

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1980

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A Special Meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Thursday, March 20, 1980, pursuant to a "CALL" issued by the President, Sandra Goldstein, under provisions of Section 202 of the Stamford Charter.

The meeting was held in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut

The meeting was called for 8:00 P.M. The President of the Board, Sandra Goldstein, called the meeting to order at 10:18 P.M. following a Question-and-Answer period; and following caucus of both parties.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President Sandra Goldstein.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: The machine is not in proper working order. We're going to use hands tonight or voice votes.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie Summerville called the Roll. There were 35 members present and 5 absent. The absent members being Reps. Hawe, Esposito, Bowlby, Livingston and Guglielmo.

The PRESIDENT declared a QUORUM.

CALL OF THE MEETING:

THE PRESIDENT, Sandra Goldstein, read the "CALL" of the meeting, as follows:

I, SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, President of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, pursuant to Section 202 of the Stamford Charter, do hereby CALL a SPECIAL MEETING of said 16th Board of Representatives at the following time and place:

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1980

at 8:00 P.M.

in the

Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives
Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic
Street, Stamford Connecticut.

for the following purpose:

TO CONSIDER AND ACT UPON PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE
URBAN RENEWAL CONTRACT ON PARCELS 8 and 9.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I am now going to turn the floor over to Mr. Fasanelli.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Richard Fasanelli

Mr. Fasanelli: Our Committee met and we voted on the plan amendment, amending the Urban Renewal Plan, Parcels 8 and 9. We voted unanimously 4-0 to approve the plan amendment. Present at the meeting were Ms. Summerville, Mr. Roos, Mr. Donahue, and myself. Absent was Mr. Conti.

The reasons we voted in favor of the new plan amendment are as follows: We felt under the new Urban Renewal Plan amendment, it would help clean-up and revitalize those two blocks in that particular neighborhood. It would bring a minimum of 300 housing units into the area which would add life to the downtown housing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before you go into the plan, I would like you to make your motion.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd like to make a MOTION that the Board accept the new plan amendment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FASANELLI: First of all, we felt the new plan would clean-up and revitalize that existing neighborhood and those two blocks. We felt it would add housing, at least 300 units of some sort in that particular area, thereby adding some kind of life to that existing neighborhood, and life of the whole downtown area, and life to our whole Urban Renewal investment. It would bring in a hotel which, hopefully, again would add life to the neighborhood especially at night and also bring in a certain amount of jobs in the neighborhood. It would add coordination to the development of those two blocks which is urgently needed. It would help in the traffic patterning of the whole downtown Urban Renewal. We feel that these are very important points, and we felt that this is a very important issue, and these considerations had to be weighed very carefully against some very strong opposition to this plan.

The whole character of that neighborhood, we feel, should be changed to benefit the whole City of Stamford. There were several alternatives; two alternatives, basically, one alternative, one of the alternatives was to remain with the current Urban Renewal Plan. We felt that that current Urban Renewal was not feasible since it required a parking garage which the City does not have present funds at this moment to build. We felt that that plan was unacceptable for the residents of the area and unacceptable to the people of Stamford. We felt that the other alternative, which was private development of the area, would be disastrous to the area. The private development in the area would lead to uncoordinated development. It would allow for developers to come in and build anything they wanted according to zoning, and we felt this would allow the creation of office buildings and would not allow any redress as far as the participants in the area; so we are strongly urging the Board to vote yes on the Plan amendment proposed.

MR. ZELINSKI: Tonight we are faced with a decision that will affect the taxpayers of the Community for many years. It is a decision that has required a great deal of research, and even after much study there is no assurance that there will be no law suits whichever way the decision is made this evening. There is such overwhelming opposition to this plan from not only most of the property owners affected, but also from former members of the Urban Renewal Commission and Staff, namely, Mr. Arthur Lutz and Mr. Joel Freedman; that it really is encumbent on our Board to heed their council and pleas for rejection.

The Stamford Taxpayers' Association also urges us for rejection. Furthermore, after reading the many letters and documents submitted, I cannot ascertain exactly how much this plan will cost the taxpayers of Stamford; when it will be started, and when it is reasonable to expect that it would be completed. Also, even though the Urban Renewal Chairperson has declared that unless this plan is passed as amended, the City of Stamford would be responsible for the construction of a 1000-car garage in Block 9, many say that this is not true. The areas of Blocks 8 and 9 certainly are not blighted and deteriorating. The theory behind Urban Redevelopment is that the Government facilitates facilities; the improvement of properties in core areas of a City where private enterprise is not willing to take the risk of development.

From the correspondence I have received from area businesses and owners of property, this is not the case. In fact, I do not understand the rationale of the Urban Renewal Commission for spending taxpayers' money for the plan as presented. It appears that the Commission has ignored the redevelopers. I believe they, the Commission, should be accountable for the spending of these dollars for this discriminatory plan; therefore, I urge my fellow Board Members this evening to send this proposal back to the Urban Renewal Commission with the message loud and clear that our Board of Representatives is not agreeable to this proposed plan and to instruct them to ask for an extension of time from HUD from the March 31st deadline.

Further, I propose that the Urban Renewal Commission submit a more appropriate plan for this area which is more amenable to the area property owners and businesses. In addition, I would like the Commission to advise our Board with any resubmission the effect that any further amendments would have on the taxpayers of our City. A cost figure should be included with any new proposals together with commencement date and also completion date. Let us learn from our past experiences with Urban Redevelopment in Stamford and avoid the possibility that another vast area would lie desolate and empty for years.

In conclusion, private enterprise could develop this area very well without interference of the Urban Renewal Commission. Zoning and other restrictions could guide the proper development of this area. This plan is not a good deal for the City of Stamford; therefore, I recommend that this Board of Representatives vote not to reject it, but to return this plan back to the Urban Renewal Commission. The meeting we had prior to our Special Board Meeting, with all the prices and calculations in market value, it reminded me somewhat of that television program "The Price is Right", where contestants come and make bids on certain items. We really weren't given the appropriate figures and actually what market value is and everything else and, unfortunately, it's very disturbing.

MR. HOGAN: I would second Mr. Zelinski's motion to send this back to Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Hogan, a motion wasn't made. Perhaps you would like to make a motion?

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF ORDER. Don't we have a motion on the floor?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We do have a motion on the floor, but there may be a different motion that would be perfectly in order.

MR. HOGAN: I would MOVE at this time to recommit this issue to the Urban Renewal Committee of the Board with instructions that they proceed to convey the feelings of this Board to the Urban Renewal Commission and that they advise the URC that the following steps should be taken.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before you proceed with the steps, you are making a motion to recommit, which takes precedence over a main motion. It is a perfectly proper motion. Before you go on, get into specifics, and what you want the Commission to do. I would like a second to that motion. SECONDED by many.

MR. HOGAN: The motion would simply be that the Urban Renewal Commission shall exercise whatever power they have and whatever authority to:

1. Immediately send a delegation of distinguished citizens to Washington to obtain an extension of the time limit on the Federal funding.
2. Change the amended plan to provide the following:
 - a. Greatly increased parking for area merchants.
 - b. City should retain ownership to Parcels 16 and 16A with authority to lease or sell air rights. Said parcel to be used for minicipal parking purposes as currently proposed. This change would allow the City to own the land rather than be the recipient of an easement.
 - c. Retain the original plan to make Bank Street a pedestrian mall.
 - d. Language must be included in the agreement to insure "market level" purchase of land by the re-developer. A write-down on land cost must be specifically prohibited.
 - e. A written agreement with the re-developer as to priorities for building on the area. For example, housing must precede office construction, etc.
3. The financial impact of any proposed amendments to the Urban Renewal Contract must be made by the City of Stamford's Finance Dept. and then submitted to the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Reps. and the Board of Finance for review and study.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: What we have before us is a motion to refer the proposed amendment to the Urban Renewal Committee of the Board of Representatives for them, in turn, to submit the proposals to the Commission with the specifics that Mr. Hogan mentioned.

MR. CONTI: This is something else that I wanted to speak on. When Mr. Fasanelli had noted the member of people who had been in attendance for the Public Hearing, my name was mentioned as being absent. I was not notified about the meeting and I was quite perturbed about it. If I may, I'd like to go on and read something I have prepared on that; because my vote is contrary to the Urban Renewal Committee's vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm going to permit you to have a POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE because this is something that affects you personally.

MR. CONTI: Having received more mail in one week than a person could assimilate in one month, has been quite an experience. Each piece of mail very strongly worded favorably in behalf of the writer, caused me to sway back and forth. Each succeeding piece of mail helped to confuse the issue more strongly. Each seemed to be the final criteria in helping me to cast my vote as they saw fit. Having read, studied, deciphered and clarified what each had to say and the reasons for saying so, only made me wish I had the wisdom of Solomon, naturally, I don't; so my next step was to hear what my constituents had to say because they had voted me to this position as their Representative, I decided to poll them; to get their input on a matter of this extreme importance. To say the least, I was astounded how clear-cut and concise their thoughts were.

Of all people polled, talked to, reasoned with, my count came to 100% opposed, zero in favor; our vote, not just mine, of necessity, must thus be a negative one, and I hope and pray that the choice of the Democratic, Republican, and Independent voters of the 11th District is right for the ultimate good of the whole City.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Now, can we please limit our debate to the motion to refer to Committee?

MRS. GUROIAN: The motion to recommit to committee opens the main motion to debate and so the debate is on the main motion, as well as the motion to recommit.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Right, but nothing extraneous.

MRS. GUROIAN: The main motion is up for debate right now, not just the motion to reconsider, to recommit.

MRS. McINERNEY: The owners and operators of businesses located in Blocks 8 and 9 have been, over the years assured that their properties were in conservation zone and as a result, would not be affected by further Urban Renewal Development.

MRS. McINERNEY: (continuing)....They invested funds to enhance and expand their businesses and are for all intents and purposes operating productively. Many would not have undertaken investments if they knew 10 or 20 years down the road, that the City would take their property and they would be forced to relocate in other areas out of the Center City in most cases probably and, of course, if that was their intent, they could have located at a time when prices were much lower and the movement was out of Stamford; not stay and support the Inner City.

In my opinion, the URC by promoting the amended plan for Blocks 8 and 9, have, in effect, created a failure of consideration for the merchants of Summer, Atlantic, Bank, Park and Washington Boulevard who assumed that their properties would not be touched in 1968. I would speculate in approving the amended plan. The City will see litigation in amounts higher than the 4 million dollars we're speaking in terms of this evening. We must consider that these areas were not considered slum or blighted and never considered for the taking of URC, and, therefore, we are destroying economic properties.

Reading the plans for Blocks 8 and 9 as stated in the March 17th letter to Mayor Clapes from Edith Sherman, URC Chairman, she states that the estimated expenditure of \$12,7000,000.00 is off-set by the \$6 million dollars Urgent Needs fund and land sales proceeds from the developers so that there will be no cost to the City to achieve the developed development envisioned by the amended plan.

It is unfortunate that with regards to financial impact, no mention of possible and probable settlements of litigation of properties to be taken was considered. As stated earlier, I feel that litigation as a result of taking of these properties, which will cause incalculable losses in economic ruin to merchants, could run into millions. After all, United Oil had the City's URC program held up in the courts for many years. Certainly \$4 millions of Federal Funds will not off-set litigation costs and funding obligations for land purchases and development. Personally, I consider the constant cry of \$4 million lost Federal Funds as a tool where use of force on the Board of Representatives Members and has created a feeling of approving the proposed amendment under duress and pressure. It enables one to think clearly of the ramifications to the City at large and its taxpayers.

I agree with Mr. Hogan's amendment especially the point requiring a financial impact statement for the entire project from the Board of Finance, the Finance Department, and the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Reps.

Another point with regards to the current plan between the Urban Renewal Plan and the parking agreement and the developer, requiring the Urban Renewal Committee and the City to construct a 1000-car parking structure is very ambiguous. The letters we have from two lawyers and three lawyers all indicate different legal stands. I realize that when you have 40 lawyers in a room, you have a congress; and that when you have 2 lawyers, you have varying opinions. This is what makes the legal world go around; however, I do think it is incumbent upon us, before we take any action on this plan, to clarify with legal research not one week but with legal research intent on looking at all aspects of this particular agreement as to its binding effects on the City.

MRS. MCINERNEY: (continuing)...It appears also that the proposed amended plan is in conflict with the intent of the General Assembly when it approved and adopted a redevelopment in Urban Renewal Law enabling municipalities to combat the social and economic liability of sub-standard, insanitary, deteriorated, obsolete slum or blighted conditions through redevelopment and renewal necessary for revitalization of the Center City. I would not like to take this opportunity to go on with further points other than to say I am in total agreement with Mr. Hogan's motion to resubmit; however, in his delegation to Washington for an extension, I would urge that a Member of this Board be along with City officials to speak with HUD.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to clarify something. A motion to recommit, or to commit, or to refer, which are all the same status, does not permit debate on the main question, it only permits debate on the motion itself. Let me read from Robert's Rules of Orders Section 13, page 143 in the text, and it says the following: "The debate can extend only to the desirability of committing the main question and to the appropriate details of the motion to commit, however, and not to the merits of the main question". Please, ladies and gentlemen of the Board, keep your remarks to the motion to recommit.

MRS. GUROIAN: I can quote from the same Robert's Rules which says exactly the opposite that it opens up the main motion to debate.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry, Mrs. Guroian, we are going by Robert's Rules of Order the revised edition. I have read the Rule to the Board.

MR. DeLUCA: In other words, what you are saying, some of the comments that I had planned, cannot be made if they relate to the main motion, if I understand them correctly?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Please, try to limit it to the merit of either committing or not committing.

MR. DeLUCA: I'll try to phrase my words accordingly. Number 1, I would urge this Board to reject to recommit this item. We are just playing a "Mickey-Mouse" game, bouncing it back and forth. To think that by sending a Committee back to Washington with the Mayor or a Member of this Board, is going to be any different than what has happened in the past, is utterly ridiculous. We are just shirking our duties and just postponing the inevitable. Comments have been made to send it back, send a Committee down to Washington where we will have a meeting on March 28th. I wish to remind the Board that March 28th is the beginning of Palm Sunday weekend which happens to be a Holy Day or a Holy Season as far as the Christians go. Even thinking of having something, regardless if it was a High Holy week-end or not, on a Friday is utterly ridiculous in the respect that many people, with the warm weather coming, look forward to the weekends. We know we have an obligation to our constituents and, maybe my comments are out of order, but to keep delaying this, to put it bluntly, gives the opposition, whatever way you want it to go, more time to get more votes.

People will be going away for the weekend; we may not have 40 members or 35 members; we may have 20 members or 22 members, and to allow us more minorities

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) like this to vote on an important issue such as this, is also ridiculous; therefore, I would urge the rejection to even consider recommitment here. Statements have been made that to reject this plan and leave it up to the private developers would create a "hodge-podge". I consider this an insult to the intelligence of our Planning and Zoning Board to even think that the members of these Boards would allow any private developer to come into this area to create a "hodge-podge". This is purely conjecture on the part of our URC Committee, on the part of the Urban REnewal Commission.

We say we are a Democratic Society; we operate in a Democratic Society. We have heard loud and clear from the small merchants in the area, from our constituents. We have heard loud and clear from the President of the Taxpayers' Association; whether you believe it or not, they represent over 1,400 people, which combined with their families and friends can represent close to 7,000 people. (change of tape-some dialogue lost here) I'll get my plug in now.

MR. CORBO: I would also like to express my disagreement with the motion of colleague Hogan as to recommit the item. I don't think we can resolve anything with that. We should bring it to the floor and vote no altogether. Recommitting this item won't have enough time to re-devise the plan. We already heard the statement by the Mayor which is that the Feds won't allow any more time extension on the proposal; therefore, it's just wasting time if we recommit this item. I would urge all the Members to vote no.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'm going to speak in favor of recommitting this plan to the Urban Renewal Committee for such reasons as follows: I read some legal opinions and I, myself, cannot say at this time that if we reject this plan what are the City's liabilities; are we still committed to a garage in that area or not? Are we committed to certain other things in that area or not? This point, I think has to be taken into consideration; we're committed to a garage; we're talking \$12 to \$14 million.

I would just like to inject a little something here. Mr. Corbo said that the Mayor was down in Washington and he said that we couldn't get an extension. If I heard the radio correctly and read the Advocate correctly, I think the Mayor said it was his opinion that the mood in Washington would not allow for an extension. I think I need a little more back-up than just the Mayor's opinion on this particular item. It's a great step for the City of Stamford; it's something that's going to be with us, if we agree to it, for our lifetime and the lifetime of our children.

I really don't know if private developer would "hodge-podge" the area or not. I don't know what they want to do, so I'm not going to say that they are, or they won't. Taxpayers' Association, Mr. DeLuca said they have 1,400 members, etc. and their families, etc. They are a great organization, but I might remind them that the Mayor won by 10,000 votes and he's the one that wants this plan; so where were they in November?

At this point, I'm in a dilemma. I don't know which way to go. If I had to vote yes or not tonight, I would have a problem. I think that, and there may be some other people on this Board who feel the same way as I do, I don't know.

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing)...I would hope that at least we get another week or so, maybe we can get a few more answers. If we get an extension, we don't even have to hold a meeting. Whatever the amount of time we have, then we can work with the URC, work with the merchants; I don't want to see the merchants hurt in that area no more than anyone else, but URC has hurt a lot of other people in their redevelopment. We really didn't hear that many cries from certain people, so I just have to go along with Mr. Hogan and ask the Board to at least let us take a shot at it and see if we can come up with something that's agreeable to the merchants, taxpayers, the Board of Representatives, and the Urban Renewal Commission.

MR. BLUM: I sometimes wonder when I read our only paper and I see that same headline "the gun to the head" style. It seems that the three terms that I've been on this Board, I've seen that headline numerous times at one time or another. It's always a last minute when we get hit with changes. I remember you saying that we didn't have enough time in which to read the proposed change that was left to me at my old address, and it stood there for one day until I received it the following Monday, and I had to vote on it that night so I thank you that we had this so-called hearing of the Urban Renewal Commission. And what did we hear and what did we learn?

To hold in Committee after knowing that we should send people to Washington, that our Mayor was there at a Conference, did he speak to HUD of the necessity of giving us, and I'm sure he knows that this evening we are voting on a very important document. whether he was able to or not, and whether 10,000 votes means a lot. I think it does, and I think he's known it; so I'm just wondering if we are really gaining anything by delaying it. I think we should vote one way or another, up or down, and then we'll see whether we should bring this before Washington for a further delay.

MR. DZIEZYC: If we delay the vote on this amended plan, what will we gain? We gave the URC an extension of a month, practically a month, and what did this accomplish? The URC presented essentially the same plan for us to vote on again. The URC will pull the same tactics no matter what they've had. They've had a year to negotiate with the developers, to the businesses, the small business and what happened? They came up with the same plan that they presented us to now. There won't be any difference no matter what we give them, if we give them 10 years or 20 years. Now, this plan has been going on for 18 years and it has been draining the money from the taxpayers, millions of dollars every year. We should vote on this now and get it over with. Vote against it.

MR. DONAHUE: First of all, I would like to make one thing clear. The Urban Renewal Committee of this Board has been working on this from between 2½ - 3 months; that in 3 months, we have voted, the Members who were present at that meeting, unanimously to accept this approved amendment. For any Member of this Board to think that the Urban Renewal Committee had not done that kind of work, or done that job and make a statement to that effect on the floor of the Board, doesn't deserve any further comment.

Now, one thing I would like to say is this: we, the Urban Renewal Committee, decided that it would be good to wait till March 3rd date at one point to vote

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing)....on this matter, so we put it off for a month and we came in here on March 3rd, and there were still some unanswered questions so we asked for a Special Meeting, and we called a Public Hearing to give every member of this Board the opportunity to find out the answers to the very questions that we had asked and were satisfied with the answers. Tonight there still appear to be questions, so even though I'm in favor of the amended plan, I will vote tonight to return it to the Urban Renewal Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: I just had a question. In my particular remarks, I urged our Board to send the proposal back to the Urban Renewal Commission. Now, the motion on the floor is to send it back to our Urban Renewal Committee?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: And direct them to send it back to the Commission. It's virtually the same, except we're dealing with a motion from our Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: No, I just, because of the time element of March 31st, I wouldn't want it to be delayed. I would like it to go directly to the Commission.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sure that if it passes, it will go there.

MR. DENICOLA: I would not like to see this go back to Committee. I would like to see it be rejected tonight. There are not too many Stamfordites left in this town and most of the business men in that area are Stamfordites. They built this town and I think they are being hurt. All I see are sky-risers around here; small people are being pushed out left and right. I would urge everyone to vote no on this.

MRS. LYONS: I would like to encourage the acceptance of Mr. Hogan's motion, and the reason for this, and it is something I wanted to point out, we're all talking about voting down this particular amendment and I would like to be corrected if I'm assuming something incorrectly.

If we vote this down, I assume we go with Plan One, the first plan which, if you look at it, means that we acquire quite a few more parcels of land; so if one of the problems with this new amendment is the lack of allowing private developers, there will be less to develop with the new plan. Also, more small business men will also be affected, so by voting this down, you are in essence accepting the second plan....or the first plan, I'm sorry. By voting, if we don't accept Mr. Hogan's resolution, there's a good chance that this plan is going to be voted down. If it is voted down, you're stuck with the first suggestion of the Urban Renewal.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I wish that you would use your position to make sure that this meeting is controlled and we don't get this backfire.

MR. WIDER: I would like to MOVE the QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are the following speakers who remain; Mr. Joyce, Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Pollard, Mrs. Maihock, Mr. Rybnick, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Roos and Mr. Hogan. Is there a second to that motion? If the motion to move the question carries, we will be voting on Mr. Hogan's motion to recommit. We will now proceed to a vote.

MR. DARER: Does Mr. Hogan's motion include those five points, or is it just a motion to recommit?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is a motion to recommit with several points. They're on your desk, I believe. There are more than five points, Mr. Darer. There is a motion to move the previous question. If there is a Point of Order, I will take it.

MRS. PERILLO: POINT OF INFORMATION; I'm a little confused at this point now. Didn't Mr. Zelinski read something? Is this incorporated with Mr. Hogan's or are they two separate.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski did not make a motion. He read a statement to the main motion; then Mr. Hogan made a motion to refer this to the Committee to go to the Commission.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think it should be made, there was a question asked about five points. I think that it should be made that these five points are not written in stone. You know.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Well, the fact is that right now we are going to vote on the previous question. It is an undebatable motion. It takes two-thirds to pass this motion. We are going to proceed to a vote. All those in favor of moving the previous question, please signify by raising your hand. Unfortunately, the machine is not in good working order. The vote is 28 in favor; 7 opposed. The Motion to move the question has been CARRIED.

We will now proceed to a vote on the question. I am going to read the question to the Board because it is long and I think, everyone should hear it again.

The Motion before us now is a motion to refer to the Urban Renewal Committee who in turn will refer the proposed amendment to the Urban Renewal Commission with the following instructions: (See Mr. Hogan's motion on page 4.)

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF INFORMATION. I believe that Resolution says "with instruction" and I don't think we have the jurisdiction to instruct the URC. I would suggest that we change that to "suggest or recommend".

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Conti, we can no longer amend this motion because it is up for a vote; however, it is obvious, I think, from the intent that the instructions are simply recommendations.

Do you have a point of information, Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: I just want to clarify this, what we are going to be voting on, is it stone? There was a comment made that these recommendations are not inscribed in stone. What I want to make sure is that we are going to vote on this and then somebody is going to change it?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let me explain something to you. It cannot be changed because right now, the motion was not amended in anyway, a motion to refer can be amended. It wasn't amended and there was a call to move the previous questions which passed. We now have to vote on it as it stands. The Commission can try to go along with all of these, try to go along with some of these, throw them all out; that's their decision.

MR. DONAHUE: I'd like to ask for a roll call vote, please.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: A roll call vote requires one-fifth of the Membership. Is there a second to that motion? SECONDED. All those in favor of a roll call vote, please indicate by raising your hand. There are sufficient votes for a roll call. We will now proceed to a vote. The vote is on the motion to refer with instructions.

MR. ZELINSKI: POINT OF INFORMATION, how many votes are needed for this to carry?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: A majority of those present and voting on it. A yes vote is to refer; a no vote is opposed to referring, and then we would go back to the main motion.

MRS. GUROIAN: POINT OF INFORMATION. Am I right in understanding that if this motion is passed, then we do not vote on the main motion; but if this motion does not pass, then we vote on the main motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You are correct.

ROLL CALL VOTE

VOTING IN FAVOR (18 YES)

Burtis Flounders
Lathon Wider
Stanley Darer
Barbara McInerney
John Roos
John Hogan
Audrey Maihock
Ralph Loomis
Moiria Lyons
John Boccuzzi
John Kunsaw
Robert Fauteux
Handy Dixon
Richard Fasanelli
John Zelinski
Alfred Perillo
Donald Donahue
Sandra Goldstein

VOTING AGAINST (17 NO)

Betty Conti
Grace Guroian
Patrick Joyce
Everett Pollard
Jeanne-Lois Santy
Philip Stork
Anthony Conti
Robert DeLuca
Annie Summerville (passed-first)
Fiorenzo Corbo
Paul Dziezyc
Mildred Perillo
David Blum
Mary Jane Signore
Vincent DeNicola
Gerald Rybnick
Michael Wiederlight

ABSENT MEMBERS (5)

Paul Esposito
Doris Bowlby
Jerry Livingston
Dominick Guglielmo
Marie Hawe

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The vote is 18 in favor of the motion to refer; 17 opposed to the motion to refer. The MOTION IS CARRIED and this will be referred to the Committee to refer to the Commission.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There has been a motion to adjourn, SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: I would urge Madame President, to do everything in her power not to have a meeting next Friday.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You can be certain we will not, Mr. DeLuca, under any circumstances have a meeting next Friday.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION duly made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting ADJOURNED at 11:15 P.M.

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

cmt

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
16th Board of Representatives

Note: Attached is a draft of the Question-and-Answer Period which preceded this Special Meeting. The Question-and-Answer Period lasted from 7:25 to 8:45 P.M. There was then a Caucus period from 8:45 p.m. to 10:18 P.M., at which time the Special Meeting was called to Order by President Sandra Goldstein.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

RECEIVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637