Energy and the Environment) on the new design. They had to get new permits, so it took a while to get to where they were. This is the second time that the project was sent out to bid, With the bid results, they thought that were okay, but they got a letter from the contractor, who was the apparent low bidder, explaining that he had made a mistake on his bid, specifically, regarding temporary sheeting. His letter withdrew his low bid. That left us with two numbers that were both out of their budget: VMS Construction and Ludlow Construction, The new numbers put them out of range of doing

the project, adding that what they wanted to do was to meet with Ludlow, which was the apparent low bidder, over what happened, adding his thinking was that there was room for negotiations. They sat down and discussed it. Ludlow was concerned about the cost for the temporary sheeting and the way that specs were written were very restrictive, they met with the engineer of record and discussed that he could design the temporary sheeting and submit it for approval. Assuming the risks of safety, he could use trench boxes and not have steel sheeting everywhere. With that we came up with a negotiate prices with the temporary sheeting and everything else except police protection and some allowances for contingency and for water testing – those were taken out of the contract. The Police Department will work with the Water & Sewer Department directly for any police protection. It won't come out of bonding, but out of their budget. The allowances that went to them – the WPCA (Water Pollution Control Authority) – they requested using their existing funding to do a GSIF contingency. That was taken out of the contract and put into a separate GSIF. The negotiated price went before the WPCA. It was approved to move it forward to the Couicl What the Council is now seeing before it is the resolution of a lot of work – a bid, negotiations, coming up with the number that we are within the bond ordinance and the budget. In the very last section of the resolution, it says:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MIDDLETOWN: *That a bid waiver for the Pamecha Avenue Sewer Separation, Water Main Improvements & Surface Improvements Project (the "Project") Bid #2021-008 is authorized, and that the contract for this Project is awarded to Ludlow Construction Company, in the amount of \$2,344,320.00 for the sewer portion, \$262,860.00 for the water portion, and \$386,340.00 for the public works portion, for a total contract award of \$2,993,520.00.*

Director Fazzino states that, if there are any additional questions, he is glad to answer them.

Councilman Nocera thanks Director Fazzino for his elaborate planning. It is an essential project and they need to move forward. It has been in the planning stage for a long time, it is complicated work. He thanks Director Fazzino and his department for an excellent job.

The Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo states that he has a couple of response to Councilman Nocera's initial inquiry. There were two (2) bids and we only negotiated with Ludlow although both bidders were rejected because we couldn't afford either one. He asks Director Fazzino why they did not enter into potential negotiations with both unsuccessful bidders.

Director Fazzino replies that VMS Constriction bid was \$4,669,819. There was no way that could get him to negotiate down \$2M.

Councilman Loffredo asks what figure had Ludlow come in with. The bid that they had come in with and that you negotiated down to the numbers presented in the resolution, around \$3M.

Director Fazzino states that the original bid from Ludlow Construction was \$2,696,950. That was the original bid, which was in our budget, then he came back and removed his bid, saying that he had made an error on temporary sheeting. Instead of \$1/sq. ft., he said it should have been \$100/sq. ft. That would have added \$2Minto his bid. That was based upon the specifications as written or the temporary sheeting. With that, they wanted to see if they could negotiate a price on temporary sheeting as far as the engineer's specs and what he could do the project at.

Councilman Loffredo replies that he understands. He reiterates that the bid came in at \$2M

Director Fazzino replies, "\$2,696,950.

Councilman Loffredo notes that it was \$2.6M, adding that Ludlow reported that they had made an error and was allowed to correct the error and resubmit his bid. That increased his bid by another \$2M.

Directors Fazzino replies, "No," explaining that was the bid that was rejected when he came in with is bid that was \$2M higher.

Councilman Loffredo states that with the correction made in that bid, what did that impact the bid. He reiterates that they they made a mistake, were allowed to correct it, adding in \$100, whatever. He asks how much that increased the bid to.

Director Fazzino replies that it increased the bid to \$2,676,000, adding that he did not add the two numbers together, that puts both out of the budget.

Councilman Loffredo replies that he is confused. The bid by the other construction bidder. It seems that both of the bids, based on the figures that he is hearing, were both in the \$4M range at the end of the day.

Director Fazzino replies, "Correct," adding that they rejected all bids.

Councilman Loffredo state that he is confused as to why he did not enter into negotiations with both bidders considered that they both seemed to be based on, his understanding of the number, both coming in and

rejected and now try to negotiate and get the best deal that they could. He notes that Director Fazzino only did that with Ludlow.

Director Fazzino replies that they went to VMS Construction pricing and they had higher numbers throughout the contract. It was not just a matter of the temporary sheeting for VMS Construction was \$0 per sq. ft. and he did not claim to make an error.

Councilman Loffredo adds that is versus Ludlow, who made an error and went for \$1 per sq. ft. to \$100 per sq. ft.

Director Fazzino replies, "Correct," adding that, after negotiations, they were able to come up with a price of \$20 for the temporary sheeting, which was in line with VMS's price and within our budget.

Councilman Loffredo states that, in the initial part, this starts in 2002 and specifically went out to bid. Then in 2021, we go out to bid a second time

Director Fazzino replies that they had to redesign the project that was jack and bore through a contaminated site. They had relocated the design to open cut that is not contaminated that is the adjacent apartment complex. That redesign included additional easements that had to be obtained. They had the easements in place. They had to get the additional permits that had expired. And that is when that had the issue with Connecticut DEEP, which was the monkey wrench: they were not going to approve the City project unless we also addressed the Pamachea Dam project. They tied Water & Sewer with Public Works on the Pamachea Dam project. After they were able to convince DEEP that they were separate projects, they were able to get approval to go out to bid in 2021.

Councilman Loffredo states that, some 19 years later we finally get everything in place. It is an extraordinary amount of time from the rejection of the first bid and what is before the Council this evening He wasn't to be sure that we understand the timeline.

Director Fazzino replies, "Correct."

Councilman Loffredo states that, in terms of funding this project, Director Fazzino refers to the original bid authorization in 2007 when the original bid authorization, as stated in the resolution's first "Whereas" is 2002. He does not understand the difference. He did check with the Finance Department in terms of 200. He asks what happened to the original bonding that was (*inaudible*).

Director Fazzino states that this funding is still open. It is the 4150 bond. Discussion that with Finance, they had so much one left from that original authorization. The money that they currently have to complete the project. As long as they are within the original bond authorization, this was the third project out of three in that bond authorization.

Councilman Loffredo states that he is confused, noting that Director Fazzino refers only to a bond authorization of 2007. He notes that, in terms of the fiscal impact, it doesn't say anything about authorization from 2002.

Director Fazzino replies that he is not sure about the 207 authorization that Councilman Loffredo is referring to.

Councilman Loffredo replies that, looking at the resolution, under the Fiscal Impact statement, the language says, "None," and then states "Per the original bond authorization Fund 4150, 2007 Bond Issue CSO Sewer Separation." He asks if that is an error.

Director Fazzino replies that he will need to check with Finance on that. It could be 2002, noting it could be a typo. He does not know off the top of his head. He has to check. He knows that the fund is 4150.

Councilman Loffredo reiterates that the fund is 4150. He asks if that is the amount in the fund.

Director Fazzino replies, "No, no," indicating that is the fund number assigned by Finance to the bond issue.

Councilman Loffredo states that it seems to him that something is not correct. He notes that, in reality, there is a fiscal impact at the end of the day. The bonds will be put on the market and the City will have to pay those bonds off at the amount of about \$3M in principle and interest over the next 10 years.

Director Fazzino replies that this was part of the original issue that went with bond counsel.

Councilman Loffredo states that he understands that, but there is a bond authorization. We then go to the marketplace, to Wall Street, and fund the bonds, which provide the dollars, which the City – the taxpayers – will pay back. There is fiscal impact so that is confusing to him. He states that he will stop here, he thanks Director Fazzino for his responses.

Director Fazzino replies, "You're welcome."

There being no additional questions for Director Fazzino, the Chair calls on Councilmembers for questions for any other Director. The Chair calls on Councilwoman Jeanette Blackwell.

Councilwoman Blackwell states that she has a question or the Police Chief Costa. In the spirit of full transparency, she states that she had a conversation earlier with Chief Costa in advance of tonight's meeting. They talked about recruitment and the PAL program. She asks Chief Costa to share with the Council the efforts, to date, for the PAL program.

Chief Costa states that relative to the PAL Program, they have filed to be a 501(c)(3), a non-profit. Paperwork has been submitted to the State this week. They have a board of directors, which is required by PAL National. It is a 7-member board which includes community stakeholders. They are fully running this week. They also went to Liberty Bank and established an account. They have made an advertisement for funding, adding that they will begin the program with athletics – basketball – and crafts. He thanks the City recreation department or helping them to establish this and take apart in their programs as well. In terms of their agency and recruitment, they are going through their letter of hiring. He was asked about the percentages of officers. Today, he reached out to Faith Jackson (Director - Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity Management). They found that they are 32 percent protected classes: people of color and white females, adding it is split down the middle – 20/20 – in terms of the protected classes. This includes the new hires, who are in the Police Academy. They have three (3) female and two (2) male officers now in the Academy. He reiterates that they are at 32 percent for persons in protected classes. He thinks they are in a good spot as a foundation. Moving forward, they will determine if they do another lateral process or entry level process, which would be City-focused on building more diversity. In the agency.

Councilwoman Blackwell thanks Chief Costs for this information.

The Chair calls on Councilman Edward McKeon.

Councilman McKeon asks if he can disaggregate, noting that there is office staff, City staff, and arterial staff. He asks Chief Costa if he can give a break down – percentagewise – in these two areas.

Chief Costa states that the total male population is 104; female population is 21. White males is 84; white females is 20. Black male is 5; black female is 1. Hispanic male is 9; there are no Hispanic females. There are AAIAHNPI, which is 2 males, and there are 2 multiple race protected class males. The majority of the whistle females are clerical. They have 8 white female clerical. These in the department and agency round out the rest of the employment.

The Chair calls on Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr.

Councilman Faulkner asks how does the 501(c)(3) designation fit in with the City's financial structure.

Chief Costa states that this understanding is that the 501(c)(3) is on a budgeted line so there would be a self-funding program with PAL. They are working with the community stakeholders. The City would not fund line in the department budget for the PAL program/ The 501(c)(3) is established to collect monies and into an account that is audited and reviewed yearly. They also run an Explorer program, which needs such a designation as well.

There being no additional questions for chief Costa the Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo asks for the Director of Planning.

The Chair calls on Land Use Director Marek Kozikowski.

Councilman Loffredo states that an issue before the Council is a land swap on Mile Lane and Kaplan Drive. He asks if a preliminary plan has been presented to the Land Use Office, a plan of development.

Director Kozikowski replies that nothing has been submitted on paper. He had a meeting with developer and some City staff. He explains that the developer is looking to put something on the land that he currently owns; however there was no sketches, drawings, just a conversation

Councilman Loffredo asks when that conversation occurred.

Director Kozikowski replies, "Somewhere around Thanksgiving time."

Councilman Loffredo states that the matter then came to the land Use Office and the director reached out to the Facilities Office at the Board of Education for the issue of the swapping. Is that correct?

Director Kozikowski replies, "That is correct," adding that, prior to going to the Planning & Zoning Commission for the 8-24 review, he went the School Facilities Committee. There was no action taken at that meeting however, he presented the proposal. There were some comments.

Councilman Loffredo states that the issue of the swapping came before the Economic Development Committee (EDC) to take a look at, but it didn't get to what their role is in terms of the actual potential development was at that point If development did not occur, as he understand it, the City would entertain, and be willing to put the parcel of land, incorporating some City and into the potential development That is what came before EDC. It's currently under the responsibility of the Board of Education, noting that this is where Lawrence School is. He wants to be sure of his understands, The question posed to him is whether the development proposal was

discussed by EDC, at least at this point, regarding potential development of this new arrangement of land, the answer there is “No, not at this time.” There was nothing presented. He notes that he inquired in the Land Use Office if there was something that was overlooked, but they were dealing with the initial question that started in the Land Use Office: Could a swap occur? He asks if that is correct.

Director Kozikowski replies, “That is correct,” adding that there was no plans for EDC in his office.

Councilman Loffredo thanks Director Kozikowski.

The Chair calls on Councilman Philip Pessina.

Councilman Pessina asks when Director Kozikowski had the meeting with the Board of Education Facilities Director, what was the potential use if this swap goes forward. He asks if mentioned any educational benefits. He asks what the context of that conversation was.

Director Kozikowski replies that the content of that conversation described the proposal and the intent of the developers to construct a residential development on that piece of land, which it currently owns. It is seeking the additional piece of land, which is City owned for access to the developable portion of his land. That is the context.

Councilman Pessina asks if that had any issues with the development.

Director Kozikowski replies that they had questions as there was no plan to present. There was only conversation. They offered very little information regarding the use of the land that the developer is seeking.

Councilman Pessina states, that based on what they know from EDC (Economic Development Commission) and from what Director Kozikowski is saying, the Board of Education, if a plan comes forward, it will have to go back to the Board of Education for review as to possible impacts. He notes that maybe there wouldn't be. They surely have to be part of the conversation before it gets to Chairman Loffredo and the committee for review. Is that correct?

Director Kozikowski states that he did not present the full Board of Education, only to the Facilities Committee. He cannot speak to what the conversation was for the full Board of Education.

Councilman Pessina replies, “Okay,” adding that what he is trying to get to, in his opinion is that they would need to vet what would occur next to Lawrence School and redoing the multiuse trail as part of the process. He notes that he may be getting ahead of himself, adding that he knows that Chairman Loffredo has not indicated to any of them on the EDC Committee that there has been any plan forthcoming. Thank you.

There being no additional question for Director Kozikowski, the Chair states that he will chime in on this topic. He states that Economic & Community Development Director Joseph Samolis was not able to be here tonight, but that he did speak with him prior to this meeting. He notes that the developer in question followed up on this subject. The developer has not committed resources to a formal site plan because of the uncertainty of the land swap, whether or not it will take place. The developer is waiting in the order of operations to develop a formal site plan until the Common Council votes on this land swap. He understands that they are amenable to EDC review and input on that plan, but his understand is that cannot commit these resources until they know that they will have access to the land that they need.

The Chair calls on Councilman Eugene Nocera.

Councilman Nocera, noting that he is not sure if the Land Use Director Kozikowski or the Chair is covering for Economic & Community Development Director Samolis, but the bid waiver on 80 Harbor Drive he fully supports as a member of Finance & Government Operations and Chair of Public Works Commission. For the rest of the Council, he asks that they explain the rationale that they need to know for tonight.

The Chair replies that he will be brief. He explains that this is another bid waiver that is being submitted for continuation of construction at 80 Harbor Drive. The reasoning is straight-forward. There are contractors, already awarded work on other elements of the project. Completion of the roof was an urgent need for the new tenant and the City to meet our mutual goal of opening May 1, 2022. That is the intended goal. It was ambitious goal that few of thought that we could meet, but we are working very hard to meet that timeframe. The bid waiver will help us continue to work with these contractors with electrical and roof work to continue to meet that schedule. It is a continued partnership, continued work on that facility. The Chair offers to answer any questions.

There being no questions, the Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo states that, based on the Chair's comments, in terms of the land swap in the Newfield area, he asks if the Chair met with the developer. The Chair replies that, “Yes,” he has met with the developer.

Councilman Loffredo asks if the developer gave the chair a plan of development.

The Chair replies that he does not recall the extent of what was presented on paper. He states that he echoes Land Use Director Kozikowski's comment that the intent is a residential development that includes the land

being swapped by the City and Board of Education and the parcel of open space being donated to the City. It was a number of months ago, adding that it may be the same meeting that Director Kozikowski is referring to. He does not recall the paperwork, but that is the intended purpose. It would be reviewed by EDC going forward as a separate standalone project independent of the land swap. He would be amenable to that

Councilman Loffredo states that he had asked a direct question, asking them to provide some preliminary plans presented to his office. The answer was, "No" that is was just a discussion and there is no documentation. Thank you.

Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr. notes that there is no issue with the Board of Education what they do on this property.

The Chair replies that the Board of Education voted at their last meeting for this swap and the parcel that now if the Council takes action to approve this swap, the parcel that will become City property – about a 25 acre parcel of wetlands – we will work with the Board of Education on appropriate uses there, including potential extensions of the multi-use trail and if there are any educational opportunities that can be leveraged there.

Councilman Faulkner replies that it is only the piece that the City will have that may become an issue.

The Chair replies, "Correct." The Chair calls on Councilman Eugene Nocera, followed by Councilman Philip Pessina.

Councilman Nocera state that he does not know for a fact, but he understands that a couple of Board of Education members abstained from approving this land swap because they, in fact, were interested in learning more about the concept drawing for the plan itself and its potential impact on Lawrence School. He thinks it is prudent that these pans be brought forward to the, adding quickly, so that we can get this moving forward, It is important that we work with our investors, and he totally supports that. Apparently, there are still some questions from the Board of Education on this. He does not have all of the data, so he is not entirely sure, but that is his understanding.

The Chair replies that his understanding on this order of operations question is that the land needs to be secured before the plan, but certainly he agrees with the need for community input, for more information.

The Chair calls on Councilman Philip Pessina followed by Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Pessina states that Councilman Nocera, as Chair of the Public Works Committee, and their committee in itself (Economic Development Commission) will be interested how that parcel will be used for a multi-use trail. They have been planning that for a while. They will be keeping an eye on that to see the extent it helps them with it, it would be great. He also wants to comment on 8 Harbor Drive. He states that as the Co-Chair, he urges Councilmembers to take a look and see what has happened so far because of how they have been working together with the contractors and the City as well as potential owners to meet the goal stated by the Chair he thinks that the councilmembers can see the new roof, what is going on down there, plus what has been done with Harbor park itself, adjacent to it. They will get excited as their committee is excited about meeting that May goal.

The Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo states that, in terms of being responsive to the information, he did check with the Board of Education, it is his understanding that the vote was five (5) affirmative votes and three (3) abstentions, adding that maybe someone was absent. He reiterates that five (5) voted in the affirmative with three (3) abstentions, and one person was absent because that vote was not recorded.

The Chair thanks Councilman Loffredo for that information for the record, adding that this is the same item that is before the Council tonight.

The Chair calls on Councilman Edward McKeon.

Councilman McKeon states that he has a question for a different director, for Attorney Brig Smith. Councilman McKeon states that he does not need an answer tonight. He states that they are coming up on some important changes in reporting between the Board of Education and the City, He asks, for the next meeting, to have an update from Attorney Smith as to what is happening.

General Counsel Brig Smith asks what Councilman McKeon would like him to report on relative to the Board of Education transition.

Councilman McKeon would like a general report as to what is being planned, what actions are being taken, how are they negotiating with the Board of Education so that Council gets a sense of what is happening as far as he can. He adds that, if they are negotiating, he understand that there may be some things that they cannot talk about. He ask for a report to the extent possible.

Attorney Smith replies that he will.

The Chair adds that the Charter Revision officially takes effect at the beginning of July so that is the timeframe that they are working on. There have been some questions raised as to changes to Boards and Commission as well. It is perhaps something that can be included in that presentation next month. He will get material out about these changes as well.

4. Questions to Directors Workshop Closes

There being no additional questions, Question to Directors is closed at 6:54 PM.

5. Meeting adjourned

Councilman Philip Pessina moves to adjourn. Councilman Jeanette Blackwell seconds the motion. There being no discussion, the Chair calls for a voice vote. The motion is approved unanimously by a vote of 11-0 (AYE: Councilmembers Blackwell, Carta, Faulkner, D. Ford, Gennaro, Loffredo, Mangiafico, McKeon, Nocera, Pessina, and Salafia; ABSENT: Councilman E. Ford). The matter is approved

The meeting is adjourned at 6:55 PM.

ATTEST:
LINDA S.K. REED,
COMMON COUNCIL CLERK

K: review/ minutes/ 2022 February 07 – Questions to Directors and Monthly COVID report – 7 February 2022