

MINUTES OF MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1980 REGULAR MEETING

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut was held on Monday, June 2, 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 at 8:30 P.M. by President Sandra Goldstein, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: None.

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

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville took the Roll Call. There were 37 members present and 3 absent. The absent members were: Everett Pollard, Mary Jane Signore, and Alfred Perillo (ill). (Rep. Livingston was off the floor until later in the evening. Rep. Hogan (ill) left at 9:15)

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PAGES: None in attendance.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Found to be in good working order.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

The late GIRALDO BOCCUZZI, father of former Rep. Theodore Boccuzzi.
The late CHARLES E. WILMOT, father of former Rep. Charles Wilmot, Jr.
Mr. Zelinski requested a Moment of Silence.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I am sure all of you have noticed the beautiful yellow ribbons we have placed on the voting machine and also on the desk. These yellow ribbons are a symbol of the hostages being held in Iran. We intend to keep these ribbons here until the hostages are released, and we hope that this will be very soon.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, May 19, 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 began at 7:40 P.M. when a Quorum was present. Chairwoman SANDRA GOLDSTEIN called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairperson	Robert Gabe DeLuca
John J. Boccuzzi	Robert Fauteux
Handy Dixon (8:02 p.m.)	Audrey Maihock (8:45 p.m.)
John Zelinski	Philip Stork (8:04 p.m.)
Donald Donahue	Anthony Conti
Michael Wiederlight	John J. Hogan, Jr.
Richard Fasanelli (8:45 p.m.)	Fiorenzo Corbo (7:50 p.m.)
Lathon Wider, Sr. (8:45 p.m.)	Pollard (on Steering, substituting for Alfred Perillo)
Barbara McInerney	Media - and a stranger
Jeanne-Lois Santy	

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven prospective appointees: Charles Griffith for the Building Board of Appeals; Joseph Rinaldi for the Sewer Commission; Frank Arturi for the Patriotic and Special Events Commission; Raymond Sanborne for the Zoning Board of Appeals; Janet Weintraub for the Commission on Aging; Raymond Humiston for the Board of Ethics; and Austin Rinella for the Personnel Commission. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE for next month were five prospective appointees: Joseph Martin for the Zoning Board; Dr. Michael Sabia and Dr. Angelo Mastrangelo, Jr. for the Health Commission; Janet Garelik and Philip E. Norgren for the Personnel Appeals Board. The name of ROBERT OWENS for the Human Rights Commission was withdrawn by the Mayor.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

Thirteen items appearing on the Tentative Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ordered HELD IN COMMITTEE was a proposed resolution to file for a grant for Adolescent Pregnancy Program. Ordered removed from the Agenda was Rep. Betty Conti's proposed resolution to re-evaluate the unbonded capital projects to determine priorities, etc.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

The first nine items on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were the remaining four items, all proposed ordinances for publication: (a) Alternate members for the Board of Finance; (b) Tax abatement for The Hanrahan Center; (c) Control and regulate excavation, filling and grading; and (d) Tax abatement for Asst. Pastor's residence of Zion Lutheran Church at 17 Fenway. From Section II of the Tentative Steering Agenda; also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a resolution concerning Spring and Fall Clean-up and Leaf Pick-up; ordinance re safety of construction equipment; Ordinance for Code of Ethics for employees and officials. Also Ordered Held was a proposed change to Rules of Order from Rep. P. Stork

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items from Tentative Agenda; and Ordered off the Agenda was the proposed ordinance re conflicts of interest of professional employees.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items from Tentative L&R Agenda: Planning Board Referral re Strazza and Lupinacci; also the hiring of a Zoning Analyst. Also ON AGENDA is truck storage in residential zones.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

Two items on Tentative Agenda ORDERED ON AGENDA. One item HELD, being sidewalk problems at Mayflower Ave., Wenzel Terrace and Plymouth Road.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

Three items ORDERED ON AGENDA from Tentative Agenda. One item Ordered HELD, being proposed ordinance dissolving Sterling Farms Golf Authority.

(8) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

Rep. Corbo's item re Board of Education Personnel practices was ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE, and the other item on Tentative was removed, being Rep. DeLuca's item on reducing costs of Presidential Primaries.

(9) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one items with its several sub-sections re SDCP.

(10) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

The three items on Tentative Agenda were ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE: (a) Ordinance re control of aircraft, heliports, etc.; (b) Resolution re keeping Con-Rail system intact; (c) Rep. Corbo's request to further study Summer-Bedford one-way system re Advocate article 5/13/80 "City Traffic Plan a Waste of Tax Money, Gasoline."

(11) RESOLUTIONS

Ordered removed from the Agenda was proposed resolution from Rep. Blum that Board members take turns serving as Chaplain and giving monthly Invocation.

(12) NEW BUSINESS

Item of proposed ordinance re gifts to employees and officials was moved to Legislative and Rules Committee. The other five items were ordered removed from the Agenda: (a) Rep. Corbo's request re further inquiry into police under-cover operation and Reps. Perillo/DeLuca; (b) Rep. Blum's request for public apology from Rep. Esposito for remarks re Bd. of Ed. budget; (c) Rep. Summerville's request for clarification of Leadership of Board; (d) Deputy Corp. Counsel's re Code of Ordinances, Charter, and adoption of plain language in City regulations and laws; (e) Rep. Blum's request for action on enclosing swimming pools per editorial of Advocate 5/19/80.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, Seconded, and CARRIED, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 8:45 P.M., with some members remaining until 9:15 P.M. to arrange committee schedules.

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, Chairwoman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met Thursday night 7:30 in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present and participating in the meeting were Reps. A. Summerville, M. Signore, S. Darer, R. DeLuca, V. DeNicola, J. Boccuzzi, and myself, Handy Dixon.

It had been my intention to place items #1 through 6 on the Consent Agenda, but it is my understanding now that there will be some objection to this. Items #1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 MOVED. SECONDED.

BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALSTerm Expires

(1) <u>CHARLES GRIFFITH</u> (R) 361 Eden Road	Replacing Frank Greco whose term expired	December 1, 1981
--	---	------------------

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDASEWER COMMISSION

(2) <u>JOSEPH RINALDI</u> (R) 34 Donald Road	Re-appointment	December 1, 1982
---	----------------	------------------

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDAPATRIOTIC AND SPECIAL EVENTS COMMISSION

(3) <u>FRANK ARTURI</u> (R) 1394 High Ridge Road	Re-appointment	December 1, 1984
---	----------------	------------------

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDAZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

(4) <u>RAYMOND SANBORNE</u> (D) 12 Pell Place	Re-appointment	December 1, 1984
--	----------------	------------------

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDACOMMISSION ON AGING

(5) <u>JANET WEINTRAUB</u> (D) 100 Wedgemere Road	Replacing E. Daley deceased & term expired	December 1, 1982
--	---	------------------

MR. DIXON: Mrs. Weintraub has been a resident of Stamford for nine years and seeking this Board's approval of her appointment to the Commission on Aging. We conducted a thorough interview. She expressed a deep concern to serve on this Commission. The Appointments Committee approved her by a vote of 6 in favor, with 1 abstention and I would so MOVE for her confirmation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 31 in favor, 6 opposed. (Three of the NO votes were Mr. Dziezyc, Mrs. Guroian and Mrs. Betty Conti. It was a voice vote and the other three NO votes were not recorded.)

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)BOARD OF ETHICSTerm Expires

(6)	<u>RAYMOND HUMISTON</u> (R) 71 Strawberry Hill Ave.	Replacing Leon Noe	June 30, 1981
-----	--	--------------------	---------------

(Note: The same name may be submitted only once on Board of Ethics.
Code Sec. 2.2. Requires 2/3 vote of those present and voting.)

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDAPERSONNEL COMMISSION

(7)	<u>AUSTIN RINELLA</u> (D) 25 Island Heights Drive	Re-appointment Term expired 12/1/79	December 1, 1984
-----	--	--	------------------

MR. DIXON:
The Appointments Committee approved his confirmation by a vote of 4 in favor, 1 against and 1 abstention. I would MOVE for this Board's approval.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 33 in favor, 4 opposed (DeLuca, Santy, Guroian, Summerville). (voice vote)

MR. DIXON: Items #1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 have been placed on the CONSENT AGENDA having passed the Appointments Committee's interview and I MOVE for their confirmation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Paul Esposito and Marie Hawe

MR. DeNICOLA: Items #1 and #4, I'd like to abstain from.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will indicate that on our records.

MR. DZIEZYC: POINT OF PRIVILEGE: I believe that Rep. Paul Esposito owes the Members of the Board a public apology for the remarks he made at our last month's budget deliberation meetings.

He called the ones who cut the budget "blood-thirsty" and I resent that remark and I'm sure all the Board Members do also.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Dziezyc, we will proceed.

MR. DZIEZYC: If not, I MOVE for SUSPENSION OF THE RULES to have him apologize to the Board.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Dziezyc, if you wish to make such a motion to Suspend the Rules, you are free to do that. That requires 2/3 vote.

MR. DZIEZYC: I make a motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is SECONDED. All those in favor of Suspending the Rules to consider Mr. Dziezyc's motion please indicate by raising your hand. There are 9 people in favor; 22 opposed; 3 abstentions. The MOTION HAS NOT BEEN CARRIED. (Vote by Show of Hands)

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, if you have a POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE, you may proceed.

MR. BLUM: With that vote, I would say...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The vote is through, Mr. Blum, and the issue is finished now that the vote is through. If there is something that has insulted you, right now, here, you may have a Point of Personal Privilege, but anything that relates to that is not in order.

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday evening, May 20, 1980. Present were Committee members B. Conti, R. Fautaux, B. Flounders, J. Livingston, M. Lyons, J. Hogan, G. Rybnick and M. Hawe, as well as other members of the Board including A. Maihock, M. Rinaldi, S. Darer, L. Wider, and D. Blum.

On the Agenda this evening is \$204,114.00 in additional operating appropriation requests. \$111,000.00 in additional Capital appropriation requests and \$500,907.92 in transfers.

I would like to MOVE that the following items be placed on Consent Agenda. Items #3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, and 13. (On those items where the secondary committee did not have a report, the proper motions were made, seconded and carried).

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT FOR "MULTI-RISK SHARING AGREEMENT - SECTION 312" submitted by Mayor 4/14/80. HUD will fund \$100,000 for rehabilitation of multi-family dwellings and the City will match 20% or \$20,000. \$20,000.00 will come from Community Development money.

MRS. HAWE: The units to be rehabilitated will be five or more units and at least 51% of the tenants must be low to moderate income. The owners must own the property for at least one year before they can apply for this 3% rehabilitation loan. The loan must be paid off before the property changes hands. There are two West Side properties being considered for this program. One is six units and one is five units.

Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 abstention and I so MOVE. **SECONDED.**

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. WIDER: The Public Housing and Community Development Committee met with the Fiscal Committee and we voted 3-0 in favor.

MR. JOYCE: I'd like to speak in favor of this. We are badly in need of housing, particularly in the West Side. Anything that can be done to increase the number of dwelling units should certainly be moved along as expeditiously as possible. We should think of housing in other parts of the City as well.

MRS. MAIHOCK: What is the term of the mortgage? Any prepaid privileges that would enable them to pay for the mortgage sooner?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: 20 years is the term of the mortgage. About any privileges, I don't know. Maybe Mr. Wider can answer that.

MR. WIDER: Under the program, there is no stipulation which states that they may be able to pay the mortgage off. The stipulation is that any person that takes it, must keep it for at least four years.

MRS. GUROIAN: It seems to me that the recipients of this money have already been predetermined. Is that right?

MRS. HAWE: I think they have two houses that are on line for this. Yes, that's the amount that this would cover.

MRS. GUROIAN: This would cover the rehabilitation to two specific houses that have already been on file. It isn't open to the public at all. We're getting a grant for two specific pieces of property. Am I right in assuming that?

MRS. HAWE: That's the impression we got from what they told us. I did check with the Neighborhood Preservation Department and they said that this was in accord with HUD regulations; that it could be done this way. These applications had been on file and with this money they are able to help them. They hadn't fallen under any previous Grant money that we had gotten.

MR. FLOUNDERS: A number of applications have been made and there are a number of qualified names on the list and these two properties are already in place.

MR. DARER: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.
We will vote by use of the machine. 30 in the affirmative; 3 in the negative; 4 abstentions. The Resolution has been CARRIED.

- (2) \$ 8,150.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - DIVISION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS -
Additional Appropriation requested to fund for three months (April, May, June, 1980) for the operation of the RAILROAD STATION per Mayor's letter 3/3/80. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

MRS. HAWE:
The State has not taken title to the Railroad Station. The project date is now possibly mid June. If this should happen before the end of the Fiscal year, Commissioner Spaulding has told us that we would be able to transfer the amount needed to operate the Railroad Station for the few remaining weeks of the Fiscal year. Fiscal voted 8 to 0 to DENY this request. As is our practice, I make a positive motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That has been SECONDED. We do proceed with our votes in the affirmative, but it was a unanimous vote to deny this request.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. JOYCE: The public would like to have some answers; the reasons for the delay. This is not something that emanates out of Stamford. It's not a problem with this Body or with the local authorities. The problem leading to this delay is in Hartford. It is a matter of weeks before the problem arisen in Hartford will be rectified. What we have here is a technicality. I don't want people to get the impression that we're side-tracking this Railroad Station item, but because of the ending of our Fiscal year, this is a matter that is going to carry over to the end of this month. This is a high priority item which will be taken up at the very earliest opportunity and we expect to have the matter in hand within the next 30 to 60 days.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We'll proceed to a vote on Item #2. Fiscal voted unanimously to deny this. We'll vote by a voice vote. It has been DENIED unanimously.

- (3) RESOLUTION REQUIRED PER CHARTER SECTION 484.1 "Duties of Purchasing Agent" which provides that the Purchasing Agent shall put out for bid the supplies and/or services which exceed a sum determined by the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives.

On 12/13/79 The Board of Finance adopted a resolution setting the limit at \$3,000.00. At its Feb. 4, 1980 meeting, the Board of Representatives approved and adopted the \$3,000.00 limit. (The Charter requires that this figure be set each year.)

Under date of 5/8/80, Board of Finance Chairwoman Margaret J. Nolan advised that her Board renewed this resolution, setting the one year period to co-incide with the fiscal year. This resolution will, therefore, cover the fiscal year July 1, 1980 through June 30, 1981.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) \$ 530.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Code 114.2650 - NEW EQUIPMENT - EQUIPMENT. Additional Appropriation per Acting Mayor's request 4/25/80 and Dir. M. Wahl's 4/25/80 to make available funds already received from Boosters' Club of Quintard Center to purchase one new Kalart Victor 16 mm. Projector #90/25. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (5) \$ 100,434.00 - FERGUSON LIBRARY - Salary increases retroactive to 7/1/79 at 7%, plus F.I.C.A. 6.13%. Per Acting Mayor's letter 4/30/80; and Library President Joseph L. Gambino's letter 4/29/80 per City's request. 7% same as MEA. Finance Board approved 5/7/80.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

1979-1980	Salary 7%	\$ 94,633.00
1979-1980	FICA (6.13%)	<u>5,801.00</u>
		\$100,434.00

MRS. HAWK: The Ferguson Library employees' bargaining unit which covers all salaried employees, signed a three-year contract with the Library. The contract runs from 1979 to 1982 and provides a 7% raise for the first year, a 7% raise for the second year and a 7½% raise for the third year.

The amount requested here represents the 79-80 portion of the raises for 69 non-supervisory salaried personnel as well as an average 7% merit raise for 16 salaried supervisors. 7% increases for about 20 part-time workers and \$5,801.00 in F.I.C.A. benefits.

Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed and I so MOVE. **SECONDED.**

Above also referred to **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.**

MR. BLUM: Personnel met on this this evening to vote on a reconsideration of our vote of our previous vote due to a lack of communications between the Ferguson Library and the Personnel Committee. We voted 6 - 0 to concur.

I'd like to say that this contract is an initial contract and I think it's worthy of the print that it's been given as the initial contract. For one, I see things here, and this was supposed to be comparable with the MEA employees, that this contract has the Martin Luther King holiday and has an Affirmative Action Program in this contract.

MR. JOYCE: I am not objecting to the idea that we should give raises to City employees but I do think that we as a Board have got to take cognizance of the sign of the times.

We are ultimately responsible for one of the very large budget items in the taxpayers' everyday allocation of monies and when we pass these things, we must think of that item. Every item that we take up as being something which would come personally that would come from each and everyone of our pockets at a time when unemployment is on the increase.

If we grant the monetary wish of every single individual group, or pressure or lobby group that comes before us, we run a very serious risk of not having the monies available. We have to be very judicious with the way we dole out our money. I urge you to consider that we put a much more discerning eye to the monies we spend.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The question is \$100,434.00 for the Ferguson Library for salary increases. It has been **MOVED** and **SECONDED**. The vote is 23 yes; 7 no and 7 abstentions. **THE MOTION HAS BEEN DENIED.** This needed a 2/3 vote of those present.

(Note: Upon voting on Reconsideration, this item was **APPROVED**. See last paragraph on Page 11.)

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (6) \$ 12,000.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - Code 290.1350 WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION - LEGAL, EMPLOYEES TAX AND INSURANCE - Additional appropriation requested by Comm. Hoffman 5/5/80, to pay more awards which have been processed by Workmen's Compensation. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

MR. BLUM: PERSONNEL concurs.

- (7) \$ 47,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - Additional appropriation Corp. Counsel Cookney's 4/18/80 request to fund outside legal services. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

MR. ESPOSITO: POINT OF INFORMATION. How many votes did we need for that?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There were 23 in the affirmative; 7 in the negative. In order for item #5 to have passed, we need 25 votes. There are 37 present.

MR. ESPOSITO: Mr. Livingston is not here. I don't know if you're counting him as present or not.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I counted him as present for that vote. Even if Mr. Livingston was counted as absent and he will be counted present for that vote because it was not brought to my attention that he had left. It still would not have received the necessary 2/3. It would have needed 24 votes.

If anyone wishes to move at some point this evening for a reconsideration, they may if they voted on the prevailing side.

We will now proceed to #7.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Kunsaw, did you vote against it? **SECONDED.**
All those in favor to reconsider: the AYE's have it. We will reconsider on Item #5 which is for \$100,434.00.

MRS. HAWE: Item #5, \$100,434.00 Ferguson Library. They came in after MEA. They have their own bargaining unit which covers all salaried employees. There's no increase in fringe benefits requiring any outlay of cash. This is just for salary and a small amount for F.I.C.A.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. FLOUNDERS: While I agree philosophically with the argument made by Rep. Joyce, we must watch these increases. This is a contract that the City has with these workers and it has been approved. The contract has been signed. It now has to be funded. The time to argue is not after the contracts have been agreed upon. The time to argue is before the contracts have been agreed upon and we must get to our Labor Negotiator prior to the contracts; not after the fact.

If we disapprove this tonight, we'll have to approve it. They will just come back. We must. The time to get to resolve this issue of what constitutes fair increases in light of our inflationary problems and recessionary problems is before the contracts are approved.

MR. DeLUCA: Let the record show that we have 37 people now that Mr. Livingston left.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We now have 36 people.

MR. BLUM: I would like to comment on the fact that although we have the Ferguson Library employees bargaining unit, this is sort of a private corporation and it's sort of State run. We do not have any input into the negotiation as the Board of Representatives. There's input as far as the City is concerned, meaning our City Governments. Our Negotiator had some input on this because we support, through State Law, the Ferguson Library's operating expense. I would like to say only this: that, in the future, the Ferguson Library at least let us see this contract previous^{to} or at the same time as we are voting for this appropriation.

I think it's more than right we have the contracts.

MRS. CONTI: I believe Mr. Flounders said this was a contract with the City. I believe it's a contract with Ferguson which is a private corporation and actually Ferguson does not have a line by line budget. They get a flat amount of money from us for the year and I don't know that it definitely has to come back before us because there's no reason why they can't reallocate among the budget that they have.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm looking at this F.I.C.A. allocation 6.13%. Am I to assume since this is an increase on their yearly salary that nobody in this group has a yearly salary of over the F.I.C.A. maximum?

MR. ESPOSITO: That is correct.

MRS. GUROIAN: It still comes out \$10.00 wrong but that's alright.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The question is on a \$100,434.00 for the Ferguson Library Salary increases. The vote is 28 in the affirmative; 6 in the negative and 2 abstentions. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED on reconsideration.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: Item #7 is a request from the Law Department for \$47,000.00 for professional services. This money is to pay attorneys for the Sewage Treatment Plant; to pay York Research in connection with the Sewage Treatment Plant; for various Personnel matters; for the dispute between the ZBA and the Zoning Board; for Co-Counsel to work on the litigation in connection with the Hanover Street Garage.

Fiscal Committee has reduced the request by \$3,500.00 to reflect the fact that less money than originally requested was needed for the ZBA matter. Also, because the money for the Condominium Conversion matter was not needed, therefore, the new figure is \$43,500.00.

Fiscal voted 8 in favor and none opposed and I so Move. **SECONDED.**

MR. FAUTEUX: EW&G concurs.

MR. ZELINSKI: Originally, the Corporation Counsel had requested in this package \$5,000 which was to be used in the event that an ordinance that we were considering pertaining to Condominium Conversions in the City of Stamford and I'm happy to see that \$3,500 was cut, but I remember the original request was \$5,000 and I would like to MOVE that we delete an additional \$1,500 would bring it up to the original \$5,000 that was requested and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The motion to amend has been **SECONDED.**

MRS. HAWE: I'd like to respond to Mr. Zelinski who is absolutely right. That \$5,000.00 is not needed anymore. However, this is how we arrived at the \$3,500.00 figure.

There was \$2,000.00 allotted for the controversy between the ZBA and the Zoning Board. They only need \$350.00 of that. That left \$1,650.00 extra in that respect. Then there was the \$5000.00 that wasn't needed for the Condominium Conversion. So that is \$6,650.00 extra.

The Law Department had estimated that \$4,500.00 would be needed for York Research which is the research arm of Tyler-Cooper in connection with the Sewage Treatment Plant. However, \$1,400.00 extra was needed for York.

(DEFECTIVE TAPE: SOME DIALOGUE LOST)

MR. DeLUCA: Any suits against any City employees?

MRS. HAWE: There is some money in here for Personnel matters. The letter we received in our packet this evening from Mr. Cookney explained that there's \$2,500.00 for Attorney Rothberg. There's some money in there for controversy between Dr. Gofstein and the Municipal Nurses; that's for Kveskin, Kuriansky Law firm.

There ~~is~~ several police officers in connection with a personal injury matter; trial is scheduled for this Spring \$5,000.00.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: Mr. DeLuca asked in this whole appropriation is there anything for the Personnel Manager.

MR. DeNICOLA: I'd like to make a motion that we cut that we cut that \$6,000.00 out on Personnel matters. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a motion to cut \$6,000.00 from the \$43,500.00.

MR. DeNICOLA: Under Personnel matters. I think we have competent lawyers in the City that can defend these people.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a motion to cut \$6,000.00 from the \$43,500.00 figure. That would bring it to \$37,500.00.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you, to Rep. Hawe, could you give me again the breakdown of that if this \$6,000.00 motion were to pass, what the \$6,000.00 was for. I think you mentioned...

MR. DARER: POINT OF INFORMATION. I'd just like to clear in my own mind, are these matters that we're voting on tonight specified? They're not. We're voting on an appropriation, the Co-Chairman of Fiscal was kind enough to tell us, but we can't tell the Law Department line by line what they can spend their money on, can we?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Hawe, has the Law Department delineated where the funds are going to be going.

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If they delineated the disposition of the funds, then it gives us an idea of where the funds will be spent.

MR. DARER: If we cut out 6, 10 or 20, that doesn't tell them where they can spend what we leave as a balance, does it? We can't do that.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: When they come to us with that kind of information, there is a moral obligation to spend that money. We cannot hold a hammer over their heads, no.

MR. DARER: That morality is on your part, not on the part of the Law Department. I do want to set the record straight for the Members of this Board tonight that whether you think it's moral or not whatever we pass, they have a right to spend that money for whatever they choose.

MRS. GUROIAN: All you're doing is increasing that particular account by "X" number of dollars. Where they spend that money, that gets mixed in with whatever monies are still in that account so where they spend that money, the prerogative is up to them. This is only background information as to what they believe they'll be needing the money for. It holds no responsibility on their part as to be held to what that background material says.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. ZELINSKI: Rep. Hawe, if you could give me the breakdown again if the \$6,000.00 motion were to pass, it would affect what items in the request in the \$47,000.00. I believe you said something pertaining to nurses as #1.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, first of all, on the back-up material that was sent us, it mentioned \$6,000.00 for Personnel matters. I spoke to Mr. Cookney today and he gave me, I have the notes here which I took when I was talking to him, I'd just like to say that in some of these cases, it's really impossible for the City, for instance, in the case involving Dr. Gofstein and the nurses, they're both employees of the City. Outside Counsel really has to be retained or at least Co-Counsel to assist in this kind of a case. It's impossible due to conflict of interest in some of these cases for the City to handle them and that's why they have to go to outside Counsel.

I spoke to Mr. Cookney. I don't have the exact dollar figures for all of these but this is what the \$6,000.00 will entail. First, \$2,500.00, that's the amount for Attorney Rothberg. There's some money in there for Attorney Austern regarding the Chief's litigation.

There's some money in there for members of the Internal Affairs Department of the Police Department who have been sued. Some money in there for Mr. Sotire's case and some funds for the case involving Dr. Gofstein and the City nurses. Those are the things this is for.

MR. ZELINSKI: Briefly, what was that pertaining to the nurses and the Health Department?

MRS. HAWE: I'm really not sure of the details but I do recall some controversy regarding Dr. Gofstein and the nurses. Perhaps the Chairperson of the Health and Protection, do you recall? Was that regarding salaries?

MRS. SANTY: No, I don't recall that.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to be in favor of Rep. DeNicola's motion on this. We have a very fine legal staff. This Board appropriated last year to have a second deputy Corporation Counsel hired by the City. I really don't feel that we should have to be continually going outside at the taxpayers' expense for legal counsel. How do we know there might not be a conflict of interest in a particular law firm, or partner in a law firm. You could carry it to a point where you would have to go outside the City; possibly outside the State to retain Counsel pertaining to something that's involves the City that would not be a conflict. I feel Rep. DeNicola was correct in his motion and I would hope that it does pass.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd like to speak against the motion. I think it's obvious in this situation that there exists a conflict of interest if the Law Department does defend us. How could the Law Department defend both defendant and the prosecutor at the same time. As in the case with the Health Department, you have two groups of City employees. It's obvious that the Law Department can't defend both parties.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. FASANELLI: (continuing)...I think there is a definite conflict of interest if the Law Department handles some of these situations. We have to respect the Law Department's wishes that legal counsel from outside be obtained in these certain situations.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would agree that to delete \$6,000.00 from this account would be foolhardy. A conflict of interest definitely appears in this particular item. You can't expect Corporation Counsel to give a legal opinion to a Department Head as to what their rights are and give another legal opinion to another group as to what their rights are and expect them to go into Court and fight each other. It's not possible. You never see a private firm having two lawyers from the same firm go in and represent two opposite points of view.

We're here and what we're trying to do is get the best possible Counsel for City wherein the City can save the most amount of money. It would be foolhardy for us to quibble over \$6,000.00 and give away \$40,000.00 by not having people go in and be properly prepared before a Judge.

MRS. SANTY: It is my understanding that the nurses have their own lawyer. They're unionized. They have their own legal attorney. I'd like a clarification. Who said that the City was asked to represent the nurses and Dr. Gofstein. I think this could be a mistake.

MRS. HAWK: Mr. Cookney said to me on the phone that part of this money goes for the case involving Dr. Gofstein and the nurses.

MRS. SANTY: I think the clarification here is representing Dr. Gofstein.

MR. CONTI: Where legalistic maneuvers are concerned, I don't think there is anyone more capable than the Law Department to tell us what is right and what is wrong in this respect and whether they can handle a case without conflict of interest or not. I believe it should be up to them to decide. I would be in favor of giving them this amount of money.

MR. JOYCE: I'm going to have to address myself to this question of conflict of interest. The Corporation Counsel is not an individual. It's a series of members of lawyers all who are admitted to the Bar of the State of Connecticut who are working for the City of Stamford under contract. They are not members of a law firm. There has to be a definite distinction between municipal attorneys retained under contract with the City of Stamford as opposed to a law firm where there's a community of financial interest.

Let us examine the meaning of the words conflict of interest. Conflict of interest affects the aspects of people in a law firm but not these type of lawyers. If you had individual lawyers, they necessarily do not have to render individual opinions. In other words, if you and I were both members of the legal staff of the City of Stamford, we could represent, if necessary, a situation such as arisen in the Health Department where there's a controversy between the manager, Dr. Gofstein, and other parties such as nurses who are affected. Likewise other situation involving the Chief of Police and someone else in his Department, or between two Boards such as the Zoning Board and the ZBA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. JOYCE: (continuing)...This question of conflict of interest goes to attorney-client privilege. An attorney-client privilege can exist in situations with individual attorneys. There's no analogy between a municipal legal department and a situation where you have law firms where the partners share in a community financial interest. Think what this means.

I think you will find that a conflict of interest need not necessarily apply when two members such as Mr. Boodman and Mrs. Perry, who are in the Corporation Counsel's office, are representing two different departments within the City. They could meet individually with their clients.

The question should be carefully analyzed.

I would urge you to vote in favor of Mr. DeNicola's motion.

MR. RYBNICK: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is an amendment to the \$43,500.00 before us. It is a motion to cut \$6,000.00 so that the Law Department appropriation would be \$37,500.00. The vote is 10 in the affirmative; 22 in the negative and 3 abstentions as Mr. Hogan has left. The motion to cut HAS BEEN LOST.

We will now proceed on our original list of \$43,500.00 appropriation.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd just like to make a statement. We interviewed Mr. Cookney at the Appointments Committee, and also when I sat in on a Committee meeting of Fiscal, and then a private conversation with Mr. Cookney in this room. We discussed outside attorneys. He made a statement that Barry Boodman would defend the City against Mr. Loglisci and he would not hire any outside attorney.

He also made a statement that before he gave anymore money to Attorney Austern for the Chief of Police, he would ask for a breakdown as to how far it's going because he didn't want the bill to run up too high with the City. I noticed in the Advocate that Mr. Cookney has now decided to hire Attorney Rothberg; although he said at the time he wasn't going to.

I really don't understand the procedure Mr. Cookney is using. He is telling us one thing at Committee meeting hearings. He's telling Board members something else in private discussions, and then he's doing something else. Now, if we can't hold Mr. Cookney to his word, if we can't hold him to exactly what he wants to do with the money he's asking for, I think we should look at this whole appropriation again, and I'm going to make a motion that we return this whole appropriation to Committee and have Mr. Cookney come down and tell us why he wants to give Mr. Austern more money; why he's hiring Mr. Rothberg when he said he wasn't going to, and I want him to put down in black and white exactly where he's spending his money.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there a second to the motion? SECONDED. The motion to recommit.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think we're spending more money now for outside attorneys than we did before. I have no objection to the Sewage Treatment Plant or the Zoning Board and these items that are like death and taxes, but I do object to an open one like Personnel matters where he's tried to do something that he said he wasn't going to do, but he doesn't want to put it in the back-up material in black and white.

I'm MOVING to have this put back into Committee so we can have a breakdown of exactly where the money goes and I want to know why he's allowing more money for Mr. Austern and why he's hiring Mr. Rothberg.

MR. BLUM: Through you, I'd like to ask Mrs. Hawe as to the amount of money that's going for Personnel cases?

MRS. HAWE: \$6,000.00.

MR. BLUM: And the rest of the money?

MRS. HAWE: The rest of the money is for Sewage Treatment Plant, \$350.00 for the Zoning Board, ZBA matter, money for the Hanover Street garage litigation regarding that bond.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like the records to indicate that we now have 36 members present. Mr. Livingston has returned.

The vote is to send the original \$47,000.00 appropriation back to the Fiscal Committee for further study. The vote is 19 in the affirmative; 16 in the negative. The MOTION TO RECOMMIT TO FISCAL HAS BEEN CARRIED.

- (8) \$ 81,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE 1979-80 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING TO A PROJECT KNOWN AS "NO. 720.0811 STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER - PURCHASE OF 12.7 ACRES ABUTTING THE EXISTING PROPERTY".

MRS. HAWE: This \$81,000.00 is to pay for the principal and interest payment on the property which is due July 1. It was anticipated that at this point, the Museum would have sold the property up there with the house on it, that they're planning to sell, however due to the real estate market at this time, they haven't been able to sell it yet.

Also, the Grant which is going to help pay for this has not yet been processed in Washington; so that's been delayed. This money, if approved, will be financed from the Capital Non-recurring fund, also known as the land bank account.

Fiscal voted 7 in favor; no opposed and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MR. DeLUCA: Parks and Recreation voted 2 in favor and 1 against.

MR. JOYCE: Through you, Madam Chairman to the Fiscal Committee, Mrs. Hawe, what happens if we do not approve this \$81,000.00? Who is holding this mortgage that has to be paid July 1?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: I assume, if the Museum cannot pay from their existing funds, that it would be foreclosed on.

MR. JOYCE: Who is holding the mortgage? Who is the person lending the money who is holding the paper?

As we are asked to be public spirited, if there is a question of monies being appropriated out of Washington, there is such a thing as a moratorium for a period of time.. This need not necessarily result in a foreclosure action. If a matter of time, perhaps we can save the taxpayers \$81,000.00 and at the same time, have the person holding the paper sit tight for another 30 or 60 days until the necessary Governmental work is being taken care of.

MRS. HAWE: The prior owner is holding the mortgage.

MR. FAUTEUX: I think Mr. Joyce is taking for granted that there are no legalities to this mortgage. I have to assume that it is a legal and binding document; that the payments are to be made at a specified period of time and to do otherwise would be to put it into jeopardy and potential foreclosure.

MR. DeLUCA: Through you, to Rep. Hawe, when did the house and land go up for sale?

MRS. HAWE: In July 1979, the Board of the Stamford Museum entered into a contract to purchase this 12.7 acres which abut the Museum and agreed to pay \$500,000.00 for it. The property had suddenly been offered for sale and the Museum Board feared that it would be grabbed up by developers if they didn't act promptly.

The Museum then requested a City appropriation to finance it. Back in September and October of 1979, the City Boards appropriated \$158,000.00 from this land bank account. This was to cover the initial down payment of \$140,000.00 plus the first two interest payments which were due in January and April of 1980.

To reduce this purchase price, the Finance Department, the City Boards and the Museum worked out a plan. When it's all said and done, hopefully it will cost the City, according to Commissioner Hoffman, a net cost to the City of \$105,500.00. The plan is that the Museum will sell the house which is located on the acquired property plus one acre of the acquired property. Hopefully, this sale would yield about \$150,000.00 which the Museum, when it is sold, will apply to reduce its mortgage.

At the same time, the Grant's office has applied for a Federal and State Grant from the Department of Interior Heritage, Conservation, and Recreation Service. Such a Grant, if approved, could provide 75% of the \$360,000.00 that would be outstanding. A Resolution authorizing this application was approved by the Board of Reps on October 3.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...To qualify for the Grant, the City must own the property. That's the "catch" here. It was understood that once the Grant had been approved by the Federal and State Agencies, the City would buy the property from the Museum although the Museum would administer it. The Grant would then be received by the City and returned to the land bank.

As I said, the Grant application is still being processed by the Interior Department and the depressed real estate market has made selling the main house and the adjacent acreage a longer process than anticipated. Since this process had slowed up, that's why the July principal payment of \$72 000.00 and the July interest payment of \$9 000.00 are coming due before the Museum has been able to get this money back from the Grant and from the sale of the property and the house.

MR. DeLUCA: I believe I got a good history on the whole Museum set-up, but I don't know if I got the answer to my question. When did the house go up for sale?

MRS. HAWE: July, 1979.

MR. DeLUCA: I thought we just went in to get the ground rules set for what we had to appropriate. but the house went up for sale July, 1979?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know when it went up for sale. That's when the Museum agreed to buy it in July of '79. I don't know how long it was on the market before that.

MR. DeLUCA: Is the Museum utilizing this house for anything right now?

MRS. HAWE: No, I don't believe so.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm beginning to wonder what would happen if per chance we do not get the Grant, the house just sits there, we cannot sell it for several years; yet we have so much money sunk into it. Is the City going to have to cough up \$200,000.00 or \$300,000.00?

I can recall a similar letter that we got back on October 12, 1979 from Stamford Ambulance Corp requesting \$150,000.00 from the City to put up their new building and they were going to go out and raise \$200,000.00. At our recent budget hearings, we had to appropriate \$391,000.00 for a building. I fear that if we keep going this route where people are requesting certain amounts of money and then they can't come up with their end of it, the City keeps holding the bag for additional money. For our Senior Citizens we cannot give them a \$50.00 or \$150.00 tax break on their homes. We can throw money around like crazy because people can't come through at their end. I would hope that this gets rejected tonight.

MRS. HAWE: In September or October of last year, when we appropriated the money for the first payment and when we passed the Resolution authorizing the City to apply for this Grant, I think we were aware that there was a possibility that this well-conceived plan might not work out. I think we realized it was a very slim possibility and I think it still is.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

MRS. HAWE: (Continuing)...From what we've heard, we have every hope that things are just moving slower than anticipated, but they move; that the house and land will be sold and that this Grant will come through.

At this point to deny this money, after we have already put \$158,000.00 into it; we thought it was a valuable thing back six months ago, I see no reason why we should change our mind just because the time-table hasn't moved along as we hoped. I think it is an important thing for the City to have this land and I would hope that the Board would approve this money.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like to know when we would be liable for another mortgage payment if this house is not sold soon?

MRS. HAWE: October; there's four a year.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Would it be at all feasible for us to recommend if it looks as if this house would not be sold soon, that it would be rented?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know what condition it's in. I suppose we could inquire about this.

MR. FAUTEUX: The house apparently is in a very run-down condition and the approximately one acre that goes with the house is not enough incentive to come forward with \$150,000.00 at the present time.

I understand that there is some thought as to what they call "repackaging" the real estate. It may be that they are going to have to add a fraction of an acre more to the parcel to go along with the house in order to get the \$150,000.00 that they estimate that they can get from the sale. Under the conditions of the tight money market in the mortgages that we've gone through, and the fact that it's lessened up a little bit, I think there are some encouraging signs that they will be able to sell the house and recover that part of the money.

As far as the other reimbursement goes, there is definitely a slow-down of the money that is coming out of the National Heritage side of it. That is something we are going to have to live with for the time being.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is #8 on the Fiscal agenda which is \$81,000.00 for an amendment to the 1979-80 Capital Projects Budget for the Stamford Museum and Nature Center. You need 2/3.

The vote is 25 in the affirmative; 10 in the negative with 1 abstention.
The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

- (9) \$ 18,000.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 620.2720 GAS AND ELECTRIC - Additional appropriation for gas and electric per Supt. Cook's 5/2/80 request. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (10) \$ 907.92 - AMENDMENT TO THE 1979-1980 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING TO A PROJECT KNOWN AS "NO. 410.448 BULLET TRAP" THE SUM OF \$907.92 TO BE FINANCED BY A TRANSFER FROM PROJECT KNOWN AS "NO. 410.446 POST DRIVER" per Deputy Chief Considine's request 4/9/80. (The remaining balance of \$1,785 in the POST DRIVER account is to be closed out.) Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

MRS. HAWE: This is to pay off a remaining bill that is left over from the building of the bullet trap. Fiscal voted 8 in favor and no opposed and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: I know that \$907.00 is only peanuts compared to everything else we vote on. It's the principle behind it all. This bullet trap originally started off with about \$22,000.00. About a year and a half ago they came in for an extra \$8,000.00. They said for \$30,000.00 we're going to have the Cadillac of all bullet traps throughout the Country. Now they are coming in for another \$907.00 and who knows when this will end.

I think it's about time City departments learned that we give them a budget, we give them appropriations, they should live by it. Why do we have to keep putting money in because people cannot live within the realm of their budget? You have a budget, we give you one additional appropriation and that should be sufficient; don't come back for additional money.

MRS. MAIHOCK: A bullet trap is very necessary to the performance of our Policemen. I can't see questioning that.

MRS. PERILLO: I believe this money is to pay the electrician that never got paid for the work he did.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Rep. Perillo is correct. This amount for the electrical work was never included in the basic contract. It was a separate amount from the beginning. Now they are billing us for the labor and materials used to install the electricity to the bullet trap. It was never part of the basic contract.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The question is \$907.92 for an amendment to the 1979-80 Capital Projects budget for the bullet trap which will be financed by use of a transfer and it will therefore only require a majority vote.

The vote is 30 in the affirmative; 3 in the negative; with 3 abstentions.
The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

- (11) \$ 3,000.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 650.2710 FUEL OIL - Additional appropriation request by Supt. Giordano 4/9/80 due to increased cost of fuel oil from 43¢ per gal. to 89¢. Useage has decreased about 2,753 gallons. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (12) \$ 15,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE - SKILLED NURSING FACILITY - Code 520 - Additional appropriations requested by Supt. DeVos 4/16/80. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80. Water, gas and electric rates and useage of same have increased.

520.2720 Gas and Electric	\$10,000.
520.2730 Water	1,000.
520.3481 Laundry	4,000.
	<u>\$15,000.</u>

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (13) \$ 30,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE 1979-1980 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING THERETO A NEW PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS "NO. 535.0965 SKILLED NURSING FACILITY CONVERSION (WILLARD SCHOOL)" as per Supt. DeVos' letter 4/1/80. Funds are for initial studies to determine feasibility of converting WILLARD SCHOOL into a Skilled Nursing Facility and a congregate housing site, and architect to be engaged. To be funded by TAXATION. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (14) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SIGN AGREEMENT TO RECEIVE \$7,375.00 FROM CONN. DEPT. OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR SUMMER BUSING PROGRAM TO TAKE YOUNGSTERS 18 and UNDER TO STATE PARKS FOR DAY TRIPS. Mayor Clapes' letter 5/15/80 states this is Board of Recreation Account 650.3644 and appropriation request will be submitted following State execution of the Agreement. TITLE XX SUMMER BUSING.

MRS. HAWE: This money is to pay for chartered buses to take them on these trips. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 0 opposed and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED and SECONDED.

MR. CORBO: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Voice Vote)

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

- (15) \$500,000.00 - TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND TO RESERVE FUND FOR CAPITAL AND NON-RECURRING EXPENDITURES, pursuant to Chapter 108 of the Connecticut General Statutes, entitled "MUNICIPAL RESERVE FUND" (Sections 7-359 - 7-368) - per Mayor's letter 5/12/80. Board of Finance, per letter 5/16/80, will consider this item at their meeting of Friday, May 23, 1980.

Mayor requests this \$500,000 be transferred from the 6/30/79 surplus of \$6.5 Million.

MRS. HAWE: In the mid 1960's, the State passed Legislation enabling municipalities to set up a Capital Non-recurring fund for land purchases. We have such a fund now. The amount in it is now down to \$330,000.00.

The Planning Board has recommended that \$1 Million be retained in this account to pay for the purchase of land when any land that the City is interested in owning comes on the market, the City would have these funds available.

The Finance Commissioner feels that with the surplus that we have this year that this is a good time to build up the account and that's why he's requesting this transfer of \$500,000.00 from the General Fund into this Reserve Fund for Capital and Non-recurring expenditures.

Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed and I so MOVE.

MR. FAUTEUX: Yes. EW&G concurs. **SECONDED.**

MR. JOYCE: We are in a position where we don't have prior contracts; where we don't have monies committed as we did before with respect to some appropriation for a house or a mortgage payment that is due. This is placed before this Representative Body to decide to either put the City of Stamford in the real estate business or take them out of the real estate business.

The purpose of this Municipal Government is to collect taxes and to keep those taxes as low as possible instead of going and building up land banks so the City can purchase land. We have land. We should consider using this money for humanitarian purposes or else giving it back to the people in terms of reducing their mill rate, but to go in the land bank business is ridiculous.

MR. WIDER: We have run out of housing. One of the most important things to bring about housing is land. The only thing you can buy land with is funds. As you know, we have had three pieces of real estate taken out from under us because we didn't have the funds available. What they are saying now is let's have some funds available when the land becomes available; not wait until the land is gone and say we should be building houses on Washington Boulevard where the Ambassador Arms was. We should have the Hotel Hazelton property, but we didn't have the funds.

We need this money in this fund so we can buy some property and help a non-profit organization to develop some housing in the City of Stamford which we must have.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

MRS. CONTI: I'm opposed to putting this \$500,000.00 into to this Land Bank account. Actually, we still have about \$200,000.00 in there and that is adequate to put a down payment on any piece of property that the City might wish to acquire until such time as we can get it through the Boards to appropriate the rest of the money if the City wants the property.

This could better be used to reduce the mill rate.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I have no objections to this transfer. Wouldn't it be nice if the Mayor took some of this surplus and put it towards the Spring Clean-up? After all, the taxpayers put it there. I think we should benefit by it by having a Spring Clean-up.

MR. ESPOSITO: This money will not be used so that the City can become land speculators. The money will be used for purchasing of land that might be available for nursing facilities, future housing, parks and recreation, the land around the Museum. There are a multitude of uses this money can be used for to serve the people of the City.

MR. DONAHUE: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is of a \$500,000.00 transfer from the General Fund to the Reserve Fund for Capital and Non-recurring expenditures.

MRS. GUROIAN: I had my hand up and I didn't get called on. I don't know what I'm voting on.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Guroian, it's your prerogative to vote no. We do have a long list remaining on that, however, it is always a right to move the question. We put you down in the order we see them and I'm sorry if you have not been called on twice.

The vote is 23 yes; 11 no. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED. This is a transfer and requires a majority.

- (16) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION THAT CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THE 1977/1978, 1978/1979, and 1979/1980 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGETS, AS WELL AS CERTAIN MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR PROJECTS, WHICH HAD BEEN DESIGNATED FOR "BONDING", BE FUNDED BY "DIRECT TAXATION" per Finance Commissioner O. A. Hoffman's request of 5/12/80; and Board of Finance 5/16/80 letter advising they will consider this request at their meeting of Friday, May 23, 1980. (Resolution No. 1303 approved April 10, 1980 by Board of Representatives.)

MRS. HAWE: Number 16 is an item that is not properly on our Agenda. We have been informed by the Finance Department that the vote on which Capital Projects will be funded by bonding and which by taxation is entirely the province of the Board of Finance.

I MOVE to APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Anthony Conti and John Zelinski

MR. ZELINSKI: The Legislative and Rules Committee met on Tuesday evening, May 27, 1980. Present were Reps. Fasanelli, Pollard, Corbo, Wiederlight,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing)...Donahue, Reps. A. Conti and Zelinski, Co-Chairmen. Also present were Rep. McInerney and Mr. Paul Jacobson.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE PRIVATE GARBAGE COLLECTORS.
Submitted by City. Rep. Barbara McInerney.

MR. ZELINSKI: This was published last month and our Committee voted 7 in favor for final adoption and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED with 1 negative vote, Mr. Roos, and Mr. Rybnick abstained.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE GREENWICH LAND TRUST, INC. FOR 10.059 ACRES CONVEYED TO THEM BY FRANCES D. CLYNE
on 12/17/79 - located on Farms Road, Stamford.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 7 in favor to HOLD this item as a result of a letter from Corporation Counsel saying that the Ordinance would have to be redrafted. There is no action. We are just holding it.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT TO GIVE WILLIAM AND PHYLLIS CHAPIN ACCESS TO OLD LONG RIDGE ROAD, per Asst. Corp. Counsel Alice Perry's letter 1/8/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 4 in favor and 3 against and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The MOTION for final adoption has been CARRIED. Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Corbo are opposed.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR NATURE CONSERVANCY PROPERTY - Atty. Badger of Greenwich re-submitted 1/16/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 7 in favor to HOLD. Again, per Corporation Counsel that the ordinance would have to be redrafted.

- (5) FOR RE-PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR SOUTHWESTERN CONNECTICUT GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC. - letter 1/21/80 from Paul F. Jacobson.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor to HOLD this item.

- (6) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTIES OWNED BY BAIS BINYOMIN ACADEMY OF CONNECTICUT at 125 Prospect St. and 13 Rock Spring Road.

MR. ZELINSKI: This was published at our last monthly meeting and our Committee voted 7 in favor to vote for final adoption and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO REGULATE THE SALE AND/OR RE-SALE OF PRECIOUS METALS, INCLUDING GOLD AND SILVER. Submitted by City Rep. Michael Wiederlight 2/18/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor for publication and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is L&R going to have an open hearing on this one again? I understand at the last open hearing, there was only one person.

MR. ZELINSKI: That's correct. L&R did not anticipate having another meeting. There was a legal notice in the newspaper about the meeting and we did not consider having another meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We'll proceed to a vote. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote, with a few members off the floor.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee made a motion to waive publication and vote for final adoption. The motion was 2 in favor, 2 against and 1 abstention.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Excuse me, for what?

MR. ZELINSKI: For item #7.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We just voted to publish. If you wanted to waive publication, we should have voted on that first.

MR. ZELINSKI: Could we go back?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You may move to reconsider #7 since you voted on the prevailing side. It was a unanimous vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: No, at this particular point, let it go.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You have withdrawn your motion for reconsidering?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes.

- (8) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR BI-CULTURAL DAY SCHOOL at 2186 High Ridge Road.

MR. ZELINSKI: This was also published last month and our Committee voted 5 in favor for final adoption and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote, with a few members off the floor.)

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTY ON DIVISION STREET - (TOT-LOT) - CONVEYED TO CITY on 3/5/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted to HOLD this item.

- (10) PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP TO RESOLUTION FROM SEVEN BOARD MEMBERS REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 340 WHICH MANDATES SPRING AND FALL CLEAN-UP AND LEAF PICK-UP; RESOLUTION REQUESTS TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM UNUSED MONIES IN SNOW REMOVAL ACCOUNT. This was requested by City Rep.

Moira Lyons.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted to request a meeting with the Mayor on this item. Our Committee did meet with the Mayor Clapes on Friday, May 30, at 11:00 a.m. in his office along with Commission Spaulding and Mr. Hoffman.

After a lengthy discussion on this, we instructed Public Works Comm. Spaulding come up with figures both for a leaf pick-up only and also a figure which would be for a full clean-up not only leaves but household debris as well and we have scheduled another meeting on next Friday, 11:00 a.m. in the Mayor's office to get this information and from there we will be acting further on it. HOLD.

MR. BLUM: On this transfer of money from the snow account, from what I read in the paper was that there are no monies. I can't understand with such a calm and quiet winter there are no monies left in the snow removal account, but if it continues to go on after June 30, we'll be into the new fiscal year and that will be the end of the snow removal account for 79-80. I'd like to know more about the comments that were made at the Mayor's office in regard to this snow removal account; why there are no funds left.

MR. ZELINSKI: That question was raised at the meeting and Comm. Spaulding mentioned, at the present time there was approximately \$150,000.00 left in the snow removal account; however, he did mention that there were still outstanding bills that had to be paid and consequently, did not feel that there would be any funds or very little left for the leaf pick-up.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: He is going to be using some of that money for other purposes also, from what I understood Mr. Spaulding said. He did recognize that it was a mild winter but he, therefore, has that money ear-marked for other purposes.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd would like to go on record in support of this Resolution. I have gotten many calls from my constituents as why my name was not signed to this particular thing. I want them to understand that any Board member has a right to submit what they would like but that does not mean the people that have not signed it and it has been published in the Advocate, that we're not in support of it. A matter of the record and to those constituents, I am in support of this and I hope the Board will also support this.

MR. BLUM: I'm sure that whatever Mr. Spaulding's answers are for the \$150,000, this Spring Clean-up is just as necessary today, tomorrow and the next day before June 30. I go on record and I think we should to continue to pressure the Mayor and Mr. Spaulding that we must have a Spring Clean-up for the debris.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. LIVINGSTON: A question on #9 which is being held. I wanted to know from the Chairman of that Committee what were the definite reasons that this item is being held.

MR. ZELINSKI: One of our Committee members Rep. Wiederlight brought up some questions pertaining to that. I don't know if you would care to expand upon it. That was the reason we held it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I questioned the legality of this tax abatement and Mr. Zelinski sent it up to the Corporation Counsel's office and he sort of concurred in some respects with my thoughts; therefore, he asked Mr. Zelinski to hold up any action on this until he can do more research on it.

- (11) PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE SAFETY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT INCLUDING CRANES - submitted by Rep. John Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted to HOLD this. I have been in contact with Corporation Counsel's office and will be continuing to work with him to see if some type of ordinance can be drafted pertaining to the licensing of the crane operators because of the recent incidents.

- (12) PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING GIFTS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor to hold this and the reason is I have spoken to Corporation Counsel Cookney on this the day of our meeting. He was kind enough to put it in writing his reasons for holding this. I'd like to quote that, if I may, from Mr. Cookney's letter of May 27.

"I suggest that you hold in Committee the proposed ordinance concerning the regulation of municipal employees accepting gifts until the July meeting of the Board of Representatives.

My office is drafting an omnibus ordinance which will concern conflict of interest, acceptance of gifts, and code of ethics. It should be available within the next two weeks. The purpose of the omnibus ordinance is to consolidate existing ordinances and to draft an ordinance covering all of the above-mentioned areas."

The reason I want that written in the records was not that our Committee was holding this for any other reason other than with the advice of the Corporation Counsel. This item HELD IN COMMITTEE.

That ends my report.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MERIT RULES SYSTEM (CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS).

MR. BLUM: Personnel Committee voted to HOLD this item for any reports based on the fact that the Municipal Employees representative has a minority report on this item and would like to present it to the Personnel Committee. We are holding up on both reports of the changes and reports from Mr. Leary who is Employee representative for the Municipal Employees.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (2) CLARIFICATION REQUESTED RE PERSONNEL SALARY INCREASES AT FERGUSON LIBRARY; DETAILS AS TO PROCEDURES, SUBMISSIONS, WHAT CONTRACTS, IF ANY, ETC. - submitted by Rep. David Blum.

That has been taken up. We were the Secondard Committee in regard to the Library contract.

- (3) CONSIDERATION OF LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN MEA/CASEWORKERS and the CITY OF STAMFORD.

The Personnel Committee voted at their meeting on May 27, 1980, 5 to 0 in favor of the Labor Contract and the City of Stamford. I would like to give my report as to the contract itself.

The following contract dated July 1, 1979 to July 1, 1981. The MEA contract started negotiations since January 1979. It was first initialed in early May of this year 1980. On January 2, 1981, that's six months before the contract is terminated; they will be back negotiating their new contract. This is a two-year contract we will be voting on.

For the 7% retroactive of July 1, 1979 of 7% and 7% effective July 1, 1980, the City received give-backs of the following items for the 7%. By the way, for the first time, this contract includes five caseworkers from the Welfare Department. They are part of this contract. Prior to this, six caseworkers use to negotiate or were given a contract from the City and negotiated on their own. This year, they are with the MEA contract.

As part of the give-aways, the City received one holiday called picnic day.

Employees have gone without since July 1, 1979. One of the questions I did ask Mr. Bernstein who was in place of Mr. Barrett, why do we take so long to negotiate contracts that we are left with long retroactive activity. The answer that comes back to me is that doesn't make a good or bad contract. People wait.

I also asked other questions; 1) relative to the Martin Luther King holiday which is not a part of this contract and when we got in this, it was not a negotiable item. It's a part of the Board of Education's that it can be taken in either way; either you take a King holiday or you may take a Jewish holiday. This Board voted a Martin Luther King holiday but it's not a part of the contract.

Also, there is no Affirmative Action Clause in this contract and I asked the Mayor and his negotiator to make a supplement amendment to this after it's voted upon because the Board of Education has it in their .ffirmative ction rogram; the Library has a non-discriminatory clause in their contracts. Anyone who received Federal grants and does Federal work, as the City of Stamford does, should have a non-discriminatory clause in their Contract.

I so propose that we vote on this Contract. I make a motion that we approve this contract.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. BOCCUZZI: SECONDED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you to Mr. Blum, I find some of your thoughts confusing. On one hand you say what should be and what is not, and then you ask us to vote on this contract. I would like some clarification on a few things.

Mr. Rinella came before the Appointments Committee which I sit on and I asked him a question because I had understood there were some questions about the affirmative action plan within this particular contract. Mr. Rinella told me the City has an overall Affirmative Action Plan. Even if the City has an Affirmative Action Plan, how would that affect a contract which is negotiated every so often? Wouldn't also apply in good faith as a City we would also ask those employees to negotiate, put an Affirmative Action Clause in their contract. I was told by Mr. Rinella that I would get an answer before tonight's meeting. I did receive a call from Mr. Bernstein on my job which I do not care to discuss Board of Representative and City business on my job because I'm not allowed to do that and I did not get an answer. Can you answer that question, and then I have another question.

MR. BLUM: I received to-day from the Personnel Commission an Affirmative Action Plan for the City of Stamford. It goes on to say resolved that the Mayor shall insure equal employment opportunities for all qualified individuals without consideration of their age, sex, race, creed, national origin, political affiliation or belief. It also goes on resolved that the concept and philosophy of equal opportunity shall be provided for but not restricted to all components of employment, recruitment, selection, compensation, benefits, promotion, and training and be it further resolved the Civil Service office of the City of Stamford be it hereby designated the appropriate agency of implementation of this guideline.

Some of the employees that are under MEA work for the Board of Education. The Bd. of Education has within their Affirmative Action Program that all contracts will have affirmative action or non-discriminatory policy.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Can you tell me who is the Affirmative Action, EEO officer for the City of Stamford?

MR. BLUM: Mr. Sim Bernstein.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Who appointed him as the officer?

MR. BLUM: I would say the Mayor did.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Would you read the language in the contract where it pertains to Martin Luther King's birthday as a holiday?

If I might, Mr. Boccuzzi, while I'm waiting, I am totally confused with the language in the contract and what we voted on here as a holiday for the City. I find it somewhat confusing when this Board legally says that the City will have a holiday. It won by a majority vote. My interpretation of the discussion

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)...within the Personnel Committee meeting, with the Personnel Commission, at the last Committee meeting, that we didn't have a choice as to what unions were negotiating their contracts.

The Board is saying to me that when the Board of Representatives passed something here saying that the City will have it, and voted on and passed, when each unit comes up to negotiate a contract and they so choose that that's not the way that they want it, that it is legal for this to happen or illegal.

MR. BLUM: I'll read the part that does mention Martin Luther King date. "All employees other than those employed by the Board of Education shall have two days personal leave in each contract year to be taken at such time as the employee may elect with the consent of his department head which such consent shall be unreasonably withheld. Employees employed by the Bd. of Education shall not be required to work on Custodians' picnic day, teachers' convention day, or election day unless the school custodians are at work on such day and the Bd. of Education employees are requested to do so by the Superintendent of Schools, in which event any employee so working shall receive a compensatory day off which day shall be designated by the Board from among Martin Luther King Day or any of the Jewish Holidays designated by the Board."

That's the only mention of Martin Luther King Day in the holidays. There's no mention whatsoever of Martin Luther King. Although it is a holiday, my understanding of this contract, if you read in the contract where the City takes a day off, then it becomes a compensatory day off, and if, by choice, someone has to work on that day, he will not get because it is not a contractual holiday. He will get another day off if he had to work. He will not get paid time-and-a-half for working like every other holiday.

If a person had to work on any other holiday but Martin Luther King day, could be Washington's, Lincoln's birthday, etc., he will get time-and-a-half for that day but because Martin Luther King's day is a City holiday, now voted upon by the Board, this Municipal Hall would close down, and they will get another day.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mr. Blum, I think that you did answer it as well as you interpret the contract. I would like to make a motion that we hold this particular item in Committee until there is some clarification from Mr. Rinella.

MR. BOCCUZZI: We either have to approve or reject. If we don't have any action within 30 days of the day it was sent down, then it becomes automatic. I think by the next Board meeting, it will be more than 30 days, and the contract will be automatically agreed to.

I think your motion is going to have to be to reject without prejudice until you get certain items straightened out.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I so MOVE.

MR. BOCCUZZI: SECONDED. Any discussion on the motion to reject without prejudice? This is discussion on the motion now.

The motion on the Floor is to approve but Ms. Summerville is asking that it be rejected.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. BOCCUZZI: You don't have to move to reject. You can speak (inaudible) against approving.

MRS. McINERNEY: I will not vote in favor of the MEA contract based not so much on the salary increases, but on provisions and benefits which are included in the contract which I feel to be excessive. However, I do think that initially, I agree Ms. Summerville that last year we had several meetings and the year before that, dealing with the fact of whether the City should declare or not declare Martin Luther King's day as a legal holiday.

This Board voted to make Martin Luther King a paid holiday for City workers. I think it behooves the MEA to include that as one of their paid holidays. Otherwise, the intent and purpose of this Board passing on that particular ordinance is null and void. They are just ignoring us. Court actions are being brought against the City for other things. Certainly this is a violation of our intent.

I am against in the Contract of granting two days of personal leave. I think that that's excessive. I'm not in favor of the City providing a term life insurance policy in an amount equal to an annual salary. I am not pleased with the fact that City employees can be called back to work and would be paid for a minimum of four hours if they were called back in.

I am not in the agreement that employees hired under Civil Service agreements at all should be exempt from an examination from any position. I disagree with the provisions whereby part-time workers, who work 20 hours or more for the City of Stamford, would be entitled to hospitalization benefits substantially equal to those people who work under the classified employees' contract and are full-time employees. I think this is a tremendous injustice to the taxpayers and I would disagree in Article 21, under the Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, dealing with the shift and week-end differential rates. I think that they should be comparable to those of the other MEA workers which is 5%, and that 10% is excessive, and I would certainly agree with Ann, as I said before, that we reject this contract.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I am most definitely disappointed in our Labor Negotiator and bargaining powers of the Union for overlooking the wishes and desires of this Board especially as it concerns the declaration of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as a legal City holiday. Any contract that has been negotiated in good faith by both the City and the Bargaining Unit, I have always supported. On this Contract, I cannot help but and regretfully voting no. I urge my Colleagues on this Board to reject this contract as it has been presented to us.

MR. WIDER: I'm a bit concerned when we are supposed to speak for the people who elected us. We can pay a negotiator to do contrary to what the electors have told us to do. As a taxpayer in the City of Stamford who pays his salary, I don't appreciate what he is doing. He is making the Board of Representatives look like a bunch of figure-heads. Before we really vote on this contract, I think we should ask our Negotiator to check his job and complete it because this job is not completed.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Mr. Blum, are we correct in assuming that Martin Luther King day is not declared a holiday in this contract?

MR. BLUM: It is not a negotiated holiday as I was told. In fact, you were present when I asked Mr. Bernstein.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I was not present. I was at the Legislative and Rules Committee meeting.

MR. BLUM: I'm sorry. I asked him why the Martin Luther King day was not a holiday, one of the holidays. He told me it was not negotiated. It was not a negotiated holiday. When I talked to the negotiator, he claimed that they could not come to an agreement. They wanted the employees to give up one of their holidays in place of the King day.

I would say that when they gave up their Picnic day, that was one of their holidays; should not Martin Luther King's day come in its place? He told me it was not a negotiated item.

I'd like to read "H" from the contract: (Holidays) "If a special day off is declared for City employees by proclamation, each employee covered by this Agreement required to work on such day shall be granted a compensatory day off at a time mutually convenient to the employee and his department head."

That covers Martin Luther King day in this contract. If they are off on King's day, they will get a day's pay.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I don't feel personally that that was a negotiable item since the Bd. of Representatives in the past has declared it a legal holiday for the City. From an efficiency point of view, I can't see having half the City work and half the City off. From a legal point of view, the Bd. of Representatives has declared it a holiday. I feel it is not a negotiable item in a labor contract. For that reason, and that reason alone, I have to go along with Ms. Summerville's motion to return this. I cannot see telling Mr. Barrett, on the other hand, how to negotiate a contract. We have declared it as such and it should be honored as such. That motion is a fine one by Ms. Summerville.

MR. ESPOSITO: I'm not sure of the issue here. All City offices are closed on that day. MEA workers do not have to work on that day, is that not correct?

MR. BLUM: That is correct.

MR. ESPOSITO: They get the day off? With pay?

MR. BLUM: Yes, they do, with pay.

MR. ESPOSITO: Why is there an issue here?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: In all of the Union contracts, there is a list of holidays.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)...In this particular contract, Martin Luther King is not listed. They are listed whether they were negotiated by the Union or not. My problem with this particular contract, Mr. Esposito, is per se under their listed holidays, Martin Luther King is not listed.

MR. ESPOSITO: If it were listed, does that mean that they get any extra compensation?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: No, it just means that it's legal and it would be lived up to. If they said tomorrow, January 1, is going to be a holiday, the Bd. of Representatives approved that and then when they went back and negotiated their contract among their holidays it's not listed, their employer can legally say it's not a part of your contract so you have to work; because it's a floating holiday. You take another day off sometime.

MR. ESPOSITO: Mr. Blum, in these other contracts, when a holiday is listed and if an employee has to work on that holiday, they get time and a half?

MR. BLUM: Time and a half.

MR. ESPOSITO: With the contract that we are considering now, if the employee has to work on Martin Luther King day, they do not get time and a half?

MR. BLUM: They do not.

MR. ESPOSITO: The way I see that, that's a fiscally good move. When we considered this last year, the big issue was how much is it going to cost the City. A lot of people on that Board made the argument that if we want to have King's birthday a holiday, which I supported from the very on-set, why don't the municipal workers give up one of their other holidays. That was a major issue.

Here we have a contract where the negotiator has negotiated with the Bargaining Unit and apparently the Bargaining Unit has accepted the idea although the City is closed down, although they will have to work on Martin Luther King's holiday, they will not receive time and a half. I see that as a good fiscal position for the City.

In effect, what the negotiator has done is what this Board really convinced him he should do and not negotiate in a new holiday and yet at the same time, the City is closed down; the will of this Board is being up-held and Martin Luther King's birthday is a City holiday.

MRS. GUROIAN: Mr. Blum, why is that clause limited to Jewish holidays? Why couldn't they say religious holidays?

MR. BLUM: That's the way it is written in the contract. What can I tell you? I read it the way it is written. That's the way it was negotiated.

MRS. GUROIAN: There are other people. I don't get my Christmas off. There are other people who have religious holidays who don't get their important Holy days off, too. I would hope that if this Board defeats it, that would be one of the things they would rectify; that it just doesn't say Jewish holiday, it says religious holidays.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. BLUM: Mrs. Guroian, they get Christmas eve after 12 o'clock, and Christmas Day, and Easter Sunday.

MRS. GUROIAN: My Christmas is January 6.

MR. CORBO: This problem could have been avoided if we had a chance to have a sub-committee of our Personnel Committee sitting in on negotiations. We should come up with a resolution in order to avoid further misunderstanding. We are wasting time at this meeting. We had literature. Everyone had a chance to read the contract. Everybody had a chance to attend the Personnel Committee meeting. The problems should have been brought up when the Committee met to discuss the problems.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I can assure you, Mr. Corbo, I very seldom speak but when I do I really think it is necessary and I apologize to the Board if I am taking up your time, but I do think this is very important.

Mr. Esposito and Mrs. Guroian, I understand what you are saying. Mr. Esposito, you're saying on one hand, we sit up here and we said that Martin Luther King's birthday will be a holiday, a legal City holiday. On the other hand, you say to me that it's very good that our people didn't bring it up when they negotiated with the Union and it saved the City money. That was not the intent. It was the principle. If everything we do here, if they could all be re-negotiated the next two years around, that some of our decisions would be turned. It was negotiated whether we want to accept it or not. You can't tell me they sit there and negotiate a contract and they didn't think about what they were doing with Martin Luther King's birthday when they have all this other language when it comes to ethnic groups and there is no such item labeled as a holiday for Martin Luther King.

You, yourself, Mr. Esposito said it's very good for the City because it saved us money; I think that's what the Board wanted in the first place. Some of us that voted in favor of it because we felt it was due and should have been; not because it was going to save or cost the City money. All of us want to save the City money but it was a vote that was taken. It won by a favorable vote and it should be a part of the contract as a listed holiday.

MR. DIXON: I think we ought to get this matter settled once and for all. If we don't do that tonight, then we'll have to go through the same hassle at the passing of the next contract. I know that the ordinance that was passed mandates January 15 as a legal holiday for the City of Stamford and that all City workers, City Departments will be closed down.

We're not talking about April 25 or December 31, we're talking about January 15. The purpose and intent of that ordinance was to set that date aside for the purpose of celebrating Martin Luther King's holiday. It appears to me that the way the contract is written and I can be misunderstanding it, that the City workers at their own discretion, can take any day out of the year for that January 15 date. Any day out of the year or any date out of the year will not celebrate the Martin Luther King holiday. January 15th celebrates that

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (continuing)

MR. DIXON: (continuing)...and that was the purpose and intent of the ordinance. The contract is drawn up contrary to the purpose of the ordinance. I would very much like to see this matter cleared up and it can only be cleared up by sending it back to Committee and let them go before the negotiating teams and get that matter cleared up in the kind of language that spells it out, so that at least I can understand it.

MR. DZIEZYC: Martin Luther King is a City legal holiday but there are many employees that have to work in the Sewage plant, and in other sections. With this contract, they won't get double time if they work. They get a day off. It's going to save money. It's still a legal holiday. No matter what day you have, still some people have to work on legal holidays.

MR. CONTI: May I ask how many paid legal holidays are in this contract? 12½ and by not listing Martin Luther King as a holiday does not this in effect make it 13½? If they had listed it as one of the 12½, they would have had to give up one other day, but by not listing it, it makes it a 13½ paid holiday situation.

MR. BLUM: They had 13½ paid holidays. They gave us one holiday and that was called picnic day. They never took the picnic so they actually gave nothing away, but they had a holiday that was passed in this City and this ordinance was signed by the Mayor who is now in office and he in the long run is the guy that initials the contract. If he really wanted a holiday, Martin Luther King holiday, he would have made sure there was a Martin Luther King holiday.

I would like to read from the Minutes of the Bd. of Representatives dated July 13, 1979 is when this went into effect; submitted by Raymond G. Bernier and it says: now, therefore, be it ordained in the City of Stamford that January 15 of each year be declared a legal holiday and that only those City personnel actually necessary to maintain the good and order of this City shall work on that day.

If the 15th of January shall fall on a Saturday, the previous day, Friday, shall be that date for the legal observance. If the 15th of January shall be on a Sunday, then the following Monday shall be the date of the observance.

MR. ESPOSITO: I was a very vocal supporter of this ordinance, which doesn't change my opinion of what we're saying here tonight. We blame the Mayor, the negotiator; this contract was negotiated by two parties. Apparently, the MEA bargaining unit has approved this contract. Essentially, what we are saying here is that you did not ask for time and a half on this particular day, we insist that you take it, please or we are not going to accept this contract and they told us they were willing to negotiate a number of other things but they didn't want time and a half for this holiday. The City is still closed. They still don't have to work. It is legally a holiday. We're insisting that they take extra pay.

MRS. GUROIAN: MOVE the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will vote on the MEA/Case-workers contract for the City of Stamford.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The vote is 23 in the affirmative; 12 in the negative, 1 abstained. The contract has been CARRIED.

MR. BLUM: I do hope that something will be done about this contract. They still have time to put an admendment to this contract.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Donald Donahue, Chairman

MR. DONAHUE: Planning and Zoning met on Friday, May 30, with Reps. Guroian, Stork, Fasanelli, Wider and Donahue in attendance.

(1) PROBLEM OF TRUCK STORAGE - Residential Zones.-

MR. DONAHUE: That item will be HELD pending investigation by the Committee. The Committee realizes that it has been considered by a number of other Committees and we hope to have something concrete by next month.

(2) REFERRAL FROM ACTION OF PLANNING BOARD DENYING MASTER PLAN APPLICATION MP-243 JOHN M. STRAZZA and ANTHONY M. LUPPINACCI, TO AMEND THE MASTER PLAN BY CHANGING THE EXISTING LAND USE CATEGORY DESIGNATED "RESIDENTIAL, MULTI-FAMILY, LOW DENSITY" TO THE LAND USE CATEGORY DESIGNATED "RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE FAMILY PLOTS LESS THAN ONE ACRE."

MR. DONAHUE: This item is also HELD. We had both sides of this issue come before us and present their opinions concerning the action of the Planning Board, and we are awaiting a transcript of the Planning Board's hearing and once we have that, we will be able to make a recommendation next month.

(3) PROPOSED ORDINANCE AND PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING POSITION OF "ZONING ANALYST" submitted by Martin P. Levine, Chairman, Zoning Board - to cover hiring, effective April 21, 1980, of M. F. Brady, for one year, per contract submitted and signed; eight-week probationary period commencing 4/21. Finance Comm. O.A. Hoffman 5/13/80 letter has extended Mrs. Brady's pay until July 31, 1980 to allow time to approve the proposed ordinance and proposed resolution.

MR. DONAHUE: This is really a matter of housekeeping of accounting. A Zoning Analyst has been hired by the City. We have a signed contract and the Analyst has, in fact, been working for the City since April 21.

The Zoning Board had the approval of the Mayor, the Board of Finance, the approval for funding of the Board of Representatives and, in fact, has the approval for the funding for this position for the next year.

In order for this employee to be paid, an ordinance and resolution must be passed as a technicality enabling the Commissioner of Finance to keep issuing checks for this position. The Planning and Zoning Committee feels strongly that this, again, a matter of housekeeping and we would MOVE tonight to waive publication of this ordinance in the interest of saving time and efficiency and money that it may save us. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI: Why is there a need to waive publication as opposed to just publishing it as has been our normal course of procedure?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. DONAHUE: Basically, it is in the interest of efficiency. This individual has already been hired. She has begun her work. The monies have been approved for this position and we are agreed in principle that a comprehensive rezoning of the City is necessary. I do not see a need to hold this item for another month simply to come back here after it has been in the paper and vote on it a month from now. There's no necessity of our publishing this item.

MR. ZELINSKI: She was hired when; effective April 21, 1980?

MR. DONAHUE: That's correct.

MR. ZELINSKI: Why weren't we asked to pass this ordinance prior to her hiring? Seems like we're closing the barn door after the horse is out. I'm not disagreeing with this. It's a matter of procedure. We are going to be doing things and passing ordinances after the fact. It doesn't seem like proper procedure.

Do you have any reason why the Zoning Board waited until now to ask for the ordinance as opposed to when this originally came up, that they didn't ask for it back in March or even back in April?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski, if the Board chooses to waive publication, then we are going to be able to discuss the ordinance at great length. This is just to waive publication.

To waive publication requires a solid 27 votes at a minimum. The question is on waiving publication of the ordinance for the position of Zoning Analyst. The vote is 28 in favor; 4 opposed. CARRIED.

We will now vote on the final adoption of the ordinance. Mr. Donahue, I will accept a motion to that affect.

MR. DONAHUE: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLEM: I'd like to speak in opposition to this because of the ordinance as it is written now. I come to the part: Now therefore be it ordained by the City of Stamford that a position of Zoning Analyst is hereby created and designated an unclassified position. The services of the Zoning Analyst are to be obtained on an independent contractor basis, and I object to that because independent contractor basis is a consultant in my language. An independent contractor is a consultant. We go on to the Candidate shall be included to the extent eligible to be paid benefits programs made available to employees of comparable status.

Do we hire consultants to get fringe benefits? I ask that question of Mr. Donahue. I never knew that we are hiring a consultant for one year duration to take up an item that is badly needed in this City, yes, but we're hiring her as a consultant, independent now, and we're saying give this candidate fringe benefits. To me that's wrong.

MR. DONAHUE: You may define independent contractor as a consultant if you wish but the ordinance defines it as a Zoning Analyst. The terminology has been copied from other ordinances that the City has used in the past for hiring this type of position; word for word. There is a contract already signed, both by the City of Stamford and the person that's been hired in good faith and the terms of the contract have been negotiated in good faith.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. CORBO: I'd like to speak against this ordinance. We don't need this position at all. I don't know why the Zoning Board decided to create this position when we have a wonderful man, a great asset to the City of Stamford, who is Jon Smith. He has all the studies for the City of Stamford that we could want. If we ask him any questions, he has the answers.

What is this Zoning Analyst going to do? What is the purpose? I don't believe at this point from 1952 to '80, we have 28 years of existing zoning laws; we want to change all of a sudden. We are disregarding Jon Smith's opinion, background and studies throughout these 28 years, and we introduce an outsider to solve our zoning problems.

I would like my Colleagues to vote against this. Eliminate this position altogether, and go back to Jon Smith who is an asset to the City of Stamford.

MR. ZELINSKI: Has this ordinance been approved by the Corporation Counsel's office?

MR. DONAHUE: It is an exact copy of a form that has been used by the City in the past for various positions of this type.

MR. ZELINSKI: Am I to understand that if this ordinance is passed this evening, the person involved will be eligible for all benefits, fringe benefits of the City as is accorded other full time Civil Service employees.

MR. DONAHUE: No, that is not correct.

MR. ZELINSKI: Which benefits would they be entitled to?

MR. DONAHUE: The ones that were negotiated upon and signed into the contract. Only those that apply to positions of this type.

MR. ZELINSKI: What are the benefits; do you know? Hospitalization, insurance, things like that?

MR. DONAHUE: She will be included to the extent eligible in the City paid benefits program made available to employees comparable status; that is, Non-Civil Service employees - subject to the approval of the Board of Representatives.

MR. ZELINSKI: It still doesn't answer my question. We're approving it but what benefits? There are various Boards and Commissions within the City that their employees are not members of the Civil Service and I recall at that time that each particular case was voted on as ordinance was passed and it was specified which benefits would be payable to them; which benefits and a cost factor because I'm sure this person is getting a good salary, and again, I want to reiterate, I'm not against the principle of it but I am concerned with opening up the door as far as doing this and giving

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing)... some of these benefits that are actually accorded only for Civil Service people. Do you know exactly what benefits she is going to receive in this position?

MR. DONAHUE: The contract is very specific in saying Non-Civil Service employees. What we're talking about is sick-leave, vacation, holidays, hospitalization and workmen's compensation.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: MOVE the question

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will vote on final adoption of an ordinance concerning the position of Zoning Analyst and Resolution as well.

MR. ZELINSKI: POINT OF INFORMATION: First, there is an ordinance and two, there is a Resolution. Do we have to vote on both of them at one time, or individually, which is the proper procedure?

MR. DONAHUE: We will first vote on the ordinance and we will vote on the resolution as second, as the wording of the resolution refers to the ordinance.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The ordinance requires 21 votes for passage. 30 in the affirmative; 4 in the negative; 2 abstentions. CARRIED.

MR. DONAHUE: I would MOVE now to accept the resolution concerning the Zoning Analyst.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED and SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: What we're voting here for is that we're going to give this analyst or this consultant a vacation for one year of service, sick leaves, holidays shall be afforded to the employee in the same manner and extent as other non-civil service employees.

MR. DZIEZYC: I was on the Zoning Board when Jon Smith recommended that we hire an outside analyst to conduct the comprehensive zoning because he didn't have the Staff.

MR. DeNICOLA: Why are we even voting when the contract is already signed?

MR. DONAHUE: After the Zoning Board received the recommendation, or the agreement of the Mayor and Board of Finance, the Board of Representative's Fiscal Committee, funding for this year and also for next year and they went out and hired, as their right, this individual. The Commissioner of Finance, and very correctly so, found that no resolution was ever officially passed by this Board that allowed him to sign the check. We are only tonight rectifying that mistake, and we are now allowing the Commissioner of Finance to pay this person who has been hired and has a signed contract.

MRS. MAIHOCK: If you will look at #2, it says this resolution shall take effect upon enactment of ordinance number blank supplemental. Since we have now voted on the ordinance, is it really necessary for us to vote on the resolution?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. DONAHUE: According to the Commissioner of Finance, yes it is. An ordinance and resolution is necessary.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: The vote is 32 in favor; 4 abstentions. CARRIED.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I don't know how many times this has happened since this Board has commenced. This is another instance where we're voting after the fact to approve a contract which has been signed, sealed and delivered. Something is inherently wrong with a system that functions that way where we are really, in essence, acting as a rubber stamp.

I don't know the answer, but I'm going to put something before the Steering Committee to go to the appropriate committee.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Alfred Perillo and Everett Pollard

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Perillo and Mr. Pollard are out this evening. Is there anyone here who attended and who can report on what occurred?

- (1) CITY REP. GABE DeLUCA's LETTER 4/16/80 requesting Public Works Committee hear members of the Stamford Taxpayers Assn. and the City-Wide Refuse Co. on the subject of trash pick-up by private collectors.

MR. ROOS: We met with Mr. Spaulding. Mr. Pollard and I were there. We just discussed various questions that we had as to City-Wide Refuse and Taxpayers, but all that is being HELD.

- (2) THE PROBLEM OF SNOW HAZARDS FROM MR. APPEL - submitted by Rep. Stork.

Mr. Appel was there and voiced his opinions on snow removal and men working on same. He decided to meet with Mr. Spaulding later.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

MRS. SANTY: The campaign against Cooley's anemia will hold a screening program at the Italian Center on June 14 from noon to 4:00 p.m. The program consists of a blood test and educational presentation. It is open to the public and it's free of charge. They are urging this Board to publicize and encourage all area residents to attend.

MR. JOYCE: As a member of the Health and Protection Committee, I would like to extend an invitation to other Board members who are having police problems in their district, to contact me. In my district, we are having a lot of break and entry problems. I'm trying to get an idea of what other areas in town are having a particular heavy increase in breaking and entering.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on May 28, 1980. Attending were Reps. Rybnick, Rinaldi and myself and Bob Gillespie, the Shellfish Commission Chairman.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (1) REQUEST TO APPROVE PERMIT FEES FOR STAMFORD RESIDENTS TO TAKE SHELLFISH FROM LOCAL WATERS PER HEALTH DEPT. RULES - \$3.00 annual fee; and FREE permits for senior citizens with senior I.D. cards.

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 against, for approval and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY: I would like to compliment the Shellfish Commission for their concern for Stamford's elderly. I am please that there will be no fee for our Senior Citizens.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Who is going to sell the permits?

MR. DeLUCA: Permits will be sold at the Town Clerk's office. At the same time, permits are issued there will be a brochure and map issued as to where the waters are where you can clam.

MR. WIDER: I did have some concern with their fees. I had concern for one specific reason which has been cleared up. We were charging a fee where the State had posted signs saying, "No shellfish, clams, ormussels would be taken". We did have an investigation. We found out that the sign doesn't mean anything. For the people in the listening audience who read the sign like I did, that sign doesn't mean anything.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Approval for Item #1 is CARRIED.

- (2) PERMIT REQUESTED FROM ST. TEODORO SOCIETY, 107 WEST AVENUE to hold their Annual Feast to be held on their grounds. To be held Aug. 28, 29, 30, 31, and Sept. 1, 1980.

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee voted 3 in favor; 0 against, for approval and I so MOVE. SECONDED. CARRIED.

- (3) LETTER 5/1/80 FROM TRAFFIC DEPT. REITERATING only one location is available for banners; on Summer Street across from the Pancake House. They have removed support poles from Summer St. and Second St. Also advise that they cannot erect banners at Springdale Fire House.

MR. DeLUCA: This should have been left off the agenda. This is just for informational purposes as to where we can hang banners.

I'd like to bring up an item under Suspension of the Rules. This is an item of primary interest to the Parks Department. It concerns the rates to be applied to Terry Connors' rink.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED

- (4) SUMMER RATES FOR TERRY CONNERS' SKATING RINK.

MR. DeLUCA: In the past, the Rink has Summer rates which were lower than our Winter rates. Primarily, because of the increase in fuel costs, it is recommended that the Summer rates be the same as the Winter rates which we just approved several months ago.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing)...The proposed rates to be used all season long are for ultra-prime \$70.00 per hour, prime-time \$60.00 per hour and non-prime \$50.00 per hour. I would urge approval of these fees so they can go into effect immediately.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to extend a vote of thanks to the Parks Department for their wonderful Spring Festival which was held on May 17. Various garden clubs contributed time and effort as well as the Historical Society. Cove Island is a fantastic park and well maintained by our Parks Department.

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 Stanley Darer and Lathon Wider, Sr.

MR. WIDER: The Public Housing and Community Development Committee met on May 28, at 7:30 p.m. Present were Co-Chairman Stanley Darer, Mr. John Roos, and Lathon Wider.

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

MR. WIDER: The vote is 3 to 0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

- (2) CHANGE IN SCDP (Stamford Community Development Program) to the Board of Representatives from QUARTERLY Reports to SEMI-ANNUAL Reports. Mayor's letter 5/19/80.

MR. WIDER: Item 2 was held in Committee because we want to look into the program about quarterly reports and see if we can make it more effective by having a semi-annual report.

- (3) RESOLUTION TO INCORPORATE STAMFORD'S NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROGRAM.

MR. WIDER: This is similar to Item #1 so this was crossed off the agenda.

- (4) THE DRAFT THREE-YEAR BUSINESS PLAN FOR STAMFORD ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE CORPORATION (SEAC). Mayor's 5/19/80 letter of multi-subjects.

MR. WIDER: This discussion will be continued. We do need more communications from Mr. David Anderson, President of SEAC.

- (5) STATE URBAN ACT GRANT APPLICATION. Mayor's 5/19/80 letter, multi-subjects.

MR. WIDER: We do have an application for the Urban Act Grant where we may be able to obtain \$600,000 from various Grants to be put in for the purchase of property so that we may be able to build some housing.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (6) DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING GRANT APPLICATION - Mayor's 5/19/80 letter, multi-subjects.

MR. WIDER: We may be able to receive, I'm quoting; "We may be able to receive \$200,000 for the multi-purpose of housing". We will have a follow-up on this.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli - NO REPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock - NO REPORT

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby - NO REPORT

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

MR. JOYCE: We are going to have a meeting on June 16, for a presentation by engineers on the People-Mover System. I believe you have or will be receiving something on this.

We are inviting members of the Transit District and also State officials.

SPECIAL "ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION" STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman Fiorenzo Corbo

- (1) PROGRESS REPORT.

MR. CORBO: The On-site Refuse Conversion Committee met Thursday, May 29, 1980. In attendance were myself, Grace Guroian, Betty Conti and David Blum, Committee; Commissioner Spaulding, Mr. Ketcham, and Mr. Brennan from Management. Also, Mr. Wall from Dorr-Oliver, Dr. Marvin Nathan, Tony Buonicore, and Dr. Gosta Truedsson.

There was a very interesting exchange of ideas as to short and long-range suggestions. I would like to thank the Commissioner for his short-range suggestions. The Commissioner described the present operations to the guests.

We exchanged views with our guests as how to eliminate the \$2 or 3 million haul-away program that this City is now financing and through the years. There was discussion on conversion of this refuse and sludge to produce steam heat that can be used for heat or cooling or electricity. We were talking about a marketable product like fertilizer. Unfortunately, the guest that should have been there to talk about the last system, was not able to attend the meeting. His name is Mr. Reinecker. We intend to invite him again. This Committee is going to look deeper into this type of conversion. We may have enough heat and energy to supply our plant and/or City buildings.

SPECIAL "ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION" STUDY COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. CORBO: (continuing)...I want to thank Dr. Marvin Nathan of Crawford and Russell, Tony Buonicore from York Research, Mr. Wall from Dorr-Oliver and Dr. Gosta Truedsson, who is always ready to participate in any way that he can to assist us in our needs. He is a physicist. We should use his knowledge for the benefit of the City.

We are going to send invitations to tour the Sewage Treatment Plant as soon as possible. With the help of the Consultants and this Committee, I think we are going to get good results.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONEPETITIONS - NONEACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

March 20, 1980 Special Meeting (re URC and Question-and-Answer Period)
HELD May 5, 1980 by Rep. Zelinski. Some sets of minutes came from the Print Shop with page 6 mixed up, wrong page.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AS CORRECTED.

May 5, 1980 Regular Monthly Board Meeting - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AS CORRECTED BELOW.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I believe there is a correction.

MRS. CONTI: We have on page 16 and page 25, remarks that were attributed to me but actually they were made by Mr. Conti. I would like to have that corrected.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Darer mentioned in Caucus earlier that on pages 22 and 23, he made remarks that were pertinent to his feelings on URC and he doesn't think that they were all included. Would you please check the recording and make sure that they are put in verbatim.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mrs. McInerney, would you inform Mr. Darer that whatever he wants put in the Minutes, we would like to receive it from him in writing because there was about three pages and I have instructed the Staff that we are going to start scrutinizing our Minutes because they are so lengthy. Would you ask Mr. Darer whatever he would like to be part of the Minutes, to please put it in writing and give it to us.

MRS. McINERNEY: I will. It was his indication to the Republican Caucus that he felt his remarks were pertinent enough to be included verbatim, and those were his wishes. I'm sorry he's not here to say something.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES (continuing)

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to make a motion that we hold these Minutes. I did not receive the Minutes until Saturday afternoon. I was away for the week-end and did not have the opportunity to completely read it and before I could vote to accept the Minutes, I would like the opportunity to finish reading them; and to be no harm done, I'd like to MOVE that we hold it for one month. The other corrections can be in and we can vote on the whole package next month.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: When we correct Minutes, we do not do the entire Minutes. We just indicate the corrections and date it. However, if you have a motion to hold the Minutes, if it's seconded, we will vote on it. There is NO SECOND then I will accept a motion to accept the Minutes as corrected. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: Would it be possible to have the Minutes mailed prior to the week-end of our next Board Meeting to give us ample time to read the Minutes. It's difficult if you are away for the week-end and then Monday, the day of the Meeting, you're usually preparing for it. It's not that easy to be able to read the Minutes. If all possible, to get it two or three days before the week-end.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'm very sorry we will not be able to entertain what you are asking. The answer is no. We will try. As you know if you look at the Minutes of the previous Board, the Staff is speeding up their progress as far as getting us the Minutes before the Meetings. I will assure you that I will in turn, try to ask the Staff to do their best but I cannot promise you that.

RESOLUTIONS - NONE

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - NONE

OLD BUSINESS - NONE

NEW BUSINESS - NONE

ADJOURNMENT -

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION of Rep. Blum, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 P.M.

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

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
16th Board of Representatives

(The above meeting was broadcast in its entirety by WSTC-WYRS Radio)

HMM:AK