

MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1978 MEETING

15th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 15th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Wednesday, October 4, 1978, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives, in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 P.M. by the President of the Board, John Wayne Fox, after both parties had met in political caucus.

INVOCATION: Ms. Hilda Dudley, Baha'i Faith, 110 Little Hill Drive, Stamford, gave the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President John Wayne Fox.

PAGES: MISS JANE BAXTER, student at St. Maurice School, Grade 5, daughter of City Rep. George Baxter.

MISS TERESA SWIKLA, student at St. Maurice School, Grade 5.

ROLL CALL: CLERK DIANE RAYMOND called the Roll. 37 members present and 3 absent. Absentees were City Representatives Carlucci, McInerney, and Livingston. (This was the final attendance after a resignation, a replacement, and a few members arriving a bit late.)

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: The President tested the machine and found it to be in operating order.

MR. ESPOSITO said that with the new, lowered ceilings and new lighting fixtures, it is virtually impossible for many members in the back to see the numbers on the Board, and that even he with relatively good eyes and being relatively young, had trouble seeing them. He asked that new, more easily discernible numbers be put on the voting machine.

MR. FOX asked that Mr. Esposito write this request to the House Committee.

RESIGNATION OF MRS. MARGARET PRICE (D-6)

MR. FOX said the first item of business is a letter that was hand-delivered to him this evening, which reads as follows:

"It is with much regret that I ask you to accept my resignation as a 6th District Representative. Because of the increasing amount of hours I must spend at my job, I find it impossible to devote the time I feel that one should spend to be a good Representative. In fairness to my running mate, Jack Schlechtweg, my fellow Representatives, and members of the committees I've served on who worked so hard and devote many, many hours of their time, I hereby resign effective this date, October 3, 1978.

Sincerely yours, Peggy Price."

MR. FOX said it was with regret that he accepts this resignation of Peggy Price who was a very fine Representative who worked very hard on the committees to which she was assigned.

ELECTION OF MS. ANNIE SUMMERVILLE (D-6)

MR. SCHLECHTWEG placed in nomination to fill Margaret Price's vacated seat, the name of MS. ANNIE SUMMERVILLE, 873 Washington Blvd., Apt. 16-H, Stamford, Conn. He said she has lived in Stamford for the past 15 years. Some of her civic duties are Yerwood Women's Club, President; NAACP, past Treasurer); member of the St. John's Towers Tenants Assn. and past Treasurer. Also a member of the Democratic City Committee and the Democratic Women's Club. He moved Ms. Summerville's name into nomination. SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski.

MR. WIDER also SECONDED the nomination, and said he has known Ms. Summerville since she came to Stamford 15 years ago and that she has been an active, productive member of the community. He said she carried out her responsibilities as a citizen of this City in a most conscientious manner, and that the City is fortunate to have a person of her calibre nominated.

MR. FOX called for a Motion to close nominations, which was MOVED and SECONDED. Then a Motion was made to cast one ballot for the election of MS. SUMMERVILLE as 6th District Representative (Democrat). SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FOX then administered the OATH OF OFFICE and Ms. Summerville was sworn in and was seated.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG asked that a letter of thanks be sent to Ms. Price for her service on the Board. He said had she had more time, she would have become an outstanding leader in the community. He was sorry that the business pressures of her job caused her to resign, but what time she was able to give to the Board was indeed appreciated.

MR. SIGNORE asked for a Moment of Silence in memory of David Austin and Mr. Fox said that could be taken care of toward the end of the meeting as per the policy that was established.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. SCHLECTWEG MOVED to WAIVE the reading of the Steering Committee Report. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FOX said that before they got into the Committee Reports, he asked that members keep in mind that since the new, lowered ceilings were installed, there is a lot of feed-back and it is difficult to hear the person who has the floor. It seems the sensitive microphones pick up nearby sounds, as well as the speaker's voice.

MR. SIGNORE asked that the heating-air conditioning elements be adjusted to work properly instead of delivering heat when cooling is needed and vice versa.

MR. BAXTER would like the volume of the microphones adjusted so they could breathe without disturbing people.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met in the Democratic Caucus Room on Tuesday, September 19, 1978. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Wayne Fox at 8:30 p.m. when a QUORUM became present.

PRESENT AT STEERING COMMITTEE (11):

Wayne Fox, Chairman
John Schlechtweg
Handy Dixon
Sandra Goldstein
Michael Feighan
John Zelinski
David I. Blum
Alfred Perillo
Lathon Wider
Vere Wesley
Mildred Ritchie

ABSENT FROM STEERING (7):

Diane Raymond
Michael Morgan
Charles Wilmot
Leo Carlucci
Donald Sherer
George Hays
Ralph Loomis

ALSO PRESENT AT MEETING:

Richard Ferrara
Everett Pollard
Robert DeLuca
William MacInnis
Fiorenzo Corbo
Jeremiah Livingston

OTHERS PRESENT AT MEETING:

Gayle Elliott) Stamford Tax-
Victor Olup) payers' Assn.
Canio Santoro, Repub. Town Chmn.
Wm. Fitzpatrick, of Park Manor
Media
2 strangers

(1) MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS:

Of the nine names appearing on the Steering Agenda, six were ordered on the Agenda (Robert Kraus, Peter Hoover, Edward Rauh, Anthony Moruke, Dr. Ballin, and Christel Truglia). Three were ordered held in committee for next month, being David Jetter, Eleanor Austin, and Michael Cacace.

(2) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (FISCAL) ITEMS:

The 18 items appearing on the Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Mr. Blum MOVED that Item #9 for the 5.5% Cost-of-Living Adjustment effective 7/1/77 be HELD IN COMMITTEE and not go on the agenda. It was SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski. Mr. Wider voted that this be returned to committee. The rest of the Steering Committee members voted that it go on the Agenda as per the wish of the Fiscal Committee Chairperson, Mrs. Goldstein.

Mr. Blum asked that members be advised when expenditures are made out of the Contingency Fund and also what the current balance is each month.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE MATTERS:

The seven items on the Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Also ordered on the agenda was the matter of tax exemption for the Bi-Cultural Day School. Ordered Held in Committee was an item concerning Canine Waste for which Mr. Schlechtweg wished an ordinance enacted. Health & Protection was to be the Secondary Committee on the proposed Canine Waste ordinance.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS:

The two items on the Steering Agenda: (a) matter of the Housing Authority and Civil Service status for their employees was ordered HELD IN COMMITTEE; and (b) request from the Environmental Protection Board for Civil Service status for their director, secretary and future employees was also ordered HELD IN COMMITTEE.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:

Three matters were ordered on the Agenda: (a) discontinuance of Crosby St. and to turn it into parking lot for Pitney-Bowes; (b) resolution re Hardesty Rd.; (c) bringing Liberty Place up to standard. Three other matters were ordered Held in Committee: (i) proposed earth-moving ordinance to amend zoning regulations; (ii) Rep. Corbo's letter re Dartley St. Ext.; (iii) Rep. Blum's letter re Van Buren Circle and Hillandale Ave.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

Ordered on the Agenda was enforcement of Ord. #340 re fall leaf-pick up and spring clean-up citywide.

(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS:

The Canine Ord. request on the Steering Agenda was transferred to Legislative and Rules Committee. Added, but ordered Held in Committee, was an item concerning Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter re problems at Park Manor where he felt he was unjustly accused.

(8) SEWER COMMITTEE MATTERS:

All four items on Steering were ordered On the Agenda. They appear in the Agenda which is attached.

(9) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS:

One item was added, and ordered Held in Committee, being Mr. Blum's letter of Sept. 14th regarding the shortage of housing.

(10) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS:

The one item on Steering Agenda was removed from the agenda, being Joseph K. Sherman's letter re urgent needs pre-application re his property in the South-east Quadrant.

(11) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS:

Both items on Steering Agenda were ordered On the Agenda, being encroachment lines on Mianus River, and dredging of East Branch of Stamford Harbor.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued) - SEPT. 19, 1978:(12) TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MATTERS:

Ordered removed from the Agenda was the item re Rep. Corbo's letter 7/31 re dangerous intersection at Paragon Lane and Washington Blvd. A new item ordered into committee was Rep. Hawe's letter about the railroad station.

(13) CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE MATTERS:

Ordered Held in Committee was the one item on Steering regarding Westcott Neighborhood Assn.'s request for appointment of 3 alternates to the Board of Finance via ordinance.

Meeting dates were established for all Committees to avoid over-lapping and to ensure quorums so that committees could function properly.

ADJOURNMENT:

Upon MOTION MADE, SECONDED and CARRIED, the Steering Committee adjourned at 9:30 P.M., there being no further business to come before it. (The last Regular Board meeting was 8 days ago, on Sept. 11, 1978.)

EM:MS

JOHN WAYNE FOX, Chairman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON said the Appointments Committee met September 28th at 8:00 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present were Representatives Maihock, Carlucci, Signore, Schlechtweg, Pollard, Boccuzzi and Dixon. At that meeting the Committee interviewed most of the appointees whose names appear on the Agenda.

MR. DIXON said in the interest of saving time, he MOVED to place on the CONSENT AGENDA, items #1, #2, #4, and #6, being Mr. Kraus, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Moruke, and Mrs. Truglia.

BOARD OF RECREATION

(3) EDWARD RAUH (D)
106 Jordan Lane
(Held in Committee 8/28)
(Replacing Douglas Tucker
whose term expired)

APPROVED:

1 No (Boccuzzi)
1 Abstention (M.Perillo)
Balance: Yes votes

Term Expires:

Dec. 1, 1980

MR. DIXON said Mr. Rauh has lived in Stamford for 14 years and expressed a strong desire to lend his services to the City, and was particularly interested in recreation as he would like to effect better meeting of the needs of people on different age levels. The Committee voted 6 yes, 1 No, and Mr. Dixon MOVED for his confirmation. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote and Mr. Rauh was APPROVED with 1 No vote (Boccuzzi), 1 Abstention (M. Perillo) and the rest Yes votes by a voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON said that Item #5 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE, Dr. Bert Ballin for the Health Commission, as he was not interviewed.

HEALTH COMMISSION(5) DR. BERT BALLIN (D)

Stone Hill Drive

Held in Committee 8/28

HELD IN COMMITTEE 10/4/78

Re-Appointment

Term Expires:

Dec. 1, 1980

MR. DIXON then MOVED for confirmation on the CONSENT AGENDA of Mr. Robert Kraus for Personnel Commission; Mr. Peter Hoover for Board of Tax Review; Mr. Anthony Moruke for Board of Recreation; and Mrs. Christal Truglia for Commission on Aging. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said that Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, Sept. 27, 1978. Present were Representatives Rybnick, Hawe, Esposito, Ritchie, Wiesley, and Goldstein. She said this past month Deputy Finance Commissioner Tom Canino and Internal Auditor Robert Ruzkowski came to Fiscal's meeting and will be attending Fiscal meetings each month to help any way they can, as representatives of the Finance Department. That as an experiment this past month, it was very successful, and the Committee appreciated their help. She wishes to publicly thank both Mr. Canino and Mr. Ruzkowski.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said that on each member's desk is an envelope containing two sheets of paper, the blue one being the Fiscal Report and the other a memo from Mr. Ruzkowski to the Fiscal Committee. The latter is a summary of the current Contingency Fund balance and is self-explanatory. The blue sheet relates to the agenda tonight and explains the fiscal items, which comes out of the Contingency Fund, which are Grants, and which additional appropriations.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the following items are to go on the CONSENT AGENDA: Fiscal items #5, 7, 10, 15, 16, 17.

The following items were intended for the Consent Agenda but were not put on it at the request of certain members: (#1 (Mr. DeLuca); #11 (Mr. Signore); #13 (due to no quorum for Health & Protection).

As Mrs. Goldstein went over the list, Mr. Fox called for and received the concurrence of the secondary committee in each case, respectively, except for #13 on which a motion was made, seconded and carried to Waive report from the secondary committee.

MR. GOLDSTEIN said on Item #1, \$736.00 for Transportation Dept., this is to cover cost of gasoline for three new vehicles. Fiscal voted 6-0 and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA called for rejection of this item, stating that in a budget of \$684,000.00, there should be enough fat to cover an item of \$736.00, and if there is not, they can come back later for it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said we just got our new budget books today and Account 280.2750 for \$4,800.00 was the original department request and the Board of Finance cut the entire amount, so this is an original appropriation to purchase gasoline for the new cars that the department has.

MR. FERRARA asked whether Traffic and Parking were synonymous as they are being used interchangeably.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said they are not synonymous but are part of the same department. There is a Traffic portion and a Parking portion of the same budget, just like the Public Works Departments are part of one huge Department, there are a number of different sub-departments.

MR. FOX called for a vote, and being in doubt, called for a machine vote. In response to an unidentified voice, Mr. Fox said that a two-thirds' vote (23 yes) was required. The MOTION was DENIED by a vote of 22 YES; 10 NO; 3 ABSTENTIONS.

- (1) \$ 736.00 - TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT - Code 280.2750 - GASOLINE - Additional Appropriation. (Approved on Reconsidered Vote)

MR. RYBNICK, being on the Prevailing Side, MOVED for RECONSIDERATION of Item #1 Fiscal for \$736.00 for Transportation. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Reconsider and it CARRIED with 27 YES and 8 NO.

MR. FOX then called for a vote on the Main Motion, Item #1, \$736.00, and the Motion CARRIED with 25 YES, and 10 NO votes, fulfilling the 2/3s requirement.

- (2) ~~\$9,360.00~~ - PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT - Code 270.1110 - SALARIES-for Personnel \$8,320.00 Technician I to start Oct. 1, 1978. starting 11/1/78.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Item #2 is for a Personnel Technician I, whose express job is to monitor the City's Safety Program. Fiscal voted 6-0 to reduce the amount from \$9,360.00 to \$8,320.00 to reflect a November 1st starting date. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI said Personnel met October 3rd. Present were Representatives Blum, Santy, DeLuca, and Zelinski. They voted unanimously in favor of this item.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the Motion CARRIED with 1 NO vote, being Mr. Corbo.

- (3) \$2,729.00 - BOARD OF FINANCE - CODE 103.1130 PART-TIME SALARIES - for Staff Analyst and Clerk/Secretary.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 6-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE and she so MOVED.

MR. ZELINSKI said Personnel concurred.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (4) \$ 2,500.00 - BOARD OF FINANCE - Code 103.5120 - PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICE - to complete payment to City auditors, Arthur Young & Co.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 6-0 to DENY as the books for fiscal expenditures for 77/78 are closed and this line item has already been recorded as a deficit, so there is no need to appropriate another \$2,500.00; and she so MOVED.

MRS. RITCHIE said EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT concurred.

MR. FOX said that normally in such a situation, it is the practice to entertain a Motion to Approve and then vote on it in that fashion. He asked if anyone present intends to vote in favor of that appropriation, in light of the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee; if not, we would simply record it as an unanimous vote against the appropriation. Seeing no hands, the MOTION is REJECTED UNANIMOUSLY, and the funding is DENIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said on Item #6, this is somewhat complicated and the members will have to go over the budget for the Parking Department as this is an additional appropriation to fund fiscal 78/79 for the former Parking Authority operations. Last year's Charter Revision amendments converted Parking operations from an independent authority to a City department. In order to fulfill the Bond Trustees' obligation to the bondholders, an agreement was worked out that all parking revenues would continue to be deposited into the Trustees' fund and each month the Trustees will remit to the City one-twelfth of the Parking Budget. Fiscal voted to cut Account Code 281.2360 from \$50,312.00 to \$38,312.00, and cut Account 281.5150 from \$6,000.00 to ZERO, cuts of \$12,000 and \$6,000 respectively, for a total of \$18,000.00. This appropriation will have no effect on the mill rate as there are offsetting revenues to take care of the funds. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO said Transportation Committee concurred.

MR. FOX called for a vote on \$784,958.00 and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, Item #6.

- (6) ~~\$702,958.00~~ - PARKING DEPARTMENT - Operating Budget for 78/79 - see Mayor's
\$684,958.00 line item budget 7/31/78. Board of Finance approved \$702,958.00. Board of Representatives reduced this by \$18,000.00, cutting \$12,000 from Code 281.2360 (from \$50,312 to \$38,312), and cutting Code 281.5150 Professional Consultants from \$6,000.00 to Zero.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said on Item #8, \$20,000 for the Youth Service Bureau, this is to cover the City's portion of the Youth Service Bureau Grant. This is the third year of a 3-year declining grant from LEAA. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, 1 Abstention, and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM said Health and Protection did not have a quorum at time of voting.

MR. FOX called for a vote on a Motion made and seconded to waive the requirement of a secondary committee. CARRIED.

MR. DeLUCA recommended rejection of this, as he said once grants are no longer forthcoming, the programs should be terminated. Also that we have a Police Youth Bureau and other agencies in town that can handle this without any further burden to the City.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. RAYMOND: I also would like to recommend not voting in favor of this \$20,000.00. There are many fine people who are involved with, in very fine-intentioned positions. I think what has happened to this Youth Bureau is that it has become another paper-pushing job and that is all they really do, people sitting behind desks making loads or lots of reports and surveys that really do not help children, the youth of Stamford in other words, which is to be their purpose, and to help coordinate other activities by the groups.

For instance, I did read a very interesting survey that the Youth Bureau has to carry out, although I say it is interesting, it really isn't, because what it showed is that the youth of Stamford is very concerned in having more recreational problems, more transportation available to them, and more job training and employment programs available to them. This was the exact same thing that my peer group when I was young was interested in having, and probably the same was true in Mr. Rybnick's day, and many, many others. No offense, Mr. Rybnick, but youth has not changed that much.

There are many, many fine programs, run by many, many organizations, including our Board of Education which has a great deal of money to put toward helping our youth. We do not need more people sitting behind desks typing out reports. It is a waste of time and money. If they really want to be of true help to you, they ought to get off their chairs from behind their desks and get out there and really help the youths, whether it be physically taking them to parks or listening to them, or talking to them.

MR. VENTURA said he has to agree with some of things said by his co-representatives on the floor. That what Mrs. Raymond said is very appropriate in this case. He asked Mrs. Goldstein if this item were rejected, would it mean any other programs that are funded would be hurt as a result.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said yes, this particular request funds the administrative unit of the Youth Service Bureau. If rejected, then there would be no one to administer certain other programs which have been grant-funded, as for example PROJECT SUPPORT. These people don't really sit behind desks and do nothing. She said she doesn't mean to negatively paraphrase Mrs. Raymond but that was what Mrs. Raymond was saying. There is an Out-Reach worker whose specific job is to go out and relate to and with children in the community. An evaluation was made from the Connecticut Justice Commission of the program and it rated very, very highly. It is a worthwhile program, filling a need and servicing a very important segment of society. She urged passage of this item.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she has some reservations about this program, particularly an expensive IBM Correctible Typewriter. Also that \$1,500.00 seems high for telephone service, and that this should be investigated a little bit further. She said our own Board of Representatives office which does a monumental amount of work does not have expensive equipment, and she, being a Legal Secretary, understands those typewriters very well and that very fine work can be done on less expensive equipment.

MRS. HAWK agreed with Mr. DeLuca and Mrs. Raymond and MOVED to RETURN TO COMMITTEE. SECONDED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE said Ms. Brewster advised that funding is contingent upon a functioning Youth Service Bureau. which contracts out different programs such as Drug Liberation, Spanish International Center, Southfield Community Center Organization, Family and Children's Services, Community Mental Health Center, and some Board of Education programs. She doesn't feel, however, that the City should have to take over something that the Federal and State Governments have been funding, and in addition add 1½ people to it. She would like to have the time to investigate.

MR. FOX said Mr. Wider is next and he asked that speakers limit their discussions as to whether or not the matter should be returned to committee.

MR. WIDER said he does not feel this should be returned to committee, and he believes some people do not know about the program. He looked into this and these people are doing a fantastic job working with hard-core kids that have to stay away from home some nights, and places must be found for them to sleep. They should be encouraged not held back and they should not be discouraged.

MR. LOOMIS supported Mrs. Hawe's motion, that before we wipe out this money we get from the State and jeopardize those other programs, we should take the time to properly evaluate it. He also agreed with the logic of Mr. DeLuca and Mrs. Raymond. Every month we deal with a lot of competing needs, everyone having a compelling and legitimate need, and at some point we have to decide which needs are more important than others and establish priorities. He thinks an agency like this is essentially a paper-shuffling operation, perhaps a harsh judgment, but we can do without seriously missing it. However the funds that go to those other agencies are important and there may be a way of getting those funds for those other agencies without having this bureau around so he thinks one month will give time for a hard look and perhaps to negotiate with the State, so he supports Mrs. Hawe's motion to return to committee.

MR. ESPOSITO favors returning to committee, but also agrees with Mr. Wider totally. He suggests some people spend some time at HOBS HOUSE where the personnel is not sitting at desks, shuffling papers, that the Out-Reach worker at HOBS finds emergency shelter for the kids who are walking the streets at night, and works through the middle of the night frequently. She has been at his house in the middle of the night frequently with children who need emergency housing. He said come back next month and make a more realistic judgment about this program.

MR. SIGNORE agreed it should back to committee for Mr. Wider's reason, to learn what the program really does, and next month vote with a clear understanding of what it is all about.

MR. DARER MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said yet to speak for the first time are Mr. Hays, Mr. Schlechtweg, Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Dixon. MOTION CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on Item #8 to be Returned to Committee, and the MOTION CARRIED, 28 YES, 5 NO.

(8) \$20,000.00 - YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU - Code 792 and 793.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Item #9 is for \$221,435.00 MANAGEMENT COMPENSATION PLAN - for a Cost-of-Living increase for M.A.A. personnel for the period from July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978 retroactive, and to carry the increase forward into the 78/79 operating budget period of 7/1/78 to 6/30/79. Fiscal cut the request from \$221,435.00 to \$219,345.00. Item #107 was cut to \$1,168 from \$2,080, and decreasing the retroactive portion by \$128.00, subtracting that from \$1,040. #93 on Page 7 represents employment termination and \$780. was cut from 78/79. There was a computation error for three members of the Law Dept. on page 4 of the Agenda. Items #14, 15, 17. You will reduce by \$71.00 the retroactive portion and \$71.00 for the current portion which gives a total cut of \$426.00. Now any other vacancies you might see in this Agenda have been cut already by the Board of Finance. There is a little addenda at the end of item #9 showing which vacancies have been cut. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor of reducing to \$219,345.00 and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI said Personnel met on this on October 3rd and they do not concur. He MOVED to amend that Motion of Mrs. Goldstein's. Personnel voted 3 in favor and 1 against, to delete \$3,968, and the breakdown is: Employee #8 \$494.00; #20 \$779.00; #24 \$442; #25 \$1,131.00; #37 \$1,122. SECONDED.

MR. DARER asked what the rationale was for Item #37 leaving \$1,122, just that one specific item.

MR. ZELINSKI said that the Committee felt that the remaining employees who had been here a great length of time, even 2 or 3 years, are certainly well-deserving of these salary adjustments. However, in this particular situation that the particular individual just started working for the City on March 27, 1978. This is retroactive in two stages, one 7/1/77 thru 6/30/78 and the next retroactive is 7/1/78 to 1979. Their strong conclusions were that people who were hired by the City at a specific salary, the job being advertised at a specific salary, the person that was hired agreed to that salary, and the Committee feels that it is not fair to the remaining people who have worked for the City long and hard to give this adjustment to persons who just started working with the City. They also felt that compared to outside industry that if someone is hired at a certain salary, at least that person works in that position at least a year to show that they are doing the job they were hired for, and that's the reason the Committee strongly urges these deletions; and Mr. Zelinski added that some of his Committee members have other cuts and if those are approved, he will also MOVE those.

MR. DARER asked why on Item #45, an employee who came on stream July 1, 1978, was not included in the cuts?

MR. ZELINSKI said they had 4 members of the Personnel Committee present, and after they were discussing this item, and after they discussed #37, they lost their quorum, as Mr. Blum had left, and being left without a quorum, they could not recommend, as a Committee, any further changes, but there will be recommendations on an individual basis also, and that is one of those, #45.

MR. SIGNORE wanted something clarified. #33 on page 5 shows a new Budget Director for \$15,964.00. However in the mail the other day, he received a Civil Service Job Opportunity Flyer for a Budget Officer, Open Competitive #78-62, with a salary range on this particular position of \$20,332. to \$29,172, so assuming this is the same position, why is it listed under Item #33 as \$15,964, and the job is advertised for \$20,332. starting?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the entire thing, #33, is off the agenda, being cut by the Board of Finance. She cannot reconcile the two numbers, but it does not affect this 5.5%.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: Everything Mr. Zelinski said in recommending his amendment implied that these increases were merit increases. He was talking about the fact that these people who were here a year or so, who have devoted enough time to the City, should and do deserve the increase, but people who haven't been here, don't deserve them. This is not a merit increase. This is a cost-of-living increase, and we have to pay special attention therefor to the dates on our agenda. The 5.5% increase should be from 7/1/77 to 6/30/78. In other words what that is saying is, for example, Item #20 as of 7/1/77 should have been paid at 5.5% more. The fact that it wasn't was because we didn't approve it, or it got caught up in the bureaucratic structure. But it is saying that as of 7/1/77 it should be \$18,044, which is 5.5% less than it should have been, so therefore the position itself should be funded, not necessarily a person, the person if he or she happened to be hired as of Sept., 1977, is entitled to the 5.5% increase because their dollars bought less.

Last month we approved a new police contract that goes back to last year. All the policemen who are hired during this past year received the increase from the date they were hired. It works on the same logic. The fact is that they received the increase because when they were hired, the salary they were getting was considered to be less than what was appropriate, and they just had to wait until the time came when we approved the new salary base.

MR. BLUM said he attended the Fiscal Committee, thinking that Personnel was going to meet jointly, and he did attend the Oct. 3rd meeting. We received a Chronology of the Stamford Management Personnel Salary Plan. Now this dates back to 1976 when the Board of Finance refused the Administrators at that time the same type of traditional increase as the MEA, but instead decided to have a study of the MAA administrators on their salaries and so on.

We have knocked this around since 1976, and we have approved, at this Board, a Management Plan, and part of the Management Plan, if I remember, besides merit increases, was supposed to be an annual cost-of-living adjustment. If I, and numerous others who mentioned private industry management, do get cost-of-living adjustments, they get it in various ways. They get it through bonuses; they get it through percentages, and so on.

If a Plan is designed with a cost-of-living adjustment across-the-board, we are not giving it to individuals, we are giving it to jobs. And it does not matter if I walk in tomorrow and pass the test as an administrator. I don't care, I'll pick anyone: Data Processing, Public Works, Personnel Dept., and if I passed the test, and tomorrow I walk into the job, and the day before they passed the Cost-of-Living Adjustment, it is due that job. It is due the job, and you can go all over the country and talk to many Personnel people. I do happen to belong to an organization in which Personnel people do meet 3 or 4 times a year, and I can name many of the organizations that are represented there, management-type of organization, and if a Plan is presented through the management personnel and a man is hired the day after the plan goes through, he gets that raise, it is part of the plan, and I don't see how we can pick and say they must be here one year.

Yes, if we're going to judge his merit, or his performance, or his productivity, that's a different thing. But we are giving him a cost-of-living adjustment, and believe me, the cost-of-living in this town has really gone up; and try, in this town, to compete with our Corporation Executives to get someone. We must, in order to get good types of experts in our City Government, bring our range within sight to get these good types of people.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LOOMIS said he would like to speak against Mr. Zelinski's motion. He would like to remind the Board of the scandal and all the problems that we faced 2 or 3 years ago, and the long process we have gone through, and the many dollars we spent to arrive at this point here tonight.

We're voting on positions, and those positions have arrived, have been arrived at through a very lengthy and fair process, and one that has not been overly influenced by personal judgments and by second-guessing, and we should not at this point now start to adjust those numbers.

MRS. RITCHIE said she would speak against Mr. Zelinski's motion. Why should we single out certain people from the cost-of-living increase, in reality, as other fellow Board members have said? We are adjusting a salary scale position. We should not talk of people. This adjustment will stay whether you come in 3 months from now, or whether you come in tomorrow. That starting salary for all positions level should remain the same.

MR. DeLUCA said the taxpayers' taxes and everything else is going up drastically. We continue to give our City servants fantastic fringe benefits, and now we're going to upgrade positions, but services do not seem to go up in proportion. It has been proven throughout the country that increased wages and increased budgets and added staff do not have services going up at the same ratio. The taxpayers are getting ripped off. I agree with Mr. Zelinski and some of the other comments to vote against this package.

MR. WIDER said since we do have attrition, he hopes that they're not filling all of the positions that become vacant. However, he sees no reason to hold this pay these people are entitled to any longer and he hopes the Board will pass it. He is tired of seeing it on the agenda.

MR. HAYS MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said Mr. Wiesley is waiting to speak for the first time. The Motion to Move the Question is CARRIED.

MR. DARER said if Mr. Zelinski's motion to amend is approved, won't there be some serious complications on the others on the list who fall under the same rationale as this motion.

MR. FOX said that Mr. Zelinski's motion does not encompass #45, and many others, and he expects that after we have voted on this motion to amend which is the proposal coming out of the Personnel Committee, Mr. Zelinski will have one or more other motions to amend, to delete other items.

MR. FOX called for a vote on Mr. Zelinski's Motion to delete \$3,968 as mentioned previously. We now have 37 members present. Mr. Morgan is here. Mr. Sherer is here. The Motion to Amend is LOST, 11 Yes and 25 NO and 1 ABSTENTION.

MR. LOOMIS MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Main Motion for \$219,345.00, Item #9. The Motion is CARRIED with 27 YES, 9 NO, 1 ABSTENTION.

- (9) \$221,435.00 - MANAGEMENT COMPENSATION PLAN - 5.5% Cost-of-Living Adjustment
\$219,345.00 (See Agenda at end of Minutes for details.)

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Item #11 is for \$14,910.00 for the Board of Education to provide guidance and instruction services for handicapped children, and is part of our State Entitlement Grant to provide State relief at a local level to meet the requirements of a specific State law which is P.L. 94-142. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. RITCHIE said EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT concurred.

- (11) \$14,910.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - 100% grant under P.L. 94-142 "ENTITLEMENT GRANT FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN."

MR. SIGNORE said he had a question but quietly spoke to Mrs. Goldstein and she explained it so beautifully that he withdraws his discussion on it.

MR. FOX called for a vote on #11 and it CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Item #12 is for \$5,460.00 for the Board of Representatives. This was cut by Fiscal to reflect a November 1st starting date for a long-awaited Researcher for this Board. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI said Personnel took no action on this matter.

MR. FOX called for a Motion to Suspend the Rules in the absence of a secondary committee report. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Main Motion to approve \$4,900.00 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (12) \$-5,460.00 - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES - Code 102.1130 - PART-TIME SALARIES -
\$4,900.00 for Part-Time Researcher effective Oct. 1, 1978 per request from Board President J. W. Fox; Mayor's letter 9/6/78. Board of Finance approved 9/18/78. \$7.00 per hour x 39 weeks x 20 hrs. per week average. Period 10/1/78 - 6/30/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Item #13 is \$11,000.00 for the Fire Department's Amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for repairs to transmission of Telesquirt Pumper. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA said he had two questions. One is the negligence incurred by the Fire Department in going on the Merritt Parkway with this vehicle which shows a dereliction of duty on their part and now the City has to bail them out. Second is that a newspaper article on Sept. 7, 1978 states that the Fire Dept. is in the process of buying a new truck for \$119,900 of which \$130,000 was appropriated, which will leave a balance of approximately \$10,000 in the Capital budget, so why can't we transfer this once to take care of the \$11,000 repair bill which is considered a Capital item rather than an Operating item; therefore, before we approve this, he would like to send it Back to Committee and recommend that a transfer be made of the funds remaining from the purchase of the Fire Truck. Mr. DeLuca MOVED THAT the item be RETURNED TO COMMITTEE. SECONDED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said Mr. DeLuca's suggestion is well-taken and he doesn't really know the answer to that question if the money can be transferred. But there is another problem here and that is that the Fire Dept. is doing without this engine right now. It is up, he believes in Milford or up-state somewhere, just sitting in the yard, waiting for us to appropriate this money. As a matter of fact, it is sitting out in the open, just sitting there waiting for the money. If we return this to committee, we simply delay this process another month so the Board members should seriously consider that option, although Mr. DeLuca's point is well-taken.

MR. HAYS said that on this same subject, we, on this Board, do not transfer money here. They have to go through the Planning Board. That process could delay that fire engine at least two months, and to spend this \$11,000, to appropriate it tonight will not cost an additional \$11,000 because the money not spent for the new fire engine will go back into the City's General Fund, so there is no net increase cost as a result. This is the quickest way to get the fire engine back where it belongs and can be used.

MR. BLUM said he attended Fiscal and heard Chief Vitti say no work could be done on this vehicle until the money is appropriated. This is a very important piece of equipment which is badly needed for putting out fires, of which we have more than our share, and the engine should not be sitting up in Middletown or wherever it is. This City should not be left unprotected and we should not take chances. Mr. Blum is going to vote in favor of putting this truck back into service as quickly as can be possibly achieved.

MR. VENTURA said Mr. DeLuca is making an allegation of negligence and referred to an accounting procedure of transfer. We ought to stick to the economics of this thing and we are probably having to pay storage charges for the truck sitting in Middletown. If a transfer of funds is feasible and it is an economic advantage to the City, we should concentrate on that, but allegations of negligence and things of that nature are really uncalled for. It is important to have this piece of equipment back in the house.

MR. WIESLEY said that Chief Vitti said this was a very special transmission, and only one has been located, so we are lucky to have found it. Otherwise it would take many, many weeks, maybe months, before another one could be obtained. We know we are going to have to pay for it one way or another, either through Operating or Capital funds, so let's go ahead and get the job done. We can investigate and see if there is a different way of getting the money later on or who pays for it.

MR. LOOMIS MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Blum and Mrs. Goldstein are on the list to speak for a second time. The MOTION to Move the Question is CARRIED.

MR. FOX said the motion of Mr. DeLuca's is to Return to Committee Item #13. The MOTION is LOST, with 3 YES, 34 NO.

MR. DARER said Mr. DeLuca plays the role of Devil's Advocate very often and he ought to be commended for it. It's a tough thing when a person has to look inside his conscience and try to... (Mr. Boccuzzi said this is out-of-order)... Mr. Darer continued that he didn't see how we can vote against this motion, but he did feel this Board, in its wisdom, ought to express to the Fire Dept. its displeasure

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DARER (continuing re Fiscal #13)....with the manhandling of this equipment that caused this \$11,000 expenditure. He said some of us have looked into this matter and received the information to the effect that this equipment was towed, or was being towed, without disconnecting the drive-shaft which caused a fire in the equipment, thereby causing damage. He does believe that one of the responsibilities of this Board is to see that waste and mis-use of City property which has to be paid out of funding ought to be controlled more carefully.

MR. BLUM said the Chief said there is a possibility that because the transmission has a warranty, and the housing cracked, that the company that will be supplying the transmission, may give us some refunding of this \$11,000.00.

MR. RYBNICK MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said Mr. DeLuca and Mrs. Goldstein are waiting to speak. Motion is CARRIED to Move the Question.

- (13) \$11,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.0502 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1978/1979 - addition to project known as "REPAIRS TO TRANSMISSION - TELESQUIRT PUMPER".

MR. FOX called for a vote to approve the \$11,000.00. The MOTION is CARRIED with 36 YES and 1 ABSTENTION.

- (14) \$ 835.28 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Code 114.1130 - PART-TIME HELP.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the Fical Committee voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE Item #14.

- (18) \$ 87,384.40 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS - NON-CLASSIFIED SALARIES
 \$215,667.01 (NON-CIVIL SERVICE) for various Boards and Commissions, also
 \$303,051.41 Ferguson Library, Stamford Museum and Nature Center, etc.
 (See attached Agenda for detail.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the Fiscal Committee voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE Item #18.

MR. FOX called for a Motion to approve on the CONSENT AGENDA Fiscal Items #5, #7, #10, #15, #16, #17. MRS. GOLDSTEIN so MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Michael P. Feighan

MR. FEIGHAN said Legislative and Rules Committee met on Sept. 28th. In attendance were Representatives Markiewicz, Raymond, Wilmot, Festo and Feighan. Approved by the Committee, for publication, on the CONSENT AGENDA are items #1, 2, 6, and 8.

MR. FEIGHAN said on Item #3, the resolution that was received from the Board of Finance in regard to Tax Relief for the Elderly Ordinance is in the form of a resolution. The Committee listened to the Board of Finance members, Joel Freedman and Margaret Nolan, but because of it being in resolution form, the Committee voted unanimously to HOLD IN COMMITTEE Item #3.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM BOARD OF FINANCE RE TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FEIGHAN said concerning Item #4 for tax abatement for Evangelical Church, the Committee listened to Attorney McCabe, Attorney Swatland, and Mr. Green, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and voted to recommend a partial. The property is subdivided and the request for the abatement was for the entire parcel. However, one parcel has some existing buildings on it and one will be turned into a parsonage. The other parcel is totally vacant and with that in mind, the Committee felt that the taxes should be paid on the portion that is strictly acreage. With that in mind, the Committee voted 5 in favor and none opposed, to publish this partial tax abatement.

MR. FEIGHAN read the ordinance, mentioning that the reimbursement is to be \$1,174.30 for real property taxes paid for parcel #68 of the Grand List of Oct. 1, 1976 pro-rated as of Feb. 1, 1978, which would make it applicable to that one parcel. He so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY said she felt all tax abatements should be carefully scrutinized, but that it is extremely unfair to start with this church here in Newfield Avenue and deny them this tax abatement. These people are on the corner of Weed Hill Ave. and Newfield Ave. They have a lovely church there and they bought the property adjacent to them, the Dunning Estate. The Dunnings had this sub-divided into two parcels, a piece of property with a house, and just another vacant piece of property. This is going to be used solely and primarily, exclusively for Church growth purposes and that is all. Mrs. Santy MOVED to AMEND to include the total property being tax abated, or tax exempt, as requested by the church. SECONDED.

MR. SIGMORE said he wished to speak for total tax abatement of this particular land. This is a small congregation, and these small congregations work very hard to keep what they have and they struggle to keep their heads above water. However, many large non-profit organizations come in here and we don't touch them at all. There is one on the list tonight where they held a piece of land for ten years, made some \$400,000.00 on it, and move to another piece of land further up the road, and they were given full tax abatement, so why pick on this small congregation? Let's give them full abatement.

MR. FEIGHAN said he would like to address the issue of picking on. First of all four abatements Mr. Signore is correct, the first item was Moved on the Consent Agenda, and if anybody has a question on that, he would answer it directly. Of the remaining three, all three were scrutinized equally and all three will have the same conditions placed upon them, so nobody is really singling out this particular abatement. That when this abatement was discussed in L&R, there was really no indication what the sub-divided land would be used for one way or another, it was just sort of existing property.

MR. BAXTER said one has to be very careful as he knows the Committee has been on what is done on tax abatement for churches. There is the principle of separation of Church and State, and it is very easy, if one is not careful, to give the appearance of some sort of unintentional discrimination against one type of denomination or religious group over another. He personally finds that once you decide to give tax abatement to religious organizations, he does not understand failing to give that same abatement to land merely because it is vacant land. He also personally feels that if there is profit-making enterprises such as apartments or any other commercial-type enterprise on Church land, then for that reason the tax abatement should be forfeited, but when land is vacant and is not used for profit-making enterprises but is used for church enterprises, it is extremely dangerous and inconsistent to deny them tax abatement. He will support this amendment. You either get all of it, or none of it, and if they get none of it, then we have to have rules where nobody else who is similar to them gets nothing.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DARER said during the questioning period of this church, they were asked what they were going to do with that land and they said at that time they had no concept or thoughts of what they were going to do with it, and based on that answer, the L&R Committee voted not to give abatement. Now it might be of interest to this Board that the L&R Committee is working on a comprehensive ordinance or program that will involve itself with this entire question, and I would ask the Board to give us an opportunity to develop this into legislation, if you will, and bring it forward sometime in the future.

MR. WILMOT said he is sure he doesn't have to remind the Board members that every piece of additional property that receives tax abatement from this Board ultimately costs the taxpayers of this City additional taxes. It shrinks the size of the Grand List, therefore, increasing the burden on the existing properties remaining on that taxable List. He feels the abatement ordinance is extremely fair and should be adopted as recommended by Mr. Feighan. He said that the house and land surrounding it is for an Assistant Pastor, not for the primary residence for the Pastor of the church, so the Committee stretched the point, compromised, and came up with what they considered a very fair solution.

MR. BAXTER said it would not bother him if we removed abatement from every religious institution, including the church which he contributes to, but if we are going to give it to some, we had better be careful that we do it for all, properly and evenly. To differentiate between a Pastor and an Assistant Pastor is a dangerous concept. And to conclude that you have to construct on land is fallacious. Open space is not only desirable and enjoyable, but zoning requires certain minimum sized plots in certain zoning districts. Mr. Baxter disagrees with the main motion and supports the amendment.

MR. BAXTER said that each of us in the room who are homeowners and who bought homes or any other real estate a few years ago, now find that, to our astonishment, that real estate is worth twice, or even triple, in dollars what it was worth four-and-a-half years ago. Might we not, if we were superficial, think that there is a profit somehow, that land which cost \$20,000 now costs \$40,000, and we think it is a profit, until we go and try to buy something else, and then we recognize that inflation had reared its ugly head and while the dollars may be the same, you have not increased necessarily your relative purchasing position. So the question on profit and sale at a gain is, to me, an erroneous financial judgment. We are not an income tax, we are not taxing for capital gain, we are taxing for use, City services, if we make the decision not to charge ecclesiastical bodies for City services, which I think we have a perfect right to do.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Amend, to provide for tax abatement for the entire parcel of property. The MOTION is CARRIED with 17 YES, 14 NO, and 6 ABSTENTIONS, for full abatement, as originally submitted, FOR PUBLICATION.

(4) PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR EVANGELICAL CHURCH. FOR PUBLICATION.

MR. FEIGHAN said the original from which they were working, which is amended back to the way it was originally read, of which a copy had been sent to all members. At this point, he would like to add to these three abatements, also unanimously recommended by the L&R Committee, a conditional clause to be added in the publication.

MR. FOX said that he understands, however, this is not in the Motion that is now before the Board on this particular item.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FEIGHAN: The motion to publish?

MR. FOX: Well, the condition that you refer to is not in the ordinance which is now before us for publication. It is in the other items but not on this one. Are you proposing a motion to amend this ordinance?

MR. FEIGHAN said he understands what Mr. Fox means. The three abatements were taken up individually, and then regardless of the final form, the condition was added to all three of them. That the reason he is trying to separate it is because it is after-the-fact of how the abatement was to take place. The Committee voted unanimously to approve that the conditional paragraph be added to the final published ordinances.

MR. FOX said then the Motion to be voted on is to publish the ordinance as it pertains to the Evangelical Church with that condition attached thereto.

MR. FEIGHAN said yes, bearing in mind that it is the same condition for the two tax abatements that are on the CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DARER asked if Mr. Fox would accept a Motion to Return to Committee all of these tax abatements? He so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked how something can be returned to committee by voting on it when we don't know what Mr. Feighan is going to ask as the amendment.

MR. FOX said that Mr. Feighan is not making an amendment, nor has he made a Motion to Amend. The proposal before us is an ordinance for tax abatement for the Evangelical Church which is in writing. It has been recommended that there be attached to that ordinance a part B. He asked Mr. Feighan to read that paragraph in order to clarify it for Mr. Boccuzzi and the other members.

MR. FEIGHAN said the conditional paragraph that would be added to this and the other two abatements is: "This abatement is granted subject to the following stipulation: If the property on which the abatement has been granted is sold, conveyed or otherwise transferred, taxes will become payable in full for the entire abatement period, if the Capital Gain, as defined by the Internal Revenue Service, realized is in excess of taxes abated."

MR. FOX said that is what we have before us for publication. The Motion that is now on the floor by Mr. Darer is a MOTION to RETURN TO COMMITTEE. MOVED and SECONDED. Discussion is limited to whether or not it should go back to committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if Mr. Darer, now that he knows what the amendment was, does he still want to have it go back to committee?

MR. DARER withdrew the Motion to Amend.

MR. BAXTER said the SECONDER does not agree. He will continue with the Motion and he MOVED for the item to go back to committee. SECONDED by Mrs. Perillo.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FEIGHAN said he wanted all the Board members to know that the Committee has been working on tax abatements for several months now. They have tried in various ways to come up with a solution. They have gone to Corporation Counsel and asked for a ruling, albeit on a very nebulous-type question and we could not get any real feedback. With that in mind, they decided to take a step and give Corporation Counsel a real abatement with the condition that the full Board can accept with the recommendation of the L&R Committee. This Motion is for publication, not for Final Adoption, and the only way to get feedback from the public and from the Law Department is to put it in the Legal Notices and let the Committee have it for at least another month.

MR. ESPOSITO said that considering Mr. Feighan's last remarks, what does Mr. Baxter feel would be accomplished by returning to committee for another month.

MR. BAXTER said that in light of Mr. Feighan's remarks, any one of these amendments, any one of these tax abatements with this condition would satisfy Mr. Feighan's requirement, and Mr. Baxter would be happy to vote for ONE of them and return the rest to committee, knowing that one of them would be there just for test purposes for an opinion.

MR. FEIGHAN said to use Mr. Baxter's own words, it's all or nothing. We have to do it for all three, or we can't do it for any one of them.

MR. BAXTER said he felt, for test purposes, to get an opinion from the Law Department in a concrete situation, to publish one should be sufficient.

MR. HAYS made a Point of Order stating this they were debating Mr. Feighan's Motion which is not the issue.

MR. FOX said things were getting far-afield and that a vote should be taken on Mr. Baxter's Motion to Return to Committee. The MOTION to RETURN TO COMMITTEE is LOST, with 5 YES, 31 NO, 1 ABSTENTION, on Item #4.

MR. FOX said now the Main Motion to be voted on is to publish the Motion as proposed by Mr. Feighan, as amended by Mrs. Santy, which includes a paragraph outlined by Mr. Feighan which would result in a potential recovery of part of that tax abatement at a future time.

MR. HAYS asked if the amendment proposed by Mr. Feighan been approved by this Board to go with the rest of the ordinance, and if so, he would MOVE for an amendment to take it out.

MR. FOX said it has not. There has been nothing approved by this Board with respect to this ordinance and we have a motion which was on the floor to publish that ordinance. That is all.

MR. HAYS: With or without his amendment?

MR. FOX: With, not his amendment, with that paragraph.

MR. HAYS: That condition, then, I would MOVE to remove that addition and then ask for the privilege to give my reason.

MR. FOX: You're making a Motion to amend the ordinance by deleting that additional paragraph? SECONDED. Discussion?

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. HAYS said these non-profit organizations, and they are not limited to churches or religious organizations, are going to hold this property for some time. The dollar value is going to obviously going to decline over this period of time. To go for this Capital Gain as being taxable is really going to tax them on their lost value of the dollar, point one. Point two, there certainly should be some provision made for the fact that if they are religious organizations, their congregations are going to grow over the years; again, presumably, they're going to need larger quarters, and should they re-invest this Gain, for the good of their own purpose for larger quarters, should we penalize them because of the Gain they made here as a step to grow and go forward? The theory has merits but the proposal is not well-conceived at the moment and it should be discussed further in detail to apply to other proposed abatements later, and this should go forward; these three or four should go forward without that today.

MR. SHERER said he wished to speak on the amendment to delete. He is in favor of that deletion on very similar grounds as Mr. Hays. He wished to point out to Board members who may be relatively new to Stamford, say the last five or ten years, that almost every religious institution or many non-profit organization which are found north of the central city, so to speak, had its roots or its beginnings in downtown Stamford at one time.

There is an interesting cycle that one must be cognizant of here in Stamford. It is simply, as George Hays said, that obviously these institutions have to grow. Mr. Sherer has seen churches and synagogues start off with 10, 15 members, and start growing to 100 or 150 people, and they had to find new homes. Well, they moved elsewhere, sold their place, and did make a profit; fine, but at the same time, they enabled a new group to come in as a small budding organization and take over that place. The majority of buildings have not been torn down, but have created homes for new churches or new non-profit organizations.

The point being made is that it is not fair to penalize a group because they are trading up or growing, or they are attracting new people. Perhaps penalize someone who is making a profit and moving out-of-town, or making a profit and folding up; however Mr. Sherer agrees with Mr. Hays that this should be deleted. Perhaps in the end, ultimately, we can come up with a condition that is a little more effective, that says it shall be recaptured in the event they move out-of-town or terminate their existence, but it is unfair to just say that the mere making of a Capital Gain is enough to return the abated funds back to the General Fund of the City. It is unfair to those institutions and it is not the spirit that the Committee intended. Until we clarify that, we should take that condition out.

MR. WILMOT urged the members support the Legislative & Rules Committee's position. This group of abatements represents a good spectrum, being two religious organizations, one private school, and they would like Corporation Counsel to consider more than one isolated case which might not prove to be a good example. Many of the points mentioned were well-made and might be well-taken when final adoption is considered.

MR. MacINNIS MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on Mr. Hays' amendment which is to delete the condition. The MOTION is LOST with 9 YES, 27 NO, and 1 ABSTENTION.

MR. FOX then called for a vote on the Main Motion by Mr. Feighan to publish which encompasses tax abatement on entire parcel together with condition as set out by him.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON said many points have been made by many different speakers but there is one point that he would like to make in the form of an amendment.

MR. FOX asked Mr. Dixon could he hold that motion to amend until after the vote on the Main Motion.

MR. DIXON replied that that is what he wants to amend, the main motion. But would Mr. Fox state the amendment again.

MR. FOX said the motion before the Board is the ordinance for publication to grant tax abatement to the Evangelical Church on the entire parcel of property. It also has a second paragraph which provides for a rebate to the City of the taxes abated should there be a Capital Gain on the resale of that property. And he would hope that we do not complicate that any further and put it to a vote at this time.

MR. DIXON said he just must simply say that, whether it is agreed or not, properties are sold and the profits that are realized from the sale are often re-invested. If the profits are re-invested and they represent a profit, he does not think the profits should be taxed. An amendment to the effect that re-investment of the profits within a six-month or a year's period of time in the City of Stamford would not be taxed.

MR. FOX said he would rule that amendment out-of-order, and also further rule that any further discussion on the merits of this will also be out-of-order, and that the matter be put to a vote.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED, with 36 YES votes and 1 ABSTENTION, for publication with full abatement on entire property and with conditional paragraph on the Evangelical Church.

MR. FEIGHAN said on Item #5 re the Stamford Savings Bank said he understands from Asst. Corp. Counsel Smyth that the granting of an easement falls within the jurisdiction of this Board. The requested authorization for a lighted sign variance on the wall is confusing the issue and this Board has nothing to do with that.

A MOTION made to WAIVE PUBLICATION was SECONDED AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FEIGHAN said that as far as signs are concerned, the bank can go to Planning and Zoning or whatever, for that. This Board will deal with the easement only. MOVED and SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she wished to speak to the Motion to RETURN TO COMMITTEE which was MOVED and SECONDED. She said the Zoning Regulations of the City prohibit the erection of a sign on the side-wall of a building within subject district, and this would require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. She, therefore, questioned whether it would be proper for this Board to approve this particular item until that has been resolved.

MR. FOX asked Mr. Feighan to refresh his recollection on whether there was any reference in the ordinance to the sign or is it a separate issue to be dealt with by the Zoning Board of Appeals?

MR. FEIGHAN responded that it concerns the authorization for the easement alone and does not make any reference to the sign.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to RETURN TO COMMITTEE item #5 regarding easement for the Stamford Savings Bank. The Motion CARRIED with 19 YES, 10 NO, and 7 ABSTENTIONS.

- (5) PROPOSED ORDINANCE GRANTING EASEMENT TO STAMFORD SAVINGS BANK TO REFACE SOUTHERLY WALL OF BUILDING WITH BRICK; ALSO REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR LIGHTED SIGN ON WALL.

MR. ESPOSITO asked whether Item #6 wasn't two separate items and if that goes on the Consent Agenda as such.

MR. FOX said he believed it is and it is on the Consent Agenda as such.

MR. FEIGHAN said that was correct and an unanimous vote on both items.

MR. FEIGHAN went on to Item #7 regarding the Hurricane Barrier Property. He MOVED to WAIVE PUBLICATION, and the Motion was SECONDED and APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. He MOVED for FINAL ADOPTION and this was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (7) PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT QUIT CLAIM DEED FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RE-CONVEYING HURRICANE BARRIER PROPERTY TO CITY.

MR. FOX asked for a vote on the items on the CONSENT AGENDA, being L&R items #1 for publication; #2 for publication; #6 which encompasses a resolution and an ordinance for publication; and item #8 for publication. The MOTION is CARRIED.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

MR. FOX said the Committee does not have a report but there will be a motion to be made to bring one or more items out of committee.

MR. LOOMIS MOVED for a Suspension of the Rules to bring out Item #2. He said while the Committee did not have a meeting, work has been done to permit this item to move forward.

MR. FOX said it was not necessary to move for Suspension of the Rules, simply Move to take the item out of committee. MR. LOOMIS SO MOVED. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

- (2) ADDITIONAL RESOLUTION REGARDING HARDESTY ROAD REQUESTED BY CITY REP. LOOMIS.

MR. LOOMIS said that exactly a year ago, we approved that resolution which authorized the Commissioner of Finance to investigate the feasibility of taking over Hardesty Road. He has done that and we have a full report. In order to take a City road over we have to take three separate actions. First, is to authorize the investigation which has been done. Second, authorize the Commissioner to send us the funding plan, which would be what we would do tonight. And then the third step would be actually funding of the road, which he would do in perhaps two or three months from now when he gets all his figures together. I have a resolution, a former resolution from the Commissioner which he presented to the Board to use specifically. It is seven pages long and I don't think you want me to read it through, but it is a legal step necessary to move this process along.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: And basically what it does is to request the funds to move the date forward?

MR. LOOMIS said that is correct. It sets forth what their investigation determined is the amount of money that property-owners are going to have to pay, and so the next step, if we are to approve this, is for the Commissioner to go to the Board of Finance. Mr. Loomis MOVED for acceptance of the Resolution. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, #2 for HARDESTY ROAD.

- (1) DISCONTINUANCE OF CROSBY ST. AS A CITY STREET FOR CONVERSION INTO AN EMPLOYEE PARKING LOT FOR PITNEY-BOWES.

Item #1 above was HELD IN COMMITTEE as the Committee did not meet.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to take Item #3 Out of Committee. SECONDED. CARRIED.

- (3) THE MATTER OF LIBERTY PLACE BEING BROUGHT UP TO STANDARD.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that on Dec. 2, 1974, the Board of Representatives approved this item to be brought up under Chapter 64. Since then, they have had the public hearings; they have had the cost estimate from the Engineering Department; they have had the approval of two owners on the street, one to absorb 69% of the cost and the other one to absorb 31% of the cost, which totals 100%, and he MOVED that this resolution be approved also. SECONDED.

MR. FOX asked Mr. Boccuzzi if his Motion was the same as that of Mr. Loomis, to approve the funding to get this up.

MR. BOCCUZZI said this is so that the Public Works Department can get started and do what they have to do in order to bring it up to requirements.

MR. FOX called for a vote, which CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY on Item #3 for Liberty Place.

MR. BLUM said, reverting back to Item #1, he would like to MOVE for a public hearing to be held for approval of this particular item.

MR. FOX said this should be discussed with the Committee and a motion to have a public hearing is not proper at this time.

MR. BAXTER said for reasons known to itself as far as he knows, the Steering Committee has elected to continue to put this item on the Agenda month after month. The public hearing is not one of the Board's requirements, but as Mr. Loomis so clearly pointed out, it is a process started by us which hearings are held by the Commissioner of Finance and other people to arrive at the steps as Mr. Loomis and Mr. Boccuzzi described. The fact that it keeps appearing on the agenda shouldn't bother you, and maybe the Steering Committee one day will take it off the Agenda until there is some action for us to take on it.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Alfred Perillo(1) THE ENFORCEMENT OF ORD. #340 RE FALL LEAF PICK-UP AND SPRING CLEAN-UP CITY-WIDE.

MR. PERILLO said the Public Works Committee met on Sept. 27th. Present were Committee members Perillo, Corbo, Tiani and MacInnis. Also invited to the meeting were Public Works Commissioner Mordach and John Canavan. Mr. Vignola and Mrs. Laitman from the Board of Finance were also invited. Due to illness, Mrs. Laitman was unable to attend. We wish her a speedy recovery. Mr. Vignola also did not attend as he was out-of-town. Mrs. Nolan was present to represent the Board of Finance on the issue of the Fall Leaf Pick-Up. Also present was City Rep. Chas. Wilmot.

In May of 1978 during budget time, money was requested by the Public Works Dept. for the Spring and Fall clean-ups. The Board of Finance by a vote of 5-1 deleted this request. Upon questioning, Mrs. Nolan's comments on this subject were that the Finance Board members have studied the Public Works Dept.'s bottom line thoroughly and decided that this service could be done by the DPW without any extra-needed funds. Commissioner Mordach and Mr. Canavan said it was not possible. And a Spring clean-up was not done.

MR. PERILLO then enumerated, in detail, subsequent attempts to fund this service but each time the Finance Board denied the money.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Charles Wilmot, Jr.

MR. WILMOT said the Sewer Committee met last night, October 3rd. Present were Mr. Corbo and Mr. Wilmot. On the Sewer agenda you will see two items, #1 and #4 which are really one item, and that is what they considered last night, namely, the petition of Design Homes, Inc. for permission to extend the sanitary sewer in the area of Turn-of-River Road and Gerik Road for the purpose of servicing a proposed seven-lot sub-division. The Committee listened to the testimony of the Developer Anthony Pavia, Chairman Repucci, and George Connors, the Admin. Asst. to the Sewer Commission, as well as several residents of the area who would be allegedly affected by this proposed tie-in to the sanitary sewer.

We found that the Sewer Commission had yielded to some of the initial complaints of the neighbors and recommended an agreement whereby the developer would put the proposed sewer extension on Gerik Road, not in the road, but to the rear of his own property and extend northerly on Turn-of-River Road down the middle of the road. The residents still objected fearing that the extension of the sewer would force them to automatically tie-in, despite the fact that George Connors assured them that no one would be forced to tie-in to the systems unless their own septic systems were deemed inadequate by the Health Director. The residents still protested that the granting of the sewer tie-in would, in effect, enable the developer to put up additional homes which they felt would lead to additional congestion and so forth in the neighborhood.

The representatives of the Sewer Commission countered that the cost of the sewer extension, approximately \$60,000.00, was going to be borne by the developer and therefore would reduce the ultimate cost of sewerage to the residents and to the taxpayers of this City as a whole. Following the entire testimony, our Committee voted 1 in favor and 1 opposed, to the proposed sanitary tie-in. Therefore, our decision was, in effect, to deny, since it was a split, or tie vote. However, in order to consider the matter before this Board, I MOVE for approval of the proposed sanitary tie-in so that it may be considered in a positive fashion. SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski.

SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX said that was the way it was handled in the past, and Mr. Wilmot's MOTION then is to approve the tie-in, keeping in mind the report of the Committee which was one to one, therefore denying or rejecting the proposal.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion, there being no discussion. The voice vote was not definitive, so the machine was used. The Motion which Mr. Wilmot made is to approve the tie-in which is referred to in Items #1 and #4. The MOTION is APPROVED by a vote of 16 YES, 12 NO, 8 ABSTENTIONS.

- (1) LETTER AND PETITIONS DATED 8/24/78 FROM RESIDENTS OF GERIK ROAD, TURN-OF-RIVER ROAD, KANE AVENUE, and others objecting to sub-division of DESIGN HOMES, INC., due to traffic congestion, low city water pressure, pollution, etc. Also previous letter and petitions from Vincent J. Ray, 33 Gerik Road, re this matter. Held in Committee 8/14 and 9/11/78.
- (4) LETTER 9/12/78 FROM SEWER COMMISSION REQUESTING APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT with Anthony Pavia of Design Homes, Inc., to tie-in to sanitary sewer system. (relates to Item #1 above.)

MR. WILMOT said the second item was consideration of implications of development on the Standard Brands site. Briefly, from City Engineer Sabia's report and also testimony of George Connors and Mr. Repucci, the Committee learned that the development in terms of extension of the sanitary sewers to the Standard Brands site must be considered very carefully in light of the fact that the City has not yet received funding for the West-Side Interceptor Project. Without this Interceptor, there are serious questions that the ability of the City's sanitary sewer system in the West End to handle the additional capacity which development of this site would place on our existing system. This information will be passed on to the Environmental Protection Board which is considering an application at this time, as well as all other parties who are involved in the decision-making process. Mr. Wilmot does not believe any action is required by this full Board at this time, however, on Item #2.

- (2) CONSIDERATION OF IMPLICATIONS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE STANDARD BRANDS SITE ON EXISTING AND PROPOSED SEWERS IN THE WEST AVENUE AREA.

MR. WILMOT said Item #3 really should not have been put on the Agenda. It is really a design fund request, which is actually a transfer within an account rather than a transfer from one account to another, and therefore it was deleted from our agenda.

- (3) REQUEST BY SEWER COMMISSION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION IN AMOUNT OF \$2,500.00 FOR DESIGN CHANGES ON PROJECT #17-2. Mr. Wilmot put on Agenda.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis

- (1) REQUEST TO ESTABLISH FLOOD ENCROACHMENT LINES ON MIANUS RIVER.

MR. LOOMIS said item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)(2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON DREDGING OF EAST BRANCH OF STAMFORD HARBOR.

MR. LOOMIS said item #2 relates to dredging of East Branch and his Committee had a lengthy meeting on Saturday morning at the Oceanic Society with representatives from SACIA, from the Waterfront Industrial Assn., from the Conservationists of Stamford, Inc., and from the Oceanic Society people themselves. Mr. Boccuzzi has submitted a resolution regarding dredging of East Branch, and with some minor modifications, this Committee has endorsed it, and all members have a copy of the amended resolution before them. On Oct. 16th the Corps will have a public hearing in New Haven on the proposed dredging of the harbor and if they go ahead with their approval, action will take place in a very short time thereafter, so Mr. Loomis MOVED for approval of the amended resolution. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote, and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FOX said before going on to the SPECIAL COMMITTEES, he would call on Mr. Hays and PARKS AND RECREATION.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - George Hays

MR. HAYS said there was no committee report, but he did have a letter addressed to him that was received too late to take any committee action, from the United Way of Stamford, announcing Oct. 19th as UNITED WAY DAY, advising that they have made arrangements to use the mobile unit of the Recreation Department for which there is a \$25.00 fee and requesting WAIVER OF THIS FEE. He so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. HAYS MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to take up this item. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX said the Main Motion is to WAIVE THE \$25.00 FEE. The MOTION CARRIED.

(1) REQUEST OF UNITED WAY TO WAIVE \$25.00 FEE FOR USE OF MOBILE UNIT OF THE RECREATION DEPT. (Taken up under Suspension of Rules as not on agenda.)

MR. FOX said before dealing with the final items on the Agenda, he would go back to a point Mr. SIGNORE wanted to make, and a point Mr. DIXON wanted to make.

MOMENT OF SILENCE:

MR. SIGNORE requested a Moment of Silence for the late DAVID AUSTIN, who was a member of the Board of Education, a very beautiful person. He went to school with David Austin and knew him for many, many years. He was a man who worked hard, always did his best, and when he got on the Board of Education he did what he believed was right. It was unfortunate that David passed away so soon and we have lost one of the finest men in the City of Stamford.

MR. DIXON said his request was also for a Moment of Silence for David Austin. However, he would also like to include in his request, a Moment of Silence for the beloved POPE JOHN PAUL.

MOMENT OF SILENCE (continued)

DAVID ARTHUR AUSTIN, JR., 42, of 29 Quintard Terrace, Stamford's first black firefighter and a member of the Board of Education died Friday, Sept. 22, 1978. He was a lifelong Stamford resident and a prominent civic and political figure. He was appointed to the Fire Department in 1955, and retired in 1975 after 20 years of service. He was a 1950 graduate of Stamford High School, and Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., where he received a bachelor's degree in Physical Education. He was the former President of Zeta Phi Lambda Chapter of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., from which he received the Edward Brooks Award for Political Affairs. Mr. Austin was Vice-President of the Stamford Community Council; Keeper of the Records and Seals for the Knights of Pythias, #5 Chapter; First Vice-President of the Stamford Day Nursery; and Board Chairman of the Stamford Day Care Program.

Mr. Austin was a member of the National Recreation Assn., the Morehouse Alumni Assn. of New York, the NAACP, the Executive Board of Local 786 Stamford Firefighters, the Policy Board of the Stamford Day Nursery and the Stamford Head Start Program. He served as Fund-raising Chairman of the YMCA and the West Side Community Center, now known as the Yarwood Center. He was active in the Union Baptist Church where he was a member of its Senior Choir, its Mens' Club, and Chairman of the Church Music Committee. He was a founder of the "No Notes", a church singing group. He also was a U. S. Army Veteran of World War II. Also an amateur horticulturist.

MR. FOX asked the members to rise for a Moment of Silence for David Austin and Pope John Paul.

MR. SIGNORE also asked for a silent prayer for a speedy recovery for Marilyn Laitman of the Board of Finance.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - Lathon Wider, Sr.

MR. WIDER said his Committee did have a meeting, although they are not on the Agenda. His Committee met at the same time the Sewer Committee met so he was unable to attend the Sewer Committee meeting which he was interested in. As stated in the papers recently, the sewers in the South End are all inadequate and in poor condition. They are awaiting a report from HUD on the allocation to finance three slots to employ Housing Specialists. He wished to announce they have scheduled workshops on Community Development Program allocations .

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

On MOTION MADE, SECONDED, AND CARRIED, the Minutes of August 7, 1978 were ACCEPTED.

ON MOTION MADE, SECONDED, AND CARRIED, the Minutes of August 14, 1978 were ACCEPTED.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESCHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis

MR. LOOMIS said he would like to remind Board members that the Charter Revision Commission is holding a Public Hearing on Oct. 24th at Cloonan Middle School, so if anybody wishes to appear before them and say anything about what they should do, that's the time to do that.

MR. BLUM said it was important to remind Board members that the Fair Rent Commission is holding a seminar on October 25th at 7:30 P.M. in the Board's Legislative Chambers.

RESOLUTIONS

MR. ZELINSKI said he had two resolutions, the first being about a firefighter, Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FOX said this is a resolution which is not on the Agenda and asked Mr. Zelinski to refer it to the Steering Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI said on one of them there is a time element and should he bring it up under a Motion to Suspend the Rules or what is the proper procedure.

MR. FOX said he could MOVE to Suspend the Rules to take up an item that is not on the agenda.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED to bring up the matter of a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution concerning the UCONN Branch here in Stamford, to make it a four-year program. SECONDED.

MR. LOOMIS said that eight years ago, the General Assembly passed a measure that is very relevant to what Mr. Zelinski is proposing, and since then the matter has become quite complicated. He suggested that if the Board were going to act on it, that it be referred to an appropriate committee, perhaps Mildred Ritchie's committee, which could look into this matter, as it is really not as simple as the resolution reports.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules. The Motion to Suspend the Rules is LOST with 7 YES votes, 26 NO votes, and 3 Abstentions.

MR. FOX called the Board's attention to the fact that the next scheduled Board meeting is November 6, 1978 which is the Monday before Election Day.

MR. FEIGHAN MOVED to change the November meeting date to Monday, November 13, 1978. SECONDED. CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to be conducted by the Board, upon MOTION made and duly SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m., with several members remaining until 12:15 to discuss various matters.

APPROVED:

By:

Helen M. McEvoy
Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Asst.
(and Recording Secretary) HMM:MS

Note: The above meeting was broadcast by Radio WSTC and WYRS in its entirety.

John Wayne Fox
John Wayne Fox, President
15th Board of Representatives

22 Democrats; 18 Republicans

MEETING REGULAR - Oct. 4, 1978

(Temporary Changes in Seating:
Margaret Price (D-6) RESIGNED;
Annie Summerville APPOINTED in
vacancy in 6th Dist.

Attendance: (a couple came in late; final roll: 37 present; 3 absent: Carlucci, Livingston & McInerney)

VOTING SUBJECT; MOTIONS, ETC.

Seat	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40								
	DARER, Stanley	MAHOCK, Audrey	FESTO, Charles	DIXON, Handy	FERRARA, Richard	HAVE, Marie	TIANI, Charles	PERILLO, Alfred	GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	DeLUCA, Robert	SHERER, Donald	CORBO, Florenzio	POLLARD, Everett	LOOMIS, Ralph C.	Santey, Jeanne-Lois	WILMOT, Charles	RITCHIE, Mildred	HAYS, George	FEIGHAN, Michael	RAYMOND, Diane	MARKIEWICZ, Henry	SCHLECHTWEG, John	WIDER, Lathon	RYBNICK, Gerald	VENTURA, Joseph	McINERNEY, Barbara	MORGAN, Michael	LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	BAXTER, George	BLUM, David	ZELINSKI, John	SIGNORE, S. A.	BOCCUZZI, John	CARLUCCI, Leo	Summerville, Annie	ESPOSITO, Paul	PERILLO, Mildred	MacInnis, Wm. T.	WIESLEY, Vere	FOX, John Wayne								
	R-13	R-19	R-8	D-2	R-8	R-1	R-15	D-9	D-16	R-14	R-10	R-12	R-17	R-19	R-18	D-16	R-10	R-20	D-1	D-11	D-3	D-6	D-3	D-4	R-17	R-20	D-12	D-5	D-7	D-12	D-11	R-18	D-2	D-5	D-6	D-4	D-9	D-7	R-13	D-15								
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	O	O	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		
	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	O	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	O	A	Y	Y	N	Y	O	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	O	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	O	Y	Y	N	Y	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	O	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	O	Y	Y	N	Y	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	O	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	O	N	Y	Y	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	O	N	O	N	Y	N	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	Y	O	A	Y	N	Y	O	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

TEST PATTERN (machine turned on a bit late) Testing already begun

TEST PATTERN

(1) Fiscal #1 \$736. Gasoline for Transportation Dept. LOST 22 Yes; 10 NO; 3 Abstain (need 2/3)

(2) Vote on Motion to Reconsider Item #1 Fiscal; CARRIED 27 Yes; 8 NO.

(3) Vote on Reconsideration of Item #1 Fiscal; \$736 Gasoline; Transpn. APPROVED 25 Yes; 10 NO.

(4) Vote to RETURN TO COMMITTEE Fiscal #8: \$20,000 Youth Svce Bureau; 28 Yes; 5 NO; 2 Abstain; APPROVED

(5) Vote on Zelinski Motion to reduce 5.5% for 5 persons MAA totalling \$3,968; LOST, 11 Yes; 25 NO; 1 Abstained. Fiscal #9.

(6) Vote on \$219,345 MAA 5.5% COLA; APPROVED; 27 Yes; 9 NO; 1 Abstention.