

MINUTES OF MAY 5, 1980

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Monday, May 5, 1980, 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 by the PRESIDENT, SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, at 9:03 P.M., after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Rev. Cyril Peters, Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, 150 Fairfield Avenue, Stamford, Connecticut 06902

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Sandra Goldstein

ROLL CALL: Clerk Annie Summerville took the Roll Call. There were 37 members present and 3 absent. The absent members were: Philip Stork, Marie Hawe, (emergency) and A. Perillo, (ill).

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PAGES: Simon Fishman, 43 Arlington Road
Michele Segall, 125 Buckingham Drive

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I also would like to note that Boy Scout Troop #1, which is sponsored by the First Presbyterian Church was here for a while this evening.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Mrs. Goldstein called for a check of the voting machine. It was found that Ms. Bowlby's voting relay was not working properly. Mrs. Goldstein asked Ms. Bowlby to move to Mrs. Hawe's seat for the evening.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to ask a Moment of Silence tonight for the five airmen and the three Marines who died in an attempt in a rescue mission that failed to free the United States hostages held since last November, 1979, by the Iranian militants. These men were special in life, but they are doubly special in death, because they made ultimate sacrifice to ensure the lives and freedom of fellow Americans held hostage in foreign land. The rescue mission to Iran was a success because it showed the United States cares for its own and its relentness in our effort on their behalf. May the world always remember Capt. Richard Bakkee, Capt. Harold Lewis, Capt. Lyn McIntosh, Capt. Charles McMillan, Tech. Sgt. Joel Mayo, and the three Marines who died trying to free Americans Citizens for all of us.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to have a Moment of Silence for Mr. Sidney H. Bingham, late father of Stamford Attorney James Bingham. Mr. Bingham, who passed away on Saturday, May 3, 1980 was a well-known engineer, doing extensive work in New York City with the subway system. He served in World Wars I and II, and he was the designer of the LST's which played a key role in the landing on Normandy Beach on "D Day".

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I have a couple of announcements to make before the business of the meeting. On behalf of the entire Board, I'd like to wish Mr. Perillo a very speedy recovery. We miss you at this meeting and hope to see you at our budget meetings; and we also of course are delighted with Mr. Hogan's very fast recovery. Its wonderful to have you here tonight Mr. Hogan.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS:

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm pleased to announce that Mr. Donahue has been named Chairman of the Planning & Zoning Committee. I accepted this evening with regrets, Ralph Loomis' resignation as Co-Chairman of the Legislative & Rules Committee. He still will remain on the Committee, and Mr. Conti will take his place; and I'm very pleased to announce that. In addition, Mary Lou Rinaldi, will sit on the following Committees: Park & Recreation, Education, Welfare & Government, and Transportation.

One further announcement, and I want to make this early in the meeting, rather than later no, next week the Board will hold its Special Budget Hearings, probably the most important two nights of our entire year. They will be held on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 13th and 14th; and the Fiscal Committee has been meeting and will be meeting during this week and on Saturday, and the meetings are open to all.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report. SECONDED.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1980, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called for 7:30 P.M., and was CALLED TO ORDER at 8:40 P.M., at which time a QUORUM was achieved. Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman	Richard Fasanelli	Paul Dziezyc
John Boccuzzi	Handy Dixon	Moira Lyons
Barbara McInerney	Michael Wiederlight	Anthony Conti
Annie Summerville	Lathon Wider, Sr.	Mary Lou Rinaldi
Jeremiah Livingston	David I. Blum	Marie Hawe
Audrey Maihock	Robert Fauteux	Everett Pollard
Robert Gabe DeLuca	Donald Donahue	John Zelinski
Carmella Terenzio, staff	ADVOCATE	WSTC-WYRS

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were eight names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE for next month were the remaining five names: Joseph Rinaldi for Sewer Commission; Frank Arturi for Patriotic and Special Events; Joseph Martin for Zoning Board; Raymond Sanborne for Zoning Board of Appeals; and Janet Weintraub for Commission on Aging.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

Eighteen items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. One item was ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE, being \$8,150 for DPW, Div. of Bldgs. and Grounds, for the Railroad Station.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

Of the 23 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda, 12 were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ten were ORDERED off the Agenda, but in Committee. One was removed from the agenda, being proposed resolution for the City to charge fees for publishing costs of legal notices such as applicants for tax abatement, easements, etc. granted by City.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of changes to the Merit Rules System. Ordered off and Held in Committee for further study was the matter of personnel practices re City employees working in acting capacities.

(5) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter relating to trash pick-up by private collectors. Ordered removed from the agenda was Mr. Blum's request for examination of assessment of the Board of Finance action relating to garbage collection, etc.

(6) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two requests to give Stamford police officers an opportunity to appear and speak. Moved to Transportation was the proposed resolution re tractor trailer trucks parking in residential areas. Ordered removed from the agenda was the matter of neighborhood watch groups to try to lessen break-ins, robberies, etc.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the Exchange Club's banner request, and the annual Memorial Day Parade by the Patriotic and Special Events Committee. Ordered in Committee for further work was the matter of consolidation of golf commissions.

(8) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

Both items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ordered Held in Committee, being inquiry into personnel practices of the school system, and Mr. Carl Just's suggestions on how to effect savings in President Primary elections.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(9) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of incorporation of Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program into a non-stock, non-profit corporation. Ordered off the agenda were Mr. Rozier's letter of 4/15/80 re cash-flow problem, and Mrs. Nancy McAfee's letter.

(10) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of reconsideration of Amended Renewal Plan, which had been put on the Steering Agenda and the regular agenda before the second Special Board Meeting of April 27, 1980, were held.

(11) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

Ordered off the agenda was the matter of proposed flood-prone area regulations, 2/28/80 revisions.

(12) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were resolutions relating to ConRail System, and Tractor Trailers; also helicopter sites. Ordered off the agenda was Mr. A. Conti's letter 4/14 re Advocate editorial of 4/7/80 about railroad station.

(13) SPECIAL "ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION" STUDY COMMITTEE

This Progress Report was Ordered on the Agenda.

(14) RESOLUTIONS

Ordered on the Agenda was the matter of SNETCO's proposed 35% rate increase; and Rep. Moira Lyons' resolution re Spring Clean-up.

(15) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

Four of the items on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ordered off the agenda, and the other one relating to Mrs. McAfee was moved to Public Housing.

(16) OLD BUSINESS

Ordered off the agenda was Rep. Stork's question re impeachment of public officials.

(17) NEW BUSINESS

Ordered on the Agenda was the reminder to the Board members of the two Special Budget Meetings to be held Tuesday and Wednesday, May 13 and 14, 1980. Ordered off the agenda was Mr. Corbo's memo re allegations about Reps. Perillo and DeLuca.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, seconded, and carried, the meeting was ADJOURNED at approximately 11 P.M.

CMT:EMM

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, Chairwoman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met Thursday, May 1, 1980 at 8:00 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present at the meeting were: Reps. Summerville, M. Perillo, B. McInerney, J. Boccuzzi, R. DeLuca, S. Darer, H. Dixon. Absent were: Reps. Signore and DeNicola.

With the Board's permission I would like to move to the Consent Agenda: Items #1, 3, 5, 7. MOVED. SECONDED.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| (1) <u>MS. MARY WILLIAMS</u> (D)
109 Tresser Blvd., Apt. 12-D | Replacing D. Jetter
who resigned | Dec. 1, 1980 |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| (2) <u>ROBERT OWENS</u> (D)
49 Cedar Street | Replacing Frances Adams
who resigned. | Dec. 1, 1980 |
|--|--|--------------|

HELD IN COMMITTEE, (pending withdrawal from Mayor)

- | | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| (3) <u>ROBERT HARRIS</u> (D)
91 Strawberry Hill Ave. | Replacing R. Fleisher
whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1980 |
|---|---|--------------|

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.SEWER COMMISSION

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| (4) <u>ROBERT J. JONES</u> (R)
130 Erskine Road | Replacing M. Reppucci
whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1981 |
|--|---|--------------|

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee voted 4-3 for approval and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 26 in favor, 9 opposed, 2 abstentions.

PATRIOTIC AND SPECIAL EVENTS COMMISSION

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| (5) <u>PETER F. CANZANO</u> (D)
38 Pine Hill Terrace | Replacing J. DeVito
who resigned | Dec. 1, 1981 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| (6) <u>CHARLES GRIFFITH</u> (R)
361 Eden Road | Replacing F. Greco
Whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1981 |
|--|--|--------------|

MR. DIXON: That item is being HELD WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The Appointments Committee wants to do some research work on the Building Board of Appeals to determine its purpose and the duties of the Commissioners serving thereon.

APPOINTMENTS (cont.)TRANSIT DISTRICTTerm Expires

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| (7) <u>RONALD BANE (D)</u>
53 Nutmeg Lane | Initial appointment to
reconstituted Board | Dec. 1, 1981 |
|--|---|--------------|

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - ALTERNATE

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| (8) <u>MS. SALLY LEVENE (R)</u>
72 West Hill Circle
(Second Submission) | Replacing D. O'Toole
whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1984 |
|---|--|--------------|

MR. DIXON: Item #8 is that of Mrs. Sally Levene seeking this Board's approval of her appointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The appointment is for a five year term which will expire Dec. 1, 1984. I would like to state for the record that this is a second submission of this name of this appointment, and the Mayor is prohibited by Section 503 of the Charter to submit the same name a third time. The Appointments Committee conducted a second interview with Mrs. Levene to give her the opportunity to clarify some of her answers to questions raised in the previous interview and for the benefit of those committee members that were not present during the first interview. Mrs. Levene demonstrated again an abundance of experience and expertise in planning, zoning, and zoning appeals and re-affirmed her desire to become a servant to the City of Stamford. The Appointments Committee, in re-considering its previous vote, has voted for approval of this appointment by a vote of 3 in favor; 1 against; and 3 abstentions. I therefore would MOVE now for confirmation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to urge my fellow Board Members to support Sally Levene. She is very knowledgeable in zoning, she knows the State of Connecticut laws inside out. She will be an asset to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and I ask for your support.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The vote is 27 in favor, 5 opposed, 5 abstentions. CARRIED. Mrs. Levene has been confirmed to the Zoning Board of Appeals as an Alternate. I would like to indicate for the record that on the preceding vote for Mr. Jones, there were 2 abstentions.

MR. DIXON said Items #1, 3, 5, 7, have been placed on the CONSENT AGENDA, having passed the Appointments Committee's interview with unanimous votes and he MOVED for their confirmation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF THE RULES by Mr. Fasanelli to move up URC Item #1. SECONDED. CARRIED.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Richard Fasanelli

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE RE-CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED URBAN RENEWAL PLAN AND CONTRACT RELATING TO PARCELS 8 and 9, per Mayor Clapes' letter 4/16/80.

MR. FASANELLI: Item #1 on the Urban Renewal Committee Agenda is a Proposed Resolution reconsidering consideration of Amended Urban Renewal Plan and Contract relating to Parcels 8 and 9.

MR. DZIEZYC: POINT OF ORDER. I challenge the Chair's decision on Suspending the Rules.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If this Board so desires, we will take a machine vote on the motion to Suspend the Rules to consider an item out of order. I will reset the machine. If you wish to Suspend the Rules to consider Item #1, under the Urban Renewal Committee out of order, please indicate this by voting up for yes.

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF INFORMATION. When the Chair is challenged by a member of the Board, does it require a vote that the Chair's decision be overturned, or does the Chair make that decision itself?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: In terms of requiring a Roll Call vote or asking for a machine or Roll Call vote, that is really enough to do it. I think we will proceed much more easily by just voting on this by use of the machine. If you wish to Suspend the Rules to consider this please indicate so by voting up for yes, if not vote down for no. The MOTION to SUSPEND THE RULES HAS BEEN DEFEATED, by a vote of 24 in favor, 13 opposed; it needed 2/3. We will then proceed to the next item of business which will be Mr. Esposito, Fiscal Committee.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Paul Esposito, Co-Chairperson

MR. ESPOSITO: The Fiscal Committee has been meeting for the last two weeks and some nights. We had covered some of the items on this agenda, but all votes were taken last Wednesday night at our regularly scheduled meeting and present at that meeting were my Co-Chairperson Mrs. Hawe, Mr. Flounders, Mrs. Lyons, Mr. Fauteux, Mrs. B. Conti, Mr. Esposito, Mr. Rybnick and Mr. Livingston.

At this point I would like to place the following items on the Consent Agenda. Items # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18. (On those items where the secondary committee did not have a report, the proper motions were made, seconded and carried).

- (1) \$9,897.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - Additional Appropriation requested by Dr. Gofstein and Mayor Clapes; Bd. of Finance approved 3/13/80.

573.1110 Salaries	\$ 9,022.00
573.1310 F.I.C.A.	585.00
573.2650 New Equipment	290.00
	<u>\$ 9,897.00</u>

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE GRANTS FROM ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PROGRAMS TO COORDINATE CITY-WIDE SERVICES AVAILABLE TO PREGNANT ADOLESCENTS.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (3) \$ 80,155.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - AMEND 1979-80 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGETS BY ADDING A NEW PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #114.961 to purchase three new Dial-A-Ride Vehicles. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) \$ 3,000.00 - PROBATE COURT - CODE 220.2911 RECORD BOOKS - for microfilming costs and new index volume. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) \$ 2,500.00 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD - Code 111.7559 COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT (CAM) GRANT. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (6) \$ 4,720.00 - BELLTOWN FIRE DEPT. Code 471.1150 WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (7) \$ 300.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 550.4290 GIFTS & DONATION - Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (8) \$ 7,235.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - Code 410.1170 PERSONNEL APPEALS AWARDS - Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (9) \$181,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. - Code 313.2720 - GAS AND ELECTRIC - PUBLIC LIGHTING - Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (10) \$ 126,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. - INCINERATOR COMPLEX - Code 343.2720 GAS AND ELECTRIC. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (11) \$ 16,279.40 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3140 PRIMARY EXPENSES (Republican & Democratic Town & City Comm. Elections) Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (12) \$ 23,133.24 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3142 PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (13) \$ 21,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE SNF - Code 520.3810 PROVISIONS. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (14) \$ 9,500.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - Code 530.3810 PROVISIONS. Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (15) \$ 5,000.00 - SOUTHFIELD COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION, INC. - Code 742.2720 - for utilities,(gas and electric). Bd. of Finance approved 4/10/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (16) PROPOSED RESOLUTION REQUESTING RE-EVALUATION OF UNBONDED CAPITAL PROJECTS TO DETERMINE PRIORITIES AND WHETHER SOME CAN BE ELIMINATED. REFERS TO THE \$23,883,137.93 APPROVED APRIL 10, 1980.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (17) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT FOR 'MULTI-RISK SHARING AGREEMENT - SECTION 312". HUD will fund \$100,000. City will match 20%, or \$20,000.

MR. ESPOSITO: Fiscal voted 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions, and I so MOVE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: At this time I would like to MOVE to recommit that item to Committee because we found in the Republican Caucus that there was a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to #17.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. WIDER: POINT OF INFORMATION. I believe we were the secondary committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Wider, I am going to permit you to give your secondary committee on that and then we would move to the motion to recommit.

MR. WIDER: We met and approved it 4-0.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a motion to recommit #17 to the Fiscal Committee for further study. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 15 in favor, 14 opposed, 8 abstentions.

- (18) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING HOUSING SITES DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (HSDA) AND NEW NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. TO APPLY TO STATE FOR TWO-THIRDS MATCHING FUNDS FOR TWO HOUSING SITE ACQUISITION PROJECTS. (No City funds are being requested)

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. ESPOSITO: I MOVE the CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to take up SUSPENSION of the RULES for a new sum to be added to the STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM. At our March 3, meeting we authorized the following of a budget application for the Stamford Day Care Program for the Fiscal year 1980/81. At that time the funds we requested were \$477,878. Since that point, the State has requested that we submit a new application because they are going to provide us with approximately \$18,000. in addition, to be used to increase the salaries for the Day Care employees. The new request is for the amount of \$495,003. Fiscal voted 8-0 in favor of this and I would ask that we Suspend the Rules to take up that item.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

- (19) \$495,003.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE - Salaries - increase for employees.

MR. ESPOSITO: I MOVE that we approve the authorization to file a budget application for the Stamford Day Care Program for the Fiscal year 1980/81 in the amount of \$495,003.00.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm wondering at this moment would it be in order if we SUSPEND the RULES to bring out URC, because we have finished Fiscal.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is a perfectly legitimate motion. MOVED. SECONDED. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 15 in favor, 17 opposed, 5 abstentions. The MOTION is LOST.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - John R. Zelinski, Co-Chairman

MR. ZELINSKI: Legislative and Rules met twice this month, April 30, and May 1.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. L&R met three times this month.

MR. ZELINSKI: Present at the April 30, 1980 meeting were Reps. Donahue, Wiederlight, Blum, Fasanelli, A. Conti, and Zelinski. We had two public hearings which I'll go into when we get to those items on the Agenda.

(1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE PRIVATE GARBAGE COLLECTORS.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 7 in favor and I so MOVE. Just one point. I'd like to note for the record that I did receive a memo from Rep. McInerney and she was clearly correct at the last meeting when she said that we did not delete that section, which according to the information from Dep. Corporation Counsel Boodman said we did, and I would like to apologize and say that's why we voted 7 in favor to publish that. I hope she accept my apology on that.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will now move to the question. The MOTION has been CARRIED. There are two in opposition, Mr. Roos and Mr. Flounders. Mr. Rybnick abstained.

I would like to indicate for the record that Mr. Hogan has left; we now have 36 present. Also Mr. Darer will be recorded as a no vote; therefore there were 32 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention.

(2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE "MORATORIUM ON CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS".

MR. ZELINSKI: As I mentioned in the beginning, we did have a public hearing which was attended by approximately 59 Stamford Residents. However, the particular Ordinance at this present point in time is moot because the State Legislature last week did pass a bill which unfortunately specifies right in the bill that cities and towns may not regulate the conversion of residential rental property to condominium dwellings except as provided in this act. There will be no further action.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (cont.)

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE GREENWICH LAND TRUST, INC. FOR 10.059 ACRES CONVEYED TO THEM BY FRANCES D. CLYNE.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor. I was going to move, however, this evening on my desk as I'm sure the rest of us found a letter pertaining to a request from Deputy Coporation Counsel Alice Perry, asking that this item and another one be held. If it would be in order, I would MOVE to put it back in Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Unless there is an objection, that's perfectly in order.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT TO GIVE WILLIAM AND PHYLLIS CHAPIN ACCESS TO OLD LONG RIDGE ROAD.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor and 1 against and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR NATURE CONSERVANCY PROPERTY.

MR. ZELINSKI: We voted 6 in favor and I so MOVE. If I may rescind my motion, again Corporation Counsel asked for more information, so I would MOVE that instead we HOLD it in Committee.

- (6) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR SOUTHWESTERN CONNECTICUT GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC.

MR. ZELINSKI: Being it was voted for publication by the last Board, I understand it would not be legal for us at this time to vote for Final Adoption. Our Committee did vote 6 in favor for publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to make a MOTION to recommit this item to committee without publication based on a letter which was received by the 15th Board on October 22, 1979 by Corporation Counsel, then Michael Sherman, stating that Section 12-81 limits the powers of the municipality to grant by way of ordinance, retroactive aspect of tax exemption to those properties exempt set forth in sub-section 7 through 16 of the Connecticut State Law. Of these sub-sections, the Girl Scouts could fall only into sub-section 7, Real Estate use for scientific, educational literary, historic or charitable purposes, however, Real Estate property and equipment used for non-profit camps or recreational facilities for charitable purposes are granted tax exemption status under a separate sub-section, namely sub-section 49, and I am therefore, this is quoting from Mr. Sherman letter, "of the opinion your Board does not have the power". . .

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. McInerney, may I interrupt you, I don't believe your motion to recommit was seconded. It has been SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm sorry, I didn't realize either. "I am therefore of the opinion your Board does not have the power to enact an Ordinance granting a retroactive relief sought by Southwestern Girl Scout Council Inc. for Real Estate property which as expressed in a letter from their Attorney, is to be used as a Camp and Recreational facilities." In my motion to recommit, I would like you to send this letter to Corporation Counsel Cookney and ask for clarification and/or confirmation of the previous decision from Corporation Counsel. I have a copy which I will give to Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Motion to recommit was MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote).

(7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTIES OWNED BY BAIS BINYOMIN ACADEMY OF CONNECTICUT, INC.

MR. ZELINSKI: We voted 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote, 1 opposed, Mrs. McInerney)

(8) REQUEST FOR WAIVER AND REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE OF \$2,800 PAID BY CONTRACTOR FRANK MERCEDE IN CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AT 26 Palmers Hill Rd. for Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote, Maihock abstained)

(9) FOR PUBLICATION (VERSION #2) - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO REGULATE THE SALE AND/OR RE-SALE OF PRECIOUS METALS, INCLUDING GOLD AND SILVER.

MR. ZELINSKI: We did have a public hearing on May 1, 1980, which was attended by Chief Cizanckas who did speak in favor of this, and our Committee voted 7 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED. There are people who wish to be heard.

MR. POLLARD: I'm in favor of the motion. However, I'd like to introduce certain amendments to the proposed ordinance. It is very clear that the flavor of this proposed ordinance is very oriented to the Police Dept., since I understand that the Police Department helped write it. I think it's the job of this body to consider not only what the Police Dept. wishes, but to represent the interests of people doing business in our community. The amendments I'd like to make begin on page 3 of the ordinance, item #2, it says license required. I would like to change that from requiring a license to, instead, informinga requirement to inform the Police Dept. that people are involved in that business activity and that change would then ripple through the remainder of the ordinance where-

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (cont.)

MR. POLLARD: (continuing)...ever it stipulates that the Police Dept. is going to issue licenses and issue additional regulations. I don't favor regulations being enacted by other than this Board.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Can you please clearly state what your amendment would be, and if you are going to strike certain words, tell us what you want struck.

MR. POLLARD: Under #2, strike the words "license required" and then continue with: it shall be unlawful for any person to do business in precious metals within the City of Stamford without first informing the Police Dept. That negates all of item #3, which deals with application, it negates 3.1 dealing with duration, it negates #4, dealing with fee, it negates #5, dealing with regulations.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (first part of sentence lost in tape change)...many people choose not to show up by Rep. Blum, that's for the record. I regret, Rep. Pollard, that you didn't come to the L&R Committee meeting to discuss this Ordinance as proposed. I must object vehemently to removing license required and the subsequent changes that you want to make to this ordinance, only because it will give the ordinance no teeth. First of all, a license of \$1.00 is within the realm of anybody who wants to deal in precious metals, I'm sure we'll agree to that. Secondly, I do believe for the record that the Police Dept. along with myself and the Corporation Counsel drew up this ordinance, not the Police Dept. It was studied very carefully by Corporation Counsel and revised at least once or twice before being put out as you see it. I, therefore, have to ask you to vote against the amendment, or we're going to have a paper ordinance, none which can readily be enforced.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I am not in total agreement with Mr. Pollard, and I'm not in agreement with the part that says the Police Dept. has to issue the license. I would rather see it done through the Town Clerk's Office. The other objection I have, it says: any person authorized can refuse to issue any such license to persons convicted of any crime involving a theft, receiving of possession of stolen goods. Now, the reason for that is very simple. Say ten years ago, a young man in his prime, stole a car or something of that nature, his first offense, he did it, maybe with 2 or 3 other boys after having a few drinks; he didn't want to steal the car but that's the situation he's in, he was convicted, the Judge gave him a suspended sentence, put him on 2 years probation; the man served his probation; did nothing wrong so now he has a clean bill of goods. According to this ordinance, if he was to go into the precious metals business, he wouldn't be allowed a license, because he was convicted of a theft.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: That's not true; it says at the discretion of the Police Dept. and there are appeal methods available in such situation according to the ordinance.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I can't agree that part should be in there at all.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (cont.)

MR. JOYCE: I cannot go along with this idea of the reformed criminal getting a license to deal in silver and precious metals. The people in my district have been hard hit with breaking and entering; they're not sympathetic to having this go on and I think it's about time we draw the line here; rehabilitation is wonderful but the victims have a right to have peace and tranquillity in their homes, and I'm sick and tired of hearing people complain about the rights of the criminal; how about the rights of the people to have a safe home.

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I'm afraid Mr. Joyce misinterprets what I said. I have no love for criminals either. I made a statement that would reflect a possible situation that could have happened. I'm not saying that I agree that criminals should be let run on the streets.

MR. DARER: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The motion is on Mr. Pollard's amendment. We will proceed with a machine vote. The vote is 4 in favor, 27 opposed, with 5 abstentions; the amendment is LOST.

MR. POLLARD: On page 4, item #7, Caption, "Records delivered to Police" I would strike "Records delivered to Police" and continue with, "the licenses shall make available" as opposed to "delivered" a copy of the above record to the Police Dept. and so forth, so I'm deleting "Records delivered to Police" and I'm deleting the word "deliver" and changing that "to make available".

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. POLLARD: My reason for that is I think it would be precedent-setting to require a shop owner to make almost or perhaps a daily delivery of information to the Police Dept. I think if the Police Dept. has a need to know that information, it will be available at the shops and they would know then where the shops are.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote, we will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 18 yes, 15 no, 3 abstentions; the MOTION is CARRIED.

MR. POLLARD: I have one additional change. On page 5, the second line, I would like to change 6 days to 2 days.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MR. WIEDERLICH: The purpose of having 6 days or a time period such as this is to give the Police Dept. a chance to match up the burglary report, the incident against what was submitted to them in the form of a report from the merchants who buy and sell the precious metals, so they can see who bought what and what was burglarized or stolen as the case may be. If we're going to have a turnover within 2 days, it's not going to give the Police a chance to do their job; it's a short period of time. That's why we put in 6 days, to make a reasonable time for the Police to get the reports, process the reports and study them and then go out and take appropriate action. You're not going to get any goods back in 2 days.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

MR. DONAHUE: Last amendment has probably defeated the whole purpose of this. In order to find out about thefts, the Police Dept. would probably have to visit each licensed dealer on a daily basis to see what has been stolen, and to further go on and weaken this bill is a mistake; it does take time to check records and it can't be done over-night and I would like to see this defeated.

MR. POLLARD: I can appreciate all of the problems that the Police Dept. has. I really sincerely doubt that we have so many people involved in the business of precious metals in the City of Stamford that they cannot be routinely viewed in the course of two days, I'm keeping in mind the fact that these people are dealing with what have indeed become very precious metals. You would be imposing an inventory problem on them that could conceivably drive them out of business.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would indicate that Mr. Stork is present, and we now have 37 members.

MR. JOYCE: I think there is some confusion or lack of understanding of what this ordinance is about, and I think we really ought to get out into the record here what we are concerned about and I talked with Mr. Wiederlight about this. I haven't heard him mention it tonight, We're talking about people coming into Stamford who move into the Marriott Hotel, and they act like mobile "fences"; and these kind of people, in order for us to get a handle on this kind of situation. What they want to do is hold them for a particular period of time, and that's where the reason for the delays is here; in order to get a fix on these people before they hit and run.

MR. WIDER: In face of the many questions that have come up about this ordinance, I would MOVE that it be put back into Committee for completion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. DARER: I would like to see this recommitted for several reasons. There have been several questions raised by members of the Board tonight about alternative thoughts and ideas. The members of the L&R Committee have said we weaken the amendment to the point where it will be ineffective. I don't want to vote on something that I think will be ineffective.

MR. LOGMIS: I agree with Mr. Darer. We're acting now as a Committee as a whole, not as a Board of Representatives and I'm afraid if we pursue this we're going to kill more time. I think perhaps it would be best to send it back to Committee.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I believe that this ordinance is really urgently needed and I believe that the delay will be harmful.

MRS. CONTI: Since we are only moving this for publication and it is not in any final form, I really think we can publish it and then later correct it. We would have to have another public hearing, but, I think it would be worth publishing it.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF INFORMATION. Does this ordinance cover people that come into the Marriott Hotel for on day?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Yes.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would support the motion to recommit. It seems to me that it is not clear, too many of us truly don't understand what's happening and to deal with the amendment that's on the floor of the Board, it's extremely difficult.

MR. RYBNICK: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The motion on the floor is to recommit Item #9. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 32 yes, 5 no. The Proposed Ordinance will be sent back to Committee.

(10) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR BI-CULTURAL DAY SCHOOL. 2186 High Ridge Road.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVE. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(11) PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTY ON DIVISION STREET FOR PUBLICATION - (TOT LOT) CONVEYED TO CITY ON 3/5/80 FOR TAX PAID BY CONNECTICUT NEWSPAPERS, INC.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor; 1 against, to HOLD this for additional information.

(12) THE MATTER OF THE SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY - FOR PUBLICATION.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

(13) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - TAX ABATEMENT FOR STAMFORD MUSEUM & NATURE CENTER.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider an item not on the Agenda.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would MOVE for final adoption for the Proposed Ordinance for tax abatement for the Stamford Museum & Nature Center.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)(14) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - DRUG LIBERATION, INC. 6 Washington Court

MR. ZELINSKI: I MOVE for SUSPENSION OF THE RULES to take up an item not on the Agenda.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I MOVE for Final Adoption.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. CONTI: I'd like to MOVE to SUSPEND THE RULES to take up an item under Urban Renewal Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (requires 2/3 of those present and voting - 35 people voting) 24 in favor, 11 opposed.

MR. DARER: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I don't mean to sound like sour grapes, but one of our esteemed colleagues, John Hogan, got out of a sick bed to come here tonight and we wouldn't Suspend the Rules, and he had to leave and I think in a sense, we owe him an apology.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I do agree.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli(1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE RE-CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED URBAN RENEWAL PLAN AND CONTRACT RELATING TO PARCELS 8 and 9.

MR. FASANELLI: Item #1, Reconsideration of the Amended Urban Renewal Plan relating to Parcels 8 and 9. Our Committee voted 4 in favor; none against; 1 abstention; and I'd like to make a MOTION at this time that the full Board accept the amended plan.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MR. FASANELLI: The question here tonight which I hope the Board will deal with, is not one of personalities; it's not one of URC; it's not one of developers. I feel the question is the best usage for the City of Stamford and for the future of Stamford of those two blocks. If we can achieve the best usage through the Amended Plan, then that's the way I feel we should go; if a private developer can give us the best usage, well that's the way we should go then; we've all listened and come to the public hearings and we've heard the opinions of many that all that's going to be built there if private development has its way, if private enterprise has a free hand, is office buildings. I think we've seen enough of office buildings in the City of Stamford to satisfy. I think this Urban Renewal Plan brought before us is the best one that's been presented

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. FASANELLI (continuing)...to us so far, there've been no alternatives presented that seem any better to us. Our Committee has been studying this plan for the past three months. We've been looking over it and all the ramifications entailed in this plan, and we've come up with the decision that it is a good and fair equitable plan and we have trust in the people who implement it. We sincerely hope that what's considered here tonight is the plan on its merits, and nothing else. The plan will rejuvenate and revitalize that particular two-block area. I'm sure a lot of you have gotten calls for and against the particular plan but I'm sure a lot of merchants, in and around the area, are in support of the particular plan, and we have, and I don't think the full Board has received this letter, but it was addressed to Mrs. Edith Sherman and I would like to read it into the record if I may. It's from the St. John's Urban Development Corporation. It says;

Dear Mrs. Sherman: Please be advised that the undersigned represents St. John's Urban Development Corp., the owners of St. John's Towers. I have been authorized by this Board of Directors of said Corporation to write this letter in support of the above plan. The Board believes that the plan offers the last opportunity for the City of Stamford to provide a meaningful number of upper and middle income housing units in the downtown area and thus broaden the base of the existing housing stock. Also the construction of a 400-unit hotel and parking facility for 280 cars would do much to regenerate this older and deteriorated part of our downtown area. The total effect of this amended plan we feel would be to bring more people to the center of town thus making the streets safer, and I underline safer, and adding life to the downtown areas. Sincerely yours, Daniel M. McCabe.

I think this is the best plan for the City of Stamford and I think our Committee felt that way and I hope you all will support the plan.

MR. DZIEZYC: I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee, through Madam President, what has been changed since our last rejection of the Amended Plan?

MR. FASANELLI: Nothing to my knowledge.

MR. DZIEZYC: Why are we voting on it again?

MR. FASANELLI: As resubmitted by Mayor Clapes, legally, this time. Last time I don't believe it was on the Agenda properly.

MR. WIDER: I look around downtown and I see what has happened not to the buildings but to the people who live downtown. I'm overly bothered as whether the intent of the URC was to do away with blighted buildings or blighted people, this question has come to my mind so many times as I review the beginning of the URC program in the City of Stamford. The people have have elected us to represent

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIDER: (continuing)...then but sometimes we have a hard time representing the people who elected us and I want the public to know that we, as representatives, certainly have a hard time because when we look around and see what some of you will do in order to get what you want, it kind of upsets people in the City of Stamford. This plan I've listened to it, looked over it and tried to digest it. I've taken both sides. I own property in the City of Stamford and I own a small business and I would hate to see that business taken away from me. I would hate to see my parking on my street for my tenants taken away from them. I think we ought to have a plan showing equally as much or better than what URC plan is showing. I'm concerned with you as property owners and merchants in that area, but in the meantime I am forced to look at what I can see, and so far, unless you have something to show us tonight, we only have in front of us one plan and the only other plan that we have is the one in our mind, and I'm here to listen to the Board Members pro and con before I vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: I have received several telephone calls, and also letters from various people and merchants in the community. We came down here on March 20 and March 27th. We studied all the material which is a great deal of time consuming, in addition to all our regular work that we have to prepare for the regular Board meeting and now we are here again on May 5th voting for something that we already voted on with no changes. I'm concerned that I have to vote again and take my time to read over the material and take time to discuss this; but, just to sum it up, I think the best way to conclude it would be to say that in our local paper, just in tonight's paper, there was a full-page advertisement which was addressed to our Board and the people of Stamford, and what it simply said in the first paragraph, I think it hits home and that is the proposed Amended Urban Renewal has a parking facility for 280 cars; less than half of what is now available. We believe in Stamford and progress, but if this Plan is put into effect, we will all be condemned to a slow extinction and this was signed by merchants' group which is directly affected. I tonight plan on voting no as I did the last time and I hope my colleagues will also, even though there's been a lot of pressure on both sides.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Plan #2 consists of a ground-level parking, 360 cars, of which 180 spaces will be provided to the City by the developer. If you take and add up all the parking places in the new Plan and all the parking in the old Plan, you will find we have more parking in the second Plan. The merchants have to realize regardless what plan we take, that parking on Broad Street thus will not exist any more. That goes regardless. There will be development there that will take those particular spaces. Now there has been some question about how much more land the redeveloper will get in the second plan over the first plan. He's getting more. Why? We are insisting on 300 units or better of housing in that area. If you don't want the housing in that area, if you don't think we should have life down in that area, then you should vote against the second plan. I think when you talk about keeping a certain section of the City alive, the only way to do it is with people.

Plan #1, you sell the property to the redeveloper for approximately \$265-\$275 a square foot. Plan #2, the redeveloper has to pay the appraisal of that property today, not back in 1968 or what the guidelines were for URC. You're talking a difference of a couple million dollars. You want to give the redeveloper that break, vote against the Amended Plan, but all I can say is that disregarding all the pressures put on by either the merchants, URC, the redeveloper

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing)...or anyone else when you look at the bottom line and you have to decide how much will it cost the City of Stamford if we do not take Plan #2. What is it going to cost us for Summer Street? Are we willing to give up 300 units of housing? Are we willing to give up life after 5:30 at night? These are the things you have to take into consideration and I think that now is the time to decide that we should take the Amended Plan.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I don't believe it's as cut and dried as it seems. You take one plan or reject the other plan. I, too, have received all kinds of calls and talked to a number of people including Board Members concerning this and I'm sure that as a Board Member and fellow Board Members, we probably are somewhat reluctant about all this phone calling on a Sunday, but my feelings are the public has the right to petition its Government, be it on the local level, State level or the Federal level, and I don't think we should discourage the public from calling us. But looking at this, my feelings are that I owe the people of my district and the people of Stamford an explanation of why I voted against it the last go-around and unless I hear something on this floor tonight that's going to change my mind, I believe I am going to vote against it again because there are a couple of things that happened that all of my experience, going back some 10 years on this Board, did not prepare me to receive. I'll give you a "for instance!" One of the reason I voted against it the last go-around was because I felt that the merchants and the business people in that area; but you must also keep in mind that I'm a firm believer that everyone wants to make money anyway under either one of the Plans. I did hope and the main reasons I voted against it last time was because the merchants and the business people in that area were so against it. I felt that by voting against this there would be room for negotiation and perhaps the URC and the developer would sit down with these people and work out some kind of compromise so that we could all feel comfortable; a give-and-take on each side, but that didn't happen and I'm surprised that it didn't happen and I feel that if we're really going to do what's in the interest of the City of Stamford, we're talking about something that's going to have an impact and effect on this City probably for the next 50 years and if we're really concerned about what's going to happen to the City of Stamford with these parcels of land, then we, this Board, should insist that the developer, URC and the merchants in this area sit down again and work out a plan that they can agree upon and until that happens, I'm going to maintain my no vote.

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I want to apologize to the person who wrote the letter. I misquoted it. The word was not Condemned. It was commend. I apologize to that lawyer publicly.

MR. DIXON: Believe me when I say this is one of, if not, the most difficult situation I've been in during my 12 years on this Board. I found it hard to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong in terms of voting. I want to say up front that I am voting in favor of the amended URC Plan and I wish also to say up front that my vote should not be taken as an implication of my approval of the Plan, nor for that matter, any of the other bad situations we've been caught up in during the life of the URC program. I'm voting for the Plan because it's an alternative, the lesser of two evils, which hopefully will

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. DIXON: (continuing)...bring some relief to the taxpayers of Stamford and at the same time, bring a conclusion to a monstrosity that has been costly, not only to our taxpayers in general, but also to small business men and many former citizens who once lived and worked here. I will welcome the conclusion and complete close-out of this so-called monster because it, with the help of other opportunists, has up-rooted families and has caused Stamford to lose almost a generation of its young people to other towns and cities to satisfy their need for housing.

MR. DONAHUE: There has been a great deal of lobbying on this issue going back for 4 months now. What we're voting on tonight is for the success of the Urban Renewal Project. A project where the City has invested a lot of money, a lot of time and a lot of life. What is left in the downtown area is mainly offices and we have a new Mall going up and we have the Marriott, and we have the proposed Holiday Inn, and we have the Ramada Inn and all of these areas create activity to the South and to the East of the Stamford Super Block. I am convinced that unless we create life on this side, the western side of the Super Block, that area will die a natural death. There will be nothing to attract people to that side of the Super Block. There will be nothing to stop traffic from going by the very merchants who are here tonight and into the Super Block and not come out again. There have been many things thrown around that are not facts and this Board has to sift through those things. It's not always easy I know, but this plan is in the best interest to the City of Stamford and it's time to place the public interest above the private interest and vote for something that will help the City and will not hurt it.

MR. BLUM: We are here deliberating our future of the downtown area, Urban Renewal, something to make changes in our City, to eliminate blighted areas, to eliminate deteriorating areas, but, we have done that job, we have removed blighted areas in the real downtown area, namely, what existed in the 1960's. I think we're talking of prime land, prime land as I was told. I think this City has grown to the point that we're going to see many issues similar to an issue like this, that we will be lobbied very hard, and let us make up our minds we are no longer the small town that I grew up in. We are a big City and I accept it.

MR. DARER: The question that I believe we should address for a few moments this evening is the sociological consequence of an Urban Renewal. We've had in Stamford sensibilities affected over the last ten or fifteen years of people who rightly or wrongly felt misplaced, felt left out of the mainstream as the City developed and grew. I think those are honest and sincere sensibilities which have been affected. The sincerity of my comment now is that I believe that people want change. They are not always prepared to accept it. They want increased services; they are not always prepared to meet the cost of those services. We have a dichotomy. We have a situation where we want more of our lives but we're not always prepared to meet the cost.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. DARER: (continuing)..The point I'm making is that Urban Renewal has had its problems, but I think if one looks at the costs and the benefits and where the City of Stamford is today, and is willing to accept change; we are far better off today than we were twenty years ago. We were a City then that was a blue-collar City. It had its good points; family life might have been a little better, but so was the whole United States family life a little better and so were many of the values that we appreciated. Times have changed, not only in Stamford but all through-out the United States. I feel that successful Urban Renewals and I think Stamford has been a great success, are done by the concept of using a sole developer. This creates a unification. It also enables us to get the apartments and the hotels and I think the point has been made by Mr. Boccuzzi, by Mr. Fasanelli, by Mr. Donahue that if we don't bring that west part of this Urban Renewal alive we may have serious consequences in the future. There's still other parts of Main Street and further out the gateway will be reflected by the success of this. Success breeds success.

MR. DeLUCA: Re-submission of this item tonight by the Powers-to-be is embarrassing the Board of Representatives. We have been told of deadlines which have been passed and extended. There is mention of increased tax revenues from the present \$250,000. to \$1.6 million. Is this what life is all about, increased tax revenues? Are we to forget the fact that people have invested their life savings in Blocks 8 and 9? Are we to forget the fact that they have maintained the areas in question for approximately 20 years? Are we to forget the fact that these same merchants have previously been relocated? I should hope not. Some people are convinced that only through the URC will a hotel and housing be provided. What makes them so sure that other developers will not provide the same thing? Have they been apprised of these facts? We have an opportunity to make history tonight we have been told. What kind of history is it; to do away with the small merchants who have helped our tax base for so many years? Now we are telling them, forget it. We have used you for a certain amount of time; we need you no longer. We have previously rejected this Amended Plan by a vote of 23 to 11. At our April 10th meeting, there was no report on this item. Hopefully, the 23 votes will remain solid and this Plan will be rejected tonight with a recommendation that we are not interested in another Plan unless it concerns everyone involved. Therefore, I urge my colleagues tonight to once again reject this Plan until we receive one that is feasible to all people.

MRS. GUROLAN: I'm voting against this Plan for several reasons. I resent the fact that I've always been jockeyed into the position no matter whom we speak to from the URC, into the position of making a choice between two Plans: the old one and the proposed Amended Plan. When right from the start it had become clear to everyone that an alternative plan should have been formulated by those people responsible for it. The total disregard of the people who have the responsibility of initiating such a thing is appalling to me and the fact that the URC from the beginning has posed objections as to the time element involved in proposing another alternative, has certainly not held water. Enough time has elapsed so that they could have made some effort in that regard.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GUROLAN: (continuing)

I couldn't agree with Mr. Wider more. I think the original plan, which I am thoroughly familiar with and have been actively involved with since the beginning, was a plan of people removal. 800 families were removed with no place to relocate them and now we are faced with another phase which I consider the small business removal and I think one is just as bad as the other was; and I don't want to be a party to this one, just as I was not a party to the other proposal.

I think in the last hearing we had, it was pointed out that the passage of this amended Plan will give the developer the right to develop more than three times the acreage that the former plan did. I think that in itself should indicate why the developer is so anxious that this amended Plan be passed.

The fact that it's been continually said that the one objection to this amended Plan is the objection that small business lacks garages is not true because each of us has entertained different objections as well; one of them being housing. The lack of assurance, of creditable assurance from the developer that in fact any housing will be built as provided in the amended Plan is one of the reasons many of us are not voting for it. There are others as well which I will not go into.

I'd like to briefly remark about some of the things that Mr. Darer says. Mr. Darer is very adept at throwing out a lot of ideas, a number of which have very valid opposing opinions that could be expressed. I'd like to address myself to three out of maybe the 15 that he threw out. One of them is the notion that growth in itself is beneficial or that growth is equated with progress, or that progress in itself is a good thing.

#1. There is nothing in the world which can stop progress. Doing nothing involves progress also. It is the direction in which you direct that progress that's important; so that progress in itself is not anything that in and of itself holds complete validity. As for growth, I think we all know how well New York City grew itself into bankruptcy. So, growth in itself is not something to be desired just because it is growth. The fact that Mr. Darer said Government originally promised to build housing in the URC area is not so; and in many instances, he's unfamiliar with what has transpired insofar as the URC Plan has been concerned.

Right from the beginning the developer opposed any notion of building housing in the Urban Renewal Area and it was only through Court cases and continual pressure that we got the housing that we have in the Urban Renewal Area and nowhere had we gotten the completely assured promise that the Government would build anything; but the desire was always there to put housing in. It was the developer who opposed that desire; not the people and not the Government.

As to the fact that the Urban Renewal has been so successful, well, success is in the eye of the beholder and everybody has a different definition of success. I think you can find just as many people in the City of Stamford who are not pleased with the way that Urban Development has gone and do not consider it successful, as you would find people agreeing with Mr. Darer that

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GUROLAN: (continuing)..it was successful. These are only a few of the comments I would like to make about him, but I think all told, not a valid case has been presented by the Urban Renewal Commission as to warrant us increasing the scope of the Urban Renewal Area and by voting yes to this Amended Plan.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like to point out that the area under consideration, Blocks 8 and 9, were previously to this day designated a conservation area. We encouraged these people to move into this area to flourish and grow. We gave them our recommendations and our word that this is where they could grow and this is where they could do their business and the area would not be designated an Urban Renewal Area again. Obviously, we are trying to go back on our word to these people. I cannot disregard the many voices that I've heard over the past few weeks. These are the people whose children go to school with my children. I cannot push them aside for supposed bottom line, a bottom line that really nobody can really tell me is true. On the one hand we say if we vote for this Plan, the bottom line is thus and we might be sued by these people. On the other hand if we listen to the other side, if we vote this way, the bottom line is thus and we're going to be sued by these people. We really don't know, do we? In conclusion to my brief remarks, I feel if the cloud of this Urban Redevelopment is forever removed from this two-block area known as Blocks 8 and 9, the area will grow, there will be prosperity; it will flourish on its own through private enterprise; the land, the people are too smart not to let it do so.

MRS. CONTI: The Urban Redevelopment Committee has worked long and hard. We have studied the situation. For 4 months we have studied the Plans. We have held public hearings. There is good, there is bad in both Plans or shall I say three Plans? One with a garage, one without the garage, and then the Amended Plan. I don't believe any compromise plan will re-generate these monies, but I do believe sincerely that tonight we are seeing double jeopardy. No change, no change at all has been made. I believe this above all should necessitate a no vote. In zoning, the applicant can lose yet come back until he wins; yet the opposition cannot come back for a re-hearing after losing: double jeopardy. Let's not do it. Let's not impose this injustice. Vote no. The door will still be open for a compromise situation. Let's have both sides meet halfway. It can be done but it needs a no vote tonight.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, thank you. Before I make any remarks, I'd like to direct a few questions to Mr. Fasanelli, if he's still available for questions.

In regards, Mr. Fasanelli, to a letter from the Stamford New Urban Corporation dated March 27th and in particular item #1, do you have the letter?

MR. FASANELLI: Yes, I do.

MRS. McINERNEY: Would you please define "fee ownership of the land" and all other development rights provided by the Stamford Zoning Regulations? Let me state for people who don't know what I'm asking about is in reference to Parcel 16 and 16A and the 280 automobile spaces which will be contained on those parcels of land.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. FASANELLI: To the best of my knowledge, Mrs. McInerney, the Stamford New Urban Corporation would buy the land 16, 16A and they would pay the taxes on that particular land. The land would be subject to the Stamford Zoning Regulations.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Fasanelli, it goes on to say, "we will maintain the fee ownership of the land" and then it goes on to say, "the structure or portion of the structure containing the public parking spaces will not be subject to real estate taxes".

MR. FASANELLI: Correct, that's going to be a public garage.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then, I am to assume that the City of Stamford will own and operate the parking facility and abate the taxes and correct me if I'm wrong, fee ownership could mean that we would also possibly pay a rental fee to the developer for use of that land or for use of the parking facility if it's maintained by them?

MR. FASANELLI: It is to my understanding that the City of Stamford would get lower level, ground level plus one floor up of parking free to the City of Stamford. That's going to be tax-exempt, of course, because the City of Stamford is going to own and publicly operate that particular parking garage.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then what is meant by "fee maintenance"?

MR. JOYCE: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. To straighten this thing out, I think we're getting off here. The definition of fee is incorrect. Legally, fee does not mean that at all.

MR. FASANELLI: That's to the best of my knowledge, Mrs. McInerney. That the City of Stamford is going to own, is going to operate the garage on the first two levels for the 280 parking spaces and the Stamford New Urban is going to build its own parking facilities for its particular office building and a structure above which it will pay real estate taxes on.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then, further on down, Mr. Fasanelli, it states that the public garage structure and any addition to it which is subsequently, substantially used for parking purposes and which is no more than four stories high, excluding the public parking section, shall not be included as square footage in any density calculations required under the Stamford Zoning Regulations. That means that the developer can come in and ask for increased density of that area?

MR. FASANELLI: I really don't know.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Fasanelli, would you relinquish the floor to Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: Two things; fee ownership of the land if I just can go back for a moment, means that the developer would own the land in much the same way he owns the land at the Stamford Town Center and we have a right and we will own two levels of parking area there. So he'll own the land, we will own the parking area and he would have rights to develop above that parking area. He doesn't have rights. He can apply for the air rights for that parking area. Furthermore, his property is taxable and it's subject to current zoning laws.

MRS. McINERNEY: That's your intent then, Mr. Donahue? I'm not quite sure what it means that the four stories high excluding public parking section shall not be included as square footage in any density calculations. Does that mean we're exempting those four stories and we're starting from the fourth story up, if there is a fourth story? I'm very confused with this. It's very ambiguous.

MR. DONAHUE: Any project that's built in the Urban Renewal area, any structure that's erected has to conform to zoning laws. Furthermore, all the plans are subject to the later approval of this Board as time goes by.

MRS. McINERNEY: I agree with you, Mr. Donahue, however, if the Board approves this Plan in toto, it is also my opinion that the intent would be that we would be in agreement, totally.

Now, let me go to another question. The pedestrian skyways; is that to ring-around the entire Mall?

MR. FASANELLI: Which pedestrian skyway are you referring to?

MRS. McINERNEY: Let's do it this way. In the Advocate, tonight's story, the URC has envisioned a multi-level design with stores and office on the ground level and a high-rise hotel and residence overlooking Mill River Park. Pedestrian skyways and walkways would connect the development with surrounding areas and buildings.

MR. FASANELLI: The only overpass that I know of that's envisioned in the Plan is after they develop along the Mill River the Park frontage, that there could possibly, very possibly and probably be a walkway over Washington Boulevard that extends to the Park area. That's the only one I know of.

Under the old Plan, or the existing Plan that the City is now obligated to, it's currently in effect, there is I believe a walkway that is from the Fashion Center on Mr. Kahn's property that would cross-over to Bloomingdale's property.

MRS. McINERNEY: And to the best of your knowledge that is it?

MR. FASANELLI: Yes.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. JOYCE: I'm going to address myself not to the substance of this matter but to a matter of procedure which I think is a good point to bring out. I want to be very brief. I don't think there's anything in our present Rules of the Board to address itself to a situation that we have here, i.e., earlier this evening Mr. Fasanelli was asked by Mr. Dziezyc if there was anything new that was added to this particular Amended Plan and the answer was "no, there was not." I think that we are going to have to look very hard at our Rules of the Board to prevent this occurrence again that the enormous amount of time that has been consumed by something which has already been voted upon. I think it's something that we are going to have to really look at the Rules here because we've gone through this exercise and some of it may be quite improper, but I thought I would bring that point up.

MR. DeNICOLA: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: Being this is such an important issue, I would like to ask for a ROLL CALL VOTE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FASANELLI: How many are in attendance?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are 34 people in attendance and this requires a majority. The Clerk will call the Roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON URBAN RENEWAL MOTION TO APPROVE CHANGES RE PARCELS 8 and 9:

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITON (20) NO VOTES:

CONTI, Betty	LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah
GUROIAN, Grace	KUNSAW, John
WIDER, Lathon	DZIEZYC, Paul
McINERNEY, Barbara	PERILLO, Mildred
JOYCE, Patrick	BLUM, David
SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	ZELINSKI, John
STORK, Philip	DeNICOLA, Vincent
CONTI, Anthony	RYBNICK, Gerald
DeLUCA, Robert	WIEDERLIGHT, Michael
LOOMIS, Ralph	GOLDSTEIN, Sandra

ABSTENTIONS (1):

CORBO, Florenzio

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR (16) YES VOTE

FLOUNDERS, Burtis	SUMMERVILLE, Ar
DARER, Stanley	BOCCUZZI, John
POLLARD, Everett	FAUTEUX, Robert
ESPOSITO, Paul	DIXON, Handy
BOWLBY, Doris	FASANELLI, Rich
ROOS, John	SIGNORE, Mary J
MAIHOCK, Audrey	RINALDI, Mary I
LYONS, Moira	DONAHUE, Donald

ABSENT FROM MEETING (3):

HOGAN, John (left early - ill)
PERILLO, Alfred (ill)
HAWE, Marie (emergency)

MOTION DEFEATED: 20 No; 16 Yes; 1 Abstention; (3 absent)

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) PROPOSED CHANGES TO MERIT RULES SYSTEM (CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS) - submitted by Personnel Director to Personnel Commission, who will be holding the public hearing on Thursday, April 24, 1980.

MR. BLUM: The only thing that I can report on item #1 is that a hearing was held by the Personnel Commission in regard to the Merit Rule Changes. As far as I know, nothing has been taken yet. I have been promised a transcript of the meeting which I intend to send to all, so you will know what took place at the hearing.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue - NO REPORTPUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Everett Pollard

- (1) CITY REP. ROBERT "GABE" DeLUCA'S LETTER received 4/16/80 re trash pick-up by private collectors.

MR. POLLARD: The Public Works Committee met last week to discuss Gabe DeLuca's letter requesting a review of the Commissioner's decision to discharge the contract of private refuse collectors.

We had invited many interested parties. We had invited City-Wide, other Representatives, Stamford Taxpayers' Association and they attended. We invited Commissioner Spaulding in writing and reminded him by telephone of the meeting, but he did not attend. The meeting began at 7:00 O'clock. It adjourned at 9:00 O'clock. Following that meeting, we noticed the Commissioner and his entourage joined the Fiscal Committee and it's my understanding at a later time, a reporter asked him if he knew of our meeting or why he chose not to attend; his response was he did know of the meeting, he chose not to attend and for reasons he chose not to discuss; be that as it may.

The meeting did yield some results. One of those results is a Resolution which you all have before you. The Resolution is not coming out as a Public Works Committee Resolution simply because I didn't have time to get everyone together to vote on it. I was in that process and other business prevented that.

The Resolution essentially calls for the Mayor to direct the Public Works Commissioner to return to contract refuse collection, and let me say at this point, although it's not embodied in the Resolution, it would encourage going to open bid. Since I'm bringing the Resolution out individually, I'm not representing the City-Wide Refuse Collectors. I'm not advocating their position. I'm merely saying that if you look at the analysis done on page 2, which is an estimate of the Division of Collection costs, I've tried to embody in this analysis, or estimate, information that had not been presented to the Board of Finance at a meeting that I had attended.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. POLLARD: (continuing) I have a third attachment which are copies of the pages from our current Budget book. For 3 successive years, I have indicated the Division of Collection Budget. I have taken away from that Budget past payments to City-Wide. I have included my own estimates which are based upon information which I was able to gather to include things like gas, repairs, benefits, insurance, Capital expenditures and I have included total costs. I've used Public Works Department's expression of equivalent stops. Equivalent stops simply means that if you have 1000 one-family houses, then you have 1000 stops. If you have 1000 two-family houses, then you have 2000 stops. I divided those equivalent stops into my estimate of total costs and have... (tape changed, some words lost)... and although if you look at the average cost per stop for 1979 and 80, which says \$75.39, unfortunately, that was put in for consistency of analysis. In reality, that number is more like \$79.50.

There are many elements I did not include in this analysis. For the period 1979 to 1980, I did not include \$ 32,000.00 which was recently appropriated by the Board of Finance for overtime. I further did not include in 1980 and 1981 figures an additional \$ 81,000.00 which is our exposure to the potential 7% increase for the MEA contract. I further did not quantify, because I didn't know how to quantify certain other things.

Often in the debate as to whether or not the City ought to have all private or all public collection, people have discussed the desirability of a contention system. That contention system would require a mix of both private and public collectors in this City, the object being if the contract collectors choose to raise their rates what's considered to be an unreasonable amount, then we could switch to increasing the burden on the City collectors and vice-versa and it's my understanding that several years ago, the City collectors were threatening a strike action which was forestalled by a threat to increase the collection for the privates. I cannot quantify the expression that I've received of the public dissatisfaction of reverting to City collection. That dissatisfaction is being evidenced also by petitions which currently number about 2000.

I could not quantify the increased gasoline consumption that would result from the City engaging in collection routes that are more distant from the incinerator and I did come across one other item. We are all probably aware that private collectors usually operate with two-man crews on a truck, a driver and a fellow on the back, whereas the City operates with five men on a truck. Many people, including myself, have been critical at times in the past of the five-man truck method, but in perspective, a five-man truck method works extremely well in a high-density area. It does not work well in an area where the population is more sparsely distributed. I think that as the City engages more and more in one unit, one housing stops, it costs by necessity have got to accelerate.

There's no question that the estimates that I have provided are indeed only estimates. I could be high on some; I could be low on others; however, it is the best analysis that has been provided, I believe, to date. This information has not been provided before. It was certainly denied the Public Works Committee hearing last week and I do ask your support for the Resolution.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Pollard, are you going to move the adoption of the Resolution which is on our desks?

MR. POLLARD: I am.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MR. ZELINSKI: POINT OF INFORMATION. Was this particular Resolution on our Agenda? If not, then it would require a two-thirds vote?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: What is on the Agenda is this issue under the Public Works Committee. This is the Committee report. This has emanated from the Committee so it does not require a Suspension of the Rules.

MR. ZELINSKI: Even for a Resolution?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, this is the means by which they are coming out with their report.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Mr. Pollard called me to give me a preview of the numbers he had developed. I have heard about the high cost of the City collection as compared to the contract collection so I decided to call Commissioner Spaulding to get his point of view.

The Commissioner told me that this program has been tested for several weeks. The cost, I am told, of City-Wide collection amounts to about \$ 7,400.00, in two weeks. City-Wide collection only collects in single family homes, 1960; or two family dwellings, 140; for a total of 2100.

In the first two weeks of the City's take-over of these routes, the incremental cost to the City was \$ 394.00 in overtime. I am not willing to guarantee that the information given to me by the Commissioner is absolutely correct. I did not get into the discussion of gasoline consumption. There are a number of details that bear scrutiny. Figures from the Commissioner and Mr. Pollard are sufficiently different.

I believe that it would be premature to support this Resolution which calls for the Mayor to immediately direct the Public Works Commissioner to return to contract refuse collection.

I relooked at the April 24 notice of the Public Works Committee meeting. Commissioner Spaulding was not copied on that notice.

MR. FAUTEUX: I'm going to have to parallel what Mr. Flounders has elaborated upon. I'd like to make the point that I'm convinced the facts are not all in at the present time. What we have seen, at least in my perspective, is that what is coming in is favorable. I think the Resolution we have in front of us right now forces the issue before the facts will become apparent. I sort of wonder why the Resolution is put in front of us at the present time also. I think that there are some fundamental issues involved here with some of what the Committee has been doing recently, and I say that from the point of view of a concern about an intrusion into the Management prerogatives of our

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. FAUTEUX: (continuing)...Departmental Management in the City. I don't really think there is much sound footing with such intrusion in particular on this issue.

The foundation for the Resolution in terms of economics is tantamount to second-guessing. I respect Ev's mathematics and I'm sure I would do the same, but we would probably arrive at different estimates as to the various cost factors involved. So, I say that if the Resolution is based upon the numbers that we see behind it, I think it's assumptionally questionable.

I do go back to what Mr. Flounders said. The Commissioner has been willing to meet with any and all but he has been willing to meet in an environment which is positive and constructive not under conditions of duress, and I think some of the meetings which the Commissioner has been invited to are very definitely situations which could be considered to be duress situations.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I live in a District that has City collection. No one is telling me how bad their garbage collection is. If we do not like the way the Police and Fire Departments are operating, are we going to have a Resolution to tell them how to operate? We should leave the Management of the particular departments to the Chiefs and Heads of the Departments. If then they act remiss in their duties, then there are certain steps that can be taken. I'd like to make a MOTION to recommit this back to the Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MR. DeLUCA: If we send this back to the Committee, is it possible to also add the input of the Public Works Commissioner? There is some credibility to the figures he gave Rep. Flounders. He was notified in the past to attend the meeting and he didn't feel the need to attend. I would recommend we put it back into Committee and a letter go to Commissioner Spaulding that his attendance would be desirable at the meeting to give input with figures to justify what he claims to be a true statement.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: As I would interpret recommitting an item, if the Board votes to recommit, it is directing the Public Works Committee which is the Committee that this will be recommitteed to, to examine this Resolution which deals with the private garbage collection issue again next month. This would be on the Agenda for next month's meeting.

In relation to the motion to recommit, it is perfectly acceptable to instruct the Committee to invite or to suggest that someone or something be done in relation to a particular area, which would be the Resolution. If you wish to amend the motion to ask the Commissioner to attend, that would be in order.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to make an amendment to instruct the Commissioner to attend our meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: In you motion to recommit, you would be asking that the Commissioner attend the Public Works Committee hearing for his input in this matter. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. BLUM: I would like to speak against this motion.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BLUM: (continuing)...The W. R. Williams' report told our Manager of certain instances in the Public Works Department. The Consultant recommended that the private garbage collection be taken over by the City where the sewers went it.

I think we need more factual information and how this would affect those employees; how this affects the fact that we paid for a consultant to give us certain information and we pay for our Manger to go by this consultant's recommendation. He's doing what he was hired for.

MR. DONAHUE: Move the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

We will vote on the motion to recommit the Resolution. The MOTION has been CARRIED. 27 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention. Mr. Rybnick abstained

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

- (1) APRIL 11, 1980 REQUESTS FROM CITY REPS. DeNICOLA, DZIEZYC AND SUMMERVILLE that Health and Protection invite to next meeting and listen to the Police Association and policemen who wish to be heard about their problems, and their dispute with their chief officer.

MRS. SANTY: The Health and Protection Committee met April 30th with Committee Members Dziezyc, Joyce and Blum present. Also present were Reps. DeNicola, Boccuzzi, DeLuca, Stork, Corbo and Goldstein.

The meeting was called to give the Stamford Police Association membership the opportunity to be heard regarding their long-existing dissatisfaction with the Police Administration policies and practices.

The Republican Caucus Room was filled beyond capacity with officers. It was obvious to those Board Members present that the morale is disastrously low. What is the Committee's concern is that this morale problem is undoubtedly affecting enthusiasm, performance, and output as evidenced by the mass resignations of all volunteer members of the high-risk SWAT, Scuba, Bomb and Motorcylce Teams. This ultimately affects the taxpayers of Stamford whom we represent.

It was decided by the Committee to hold this item, hoping that Chief Cizanckas, the Police Commission Members and the Stamford Police Association Trustees and Executive Board will meet within the next month and resolve their differences expeditiously for the benefit of Stamford.

MR. DZIEZYC: The Health and Protection Committee of the Board did not overstep its bounds when it offered to try to resolve the dispute between the Stamford Police Association and Chief Cizanckas.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. DZIEZYC: (continuing)...The policemen didn't receive any satisfaction from the Police Commission or the Chief himself regarding Cizanckas' remarks about the so-called "corrupt" policemen on the force. The first statement the Chief made was almost three years ago where on National TV, he said that there were seven members of the Stamford Police Department that were associated with organized crime. And just recently in the March 24th edition of "Law Enforcement News", the Chief stated that 90% of the Stamford Police Force are honest which means there are 10% so-called "corrupt" men out of the 243 men on the Police Force or a total of 24 cops.

Within the span of three years, Cizanckas infers that the so-called "corrupt" cops increased from 7 to 24. Cizanckas hasn't identified or dismissed a single so-called "corrupt" cop during his tenure as Chief. We can assume that the Chief made these sensational statements for his own publicity, because if these cops were indeed guilty of corruption, they would no longer be part of the Police Force. These remarks by the Chief cast a cloud of suspicion upon the whole Police Department thereby demoralizing the Finest of Stamford, and eventually reducing the effectiveness of the Stamford Police Department. Therefore, the Board of Representatives must do its utmost to see that Stamford has an efficient and well-administered Police Force.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

- (1) PERMISSION REQUESTED TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER ST. TO PUBLICIZE EXCHANGE CLUB'S ANNUAL BICYCLE AND TRICYCLE SALE BEING HELD AT RIPPOWAM HIGH SCHOOL MAY 17, 1980. Wish to hang banner from May 1st to May 19th.

MR. DeLUCA: Parks and Recreation Committee met on April 24th and item #1 was approved by a vote of 3 to 0 and I so MOVE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (2) PERMISSION REQUESTED BY PATRIOTIC AND SPECIAL EVENTS COMMISSION TO HOLD THE ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY PARADE ON SUNDAY, MAY 25th, STARTING AT 1:30 P.M. Board members invited to march.

Item #2 was approved by a vote of 3 to 0 and I so MOVE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. DeLUCA: Rep. Lois Santy and I attended the opening day ceremony of the North Stamford Little League. Don Odell, President, extends his deepest gratitude to the Members of the Board for their help in seeing that their League was opened on time. A past member and former Chairman of our Parks and Recreation Committee, George Hays had the honor of throwing out the first ball.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux - NO REPORT

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight - NO REPORT

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Lathon Wider and Stanley Darer

MR. WIDER: The Housing and Community Development Committee met on April 29th. Present at the meeting were Mr. Stanley Darer, Mr. Handy Dixon, Mr. John Roos, and myself.

Because of the many complaints of poor maintenance in Public Housing we had Mrs. Margot Wormser, Mr. Jerry Egan, Mrs. Nancy McAfee, and all the Moderate Income Tenants Association Presidents. We discussed the funding, the availability for funding for maintenance. We discussed the lack of maintenance and the available funds for maintenance. We were assured that there were funds so we will be looking into that as we move along.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT RE "STAMFORD NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROGRAM (SNPP)" BEING INCORPORATED AS A NON-STOCK, NON-PROFIT CORPORATION, per Mayor Clapes' letter 3/21/80.

We did take up the application by New Neighborhoods which was referred back to Committee tonight. We won't have to work on that. We worked on a Resolution, a letter from the Mayor requesting a Resolution through this Board for the incorporation of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation. The Committee voted 4 to 0 to present the following Resolution which I'll ask Mrs. Moira Lyons to read at this time.

MRS. LYONS: Proposed Resolution.

The Resolution concerning the authorization to incorporate the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation under the laws of the State of Connecticut:

WHEREAS, the Community Development Program of the City of Stamford, Connecticut acting through the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program is engaged in a revitalization and rehabilitation of low and moderate housing within the City of Stamford by means of low interest loans and grants and technical assistance to enable property owners to repair and rehabilitate their properties; and

WHEREAS, the incorporation of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation would enable it to apply for an exemption under Section 501.C3 of the Internal Revenue Code thereby making eligible to receive grants and gifts from private foundations and other sources; and

WHEREAS, the incorporation of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation would enable it to apply for grants from the Connecticut State Department of Housing and to function as a not for profit development organization; and

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. LYONS: (continuing)...

WHEREAS, the incorporation of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation would serve to protect the Stamford Community Development Program and the City of Stamford from any claims that might arise out of the activities of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program; and

WHEREAS, the incorporation of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation would protect it from any claims which do not arrive out of the scope of its activities,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives:

1. that Mayor Louis A. Clapes or his duly appointed representative is authorized to incorporate the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program as a non-profit, non-stock corporation under the laws of the State of Connecticut and,

2. that Mayor Louis A. Clapes or his duly appointed representative is authorized to enter into a written contract between the Stamford Community Development Program of the City of Stamford and the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program after it has been incorporated which contract shall provide in detail the scope of operations and manner in which all funds received by the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program after it has been incorporated are to be expended subject to all appropriate accounting and audit controls and applicable Federal regulating governing the use of the Community Development Block Grant funds and,

3. that Mayor Louis A. Clapes is authorized to select and appoint qualified persons to serve as officers and directors of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program after it has been incorporated to insure that the new corporation continues to operate under the control and supervision of the Community Development Program of the City of Stamford and,

4. that Mayor Louis A. Clapes or his duly appointed representative is hereby authorized and empowered to execute contract agreements, grant applications, grant agreements and all other documents or legal instruments which are necessary and appropriate to effectuate and promote the goals and objectives of the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program and the Community Development Program of the City of Stamford.

Respectfully submitted by the Public Housing and Community Development Committee, Stamford Board of Representatives, Stanley Darer and Lathon Wider, Co-Chairmen.

MR. WIDER: I MOVE the approval of this Resolution.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Is this Resolution something the Corporation Counsel looked over? You are dealing with incorporating something and you are giving Mayor Clapes the sole responsibility. How long is the Mayor going to have that authority? It doesn't say until someone else replaces the Mayor.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIDER: It means that any Mayor, any person that becomes Mayor of the City of Stamford. Doesn't necessarily mean Mayor Clapes per se; it just means that Mayor Clapes will incorporate the organization now as Mayor of the City of Stamford.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The Resolution does not read that way. It says Mayor Clapes will have the right to appoint; it does not say the Mayor of the City of Stamford.

MR. WIDER: At this time, it has to read that way because Mayor Clapes is the Mayor of the City of Stamford and he will have the responsibility of appointing or electing any directors of the Corporation. That's his responsibility.

MR. BLUM: I would like to make a motion to send this Resolution back to committee for further study. SECONDED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: If it is all right with Mr. Blum, I would like to instruct that Committee to check with Corporation Counsel to make sure that the Resolution is properly stated.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by a voice vote on a motion to recommit. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (1 no vote, Mr. Rybnick)

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE RE-CONSIDERATION OF AMENDED URBAN RENEWAL PLAN AND CONTRACT RELATING TO PARCELS 8 and 9 per Mayor Clapes' letter 4/16/80.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Taken up under Suspension of the Rules after the Legislative and Rules Committee.

Although the Urban Renewal Committee have already given their report, I would like to compliment Mr. Fasanelli, the Chairman, Ms. Summerville, Mr. Donahue, Mr. Roos, and Mr. Conti on the absolute excellent and thorough job they did on this question.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

MRS. MAIHOCK: I attended a meeting with the Zoning Board on April 30 1980 at which Chairman Martin Levine stated, "the Zoning Board would give high priority to developing Zoning Regulations for flood-prone areas. Mr. DeLuca was also present at this meeting, as were Mark Lubbers, Director of the EPB and Ann Boden a member of the EPB.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby - NO REPORT

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REGARDING THE CONTROL OF AIRCRAFT, HELIPORTS, ETC. WITHIN THE CITY OF STAMFORD.

MR. JOYCE: This has been HELD IN COMMITTEE. We are awaiting an opinion from Corporation Counsel and we'll hold it over until next month.

- (2) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION FROM CITY REP. JOHN ZELINSKI TO THE EFFECT THAT CONRAIL SYSTEM BE KEPT INTACT AND NOT BROKEN UP AND SOLD OFF IN PIECES - to be sent to Congressmen McKinney, Weicker, and Ribicoff.

This will be HELD IN COMMITTEE. One of the members of the Committee wants to hear the other side of the case.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM CITY REP. PAUL DZIEZYC 4/11/80 RE HEALTH HAZARDS POSED BY TRACTORS AND/OR TRAILER TRUCKS PARKED IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

This Resolution has been approved by our Committee and we so recommend that it be approved by this Board.

This is a Resolution requesting the Traffic Commission to take action on this problem. Our Committee is entirely in agreement and we recommend that this Resolution be approved by the Board relating to this very serious problem which is coming up in a number of areas regarding the parking of tractors and trailer trucks in residential area.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Joyce, are you MOVING that we approve the Resolution?

MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. JOYCE: There are some zoning teeth that can be applied here provided that the Zoning enforcement Inspector is willing to take action on this. I will talk with Mr. Sotire about this.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

SPECIAL "ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION" STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman F. Corbo

- (1) PROGRESS REPORT - NO REPORT

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE

PETITIONS - NONE

MOMENTS OF SILENCE - NONE

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

March 20, 1980 Special Meeting (re URC and Question-and-Answer Period)

MR. ZELINSKI: I think there is a missing page 6.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We'll HOLD this until next month.

March 27, 1980 Special Meeting (re URC) - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote)

April 10, 1980 Regular Monthly Board Meeting - AS CORRECTED APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONCERNING SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR A 35% RATE INCREASE FOR STAMFORD'S 52,000 TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBERS. Submitted by John Zelinski 4/16/80.

MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Mr. Fauteux and Mrs. Perillo opposed)

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM CITY REP. MOIRA LYONS RE SPRING CLEAN-UP.

MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - NONE

OLD BUSINESS

MR. BLUM: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE that I feel is old business in a sense that there have been numerous times, I didn't bring it up in my report, where today, I reported to you there was no quorum of the Personnel Committee. Inasmuch as the Steering Committee does have some, I hope, management of when certain Committees should meet. The reason Personnel Committee did not have a quorum was the fact the night of that Wednesday, there were four meetings going on in which I was a Member of three and my other Committees were involved in each one of these Committees. Too many Committees meet on certain nights; let's break it up a little.

NEW BUSINESS

- (1) Reminder of the Special Budget Meetings of the Board to be held Tuesday and Wednesday, May 13 and 14, 1980.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, upon a MOTION made, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 1:15 A.M.

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

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
16th Board of Representatives

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

CMT:AK:HMM