

MINUTES OF MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 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, August 4, 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 9:08 P.M. by the President, Sandra Goldstein, after both parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION was given by the Rev. William A. Nagle, St. John's Roman Catholic Church, Atlantic Street, Stamford. Ms. Goldstein thanked Rev. Nagle for his patience.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG was led by President Sandra Goldstein.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Anne M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 36 members present and 4 absent. The absent members were: Paul Esposito, Doris Bowlby, Anthony Conti, and John Kunsaw.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: President Goldstein conducted a check of the voting equipment. After some adjustments by Mr. Thomsen, the equipment operated satisfactorily.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would just like to make one observation and that is, after many months of being out, Mr. Perillo has joined us tonight. We are very happy to see you looking healthy and here with us.

PAGES: LISA WIEDERLIGHT, 10 years old, Newfield School, daughter of Rep. Michael Wiederlight.

BETH AGNEW, 10 years old, Davenport Ridge School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

Rep. John Zelinski asked for a Moment of Silence for the late THOMAS LIVOLSI, SR. also for the late EDWARD CZUPKA, who served as a State Senator from 1949-1951 and also as a City Court Clerk from 1951-1953.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

MR. RYBNICK: I want to read a Citation from the Connecticut General Assembly for a former member of this Board who spent 28 years as a member of the Board of Representatives; and I am honored that he asked me to read this:

"BE IT HEREBY KNOWN IN ALL THAT the Connecticut House of Representatives hereby offers its sincerest congratulations to GEORGE and ANNE CONNORS in recognition of their 50th wedding anniversary on July 1, 1980. The entire membership extends its very best wishes on this memorable occasion and expresses the hope for continued success. Given this 22nd day of July, 1980 at the State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut; Ernest A. Abate, Speaker, and Barbara B. Kennelly, Secretary of State." (Introduced by State Rep. Ernest A. Abate, Stamford.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Our warmest congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Connors also on the celebration of their anniversary.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I have many announcements to make. First, I would like to thank the League of Women Voters, who have provided us once again with their beautiful book "They Represent Us", and it is on everybody's desk tonight.

Secondly, on Monday, October 6th, which is our October Board meeting, pictures of the Board will be taken. Notification will be sent to everyone, but I do want everyone to be aware that on October 6th, we will have our group picture.

APPOINTMENTS TO CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE:

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Co-chairpersons are John Hogan and Grace Guroian.
The members are: Barbara McInerney
Vincent DeNicola
Mary Lou Rinaldi

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, July 21, 1980, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called for 7:30 P.M. and began at 7:40 P.M. when a QUORUM was achieved. Chairlady Sandra Goldstein called the meeting to order.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairlady
 John J. Boccuzzi
 Handy Dixon
 Paul Esposito
 John Zelinski (7:54 p.m.)
 David Blum
 Michael Wiederlight
 Richard Fasanelli
 Lathon Wider, Sr.
 Jeremiah Livingston

Barbara McInerney
 Jeanne-Lois Santy
 Robert Fauteux
 Audrey Maihock (8:00 p.m.)
 Fiorenzo Corbo (8:47 p.m.)
 John J. Hogan, Jr.
 Donald Donahue
 Marie Howe
 Radio WSTC-WYRS
 Stamford Advocate

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the five names appearing on the Steering Agenda.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the ten items appearing on the Steering Agenda.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were ten items: (a) proposed tax abatement ordinance for final adoption for Greenwich Land Trust; (b) proposed ordinance re eligibility limits and moving and relocation expense concerning condominiums; (c) proposed ordinance for publication re safety of construction equipment; (d) proposed ordinance for publication re Code of Ethics concerning gifts to officers and employees of the City; (e) proposed ordinance re enclosing of swimming pools, for publication; (f) proposed ordinance for publication for tax abatement for Asst. Pastor's residence of Zion Lutheran Church; (g) proposed ordinance for re-publication for tax abatement for Girl Scouts; (h) proposed ordinance for publication for tax abatement for Bell St. and Tresser Blvd. property owned by St. John's R.C. Church; (i) proposed ordinance for publication re gradual increases in assessed values after revaluation; (j) the matter of Supreme Court ruling that citizens may sue officials.

ORDERED HELD were (i) proposed ordinance for publication for tax abatement for Nature Conservancy; (ii) proposed follow-up to resolution regarding failure of City to enforce Ordinance 340 mandating Spring and Fall clean-up; (iii) the matter of Fairfield Health Plan (HMO) and tax abatement of \$146.44 which Rep. Zelinski brought up orally.

ORDERED OFF the Agenda were (I) proposed ordinance for publication for tax abatement for The Hanrahan Center; (II) proposed ordinance for publication to control and regulate excavation, filling and grading. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE AND MOVED TO CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE was proposed ordinance for publication to appoint three alternate members to the Board of Finance.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first two items: Proposed Changes to Merit Rules System, and the Affirmative Action Policy of Stamford. ORDERED OFF the Agenda for re-submission was Advocate article of 5/18/80 submitted by Rep. Betty Conti concerning "leave" policies of the City including maternity.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item of truck storage in residential zones.
ORDERED OFF the agenda was acceptance of Northwood Lane (Ext.) as not ready.

(6) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item re very low water pressure, inadequate for fire prevention or fire-fighting in the Dolphin Cove area.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the three items on the Steering Agenda. Also ORDERED ON was the request to hang a banner across Summer St. by the Women of St. Francis Episcopal Church.

(8) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was the request of Rep. Corbo for a special committee under Section 204.2 to inquire into hiring procedures of the school system.
ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a progress report to be given by Reps. Fauteux and Hogan on the Price, Waterhouse Review and Evaluation of Personnel Practices of Board of Education.

(9) SEWER MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the proposed ordinance for publication for storm sewer easement to Holly Pond Associates at East Main St., Weed & Waterbury Aves

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items: one being the Stamford Community Development Program to submit semi-annual instead of quarterly reports; and the other being the matter of safety, supervision, maintenance, etc. of Carwin Park.

(11) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the publication of proposed ordinance re control of aircraft, heliports, etc.

(12) ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a progress report.

(13) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a Resolution opposing a rate increase being applied for by the electric utility: HELCO, N.E. Utilities.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 9:20 P.M.

HMM:MS

Sandra Goldstein, Chairperson
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon - Chairman

MR. DIXON: July 31st was set as a meeting date for the Appointments Committee, but since only four committee members showed up, we could not successfully have our meeting; therefore, tonight I don't have a report to make.

HEALTH COMMISSIONTerm Expires

(1) DR. MICHAEL SABIA (R) 22 Rambler Lane	Re-appointment; whose term expired 12/1/79	Dec. 1, 1982
--	---	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEE

(2) Dr. ANGELO MASTRANGELO (R) 19 Grandview Avenue	Re-appointment; whose term expired 12/1/79	Dec. 1, 1982
---	---	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEEPERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

(3) JANET GARELIK (D) 29 Falmouth Road	Re-appointment; whose term expired 12/1/79	Dec. 1, 1984
---	---	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEEENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

(4) PAUL J. KUCZO (D) 239 Briar Brae Road	Re-appointment (term expired 12/1/79)	Dec. 1, 1982
--	--	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEEHUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(5) RICHARD ZERANSKI (R) 81 Crane Road North	Re-appointment (term expired 12/1/79)	Dec. 1, 1982
---	--	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEEFISCAL COMMITTEE - Marie Hawe - Co-Chairperson

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday evening, July 30th. Present were committee members Resp. B. Conti, Fauteux, Flounders, Hogan and Hawe.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

On the Agenda this evening are requests for \$3,281,130.20 in additional appropriations: \$98,238.62 in grant applications, and \$1,511,000.00 for the Public Works Department, Division Collection Budget. I would like to make a motion to put the following items on Consent Agenda: Item #1....

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is objection to that, so we will not put that on the Consent Agenda.

MRS. HAWE: Item #9.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Item #9 has been referred to the Personnel Committee. Does Personnel concur?

MR. BLUM: Personnel concurs.

- (1) \$ 47,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES ACCOUNT - Operating Budget Additional Appropriation. Request per Corp. Counsel Cookney's 4/18/80 letter to fund outside legal services. Board of Finance approved 5/7/80.

MRS. HAWE: We met with Mr. Cookney concerning this item. Apparently, when the request was first put in in April, the amounts of money needed for various cases in progress was an estimation, since the bills were not in yet. On July 2nd. Mr. Cookney sent down to us an up-dated estimate of bills still to come in, and a list of those already received.

Last Wednesday, the Fiscal Committee was given copies of a final up-date. The bills have all been received, and this is the final breakdown of where these funds will go. Copies of this are on everyone's desk tonight. As you will notice, the final figure is \$48,377.52, which is \$1,377.52 more than the appropriation request. This is because several of the bills, noticeably York Research, were higher than expected. This additional amount will be noted as a deficit for Fiscal year 79/80 if the appropriation is passed.

Fiscal voted 5 in favor; none opposed and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FAUTEUX: Education, Welfare and Government voted 3-0 in favor with the Fiscal Committee. We are satisfied with the explanation from the Legal Department and specifically Mr. Cookney in explaining the items that he is requesting funding for.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Just to check with Fiscal. The explanation now before us is not the same as the explanation that was originally handed down to us when the appropriation was originally given to us, is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: That's correct, because the original was in part estimation of the bill....

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: The original also included \$5,000. for condominiums?

MRS. HAWE: That's right, the original estimation.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is it your belief now, that even though the back-up material is not the same as that that was used in the presentation to the Board of Finance, this appropriation would stand as far as the Board of Finance is concerned?

What I'm concerned about is, is our voting yes on this appropriation voting yes the same as what the board of Finance voted yes on?

MRS. HAWE: I would think so. I'm sure the Board of Finance was aware that these were not firm figures, that they were estimations. To tell you the truth, we were really satisfied with Mr. Cookney's explanation. I think it was just a matter of them not having the final bills in hand at that time and some came in more than they estimated, particularly the York Research came in quite a bit over what they anticipated.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I don't want to belabor the point, but, Mrs. Hawe, it's not the back-up material given to the Board of Finance, even though the estimates were different, it doesn't concern \$5,000. for defense of the Condo Ordinance which we no longer have to worry about. My only thinking is by us voting yes, is it legal as to the appropriation since approved by the Board of Finance? That's one; and number two, are we guaranteed that the figures shown to us on this paper are those bills that are going to be paid?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, to answer your second question first. These are the bills that are outstanding as of this time. These are the ones to be paid, we're guaranteed that this is where the money will go. As to whether it's legal to vote on something that the back-up material was slightly different than presented to the Board of Finance, I'm not the Corporation Counsel, but, it's the same amount of money, I think that's the thing that we vote on. If the back-up material changes within a month or two, I don't think that voids the Board of Finance's vote on it.

MR. BOCCUZZI: That's a matter of opinion.

MRS. GUROIAN yielded the floor to Mr. Joyce,

MR. JOYCE: I have been reviewing this question on the legal billing and the request for additional appropriations; you know, if we were going to have a meaningful budgetary process in this City, it is really quite ridiculous to have us appropriate monies to operate any particular department, and the Law Department is no exclusion for this, and then have come back for additional appropriations as these particular items are brought in to us.

I noticed in this particular item, the matter of Mr. James Sotire, an outside counsel for Mr. Sotire is enumerated in the list which is on our desk this evening. I understand from the information that I have received, the City is obligated to defend employees, including policemen,

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. JOYCE: (continuing)...We are now going to have a case which has been reported in the newspaper, and is pending, having to do with a harassment item, a citizen taxpayer has been harassed by a police officer. This is going to give rise to a very large suit against the City. While the Police Association have their own attorney, their own counsel, are we going to have to retain counsel, the expense of trial counsel, to represent the City, and with the additional appropriation?

Sooner or later we have to come to grips with plugging this constant drain of taxpayers' dollars to defend city employees, who are taking advantage of taxpayers. I think it's a situation of where, if we don't begin to become frugal with our funds in these kind of matters, I think we are really open to criticism from the average taxpayers and people we are supposed to represent.

MRS. GUROIAN: I have a question. I hate to keep going back to this, about terminology. On this sheet listing the Legal Services, request for additional funds, the following sentence says: "the following bills are open for Fiscal 1979/80", does that really mean the following 1979/80 bills are open, are un-paid, or is the intention as it's implied on the agenda, that this will be charged to 1979/80, how does that happen?

MRS. HAWE: What will happen is, whether or not this appropriation goes through, these bills will be paid. If the appropriation does not go through, then it will be listed as a deficit in this account for that year. Even if it does go through, there will be a small deficit in this account, since the bills that came in are slightly larger than the \$47,000. appropriation. The bills are going to be paid. In the many accounts in the City, there are some that come in as surplus at the end of the year, and some in deficit. This will be one in deficit if we don't pass the appropriation.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm not talking about a deficit in the 1980/81 account for that purpose, I'm talking about the implication, it says 1979/80 Operating Budget additional appropriation. Does that mean that we are now going on a partial accrual system? It's now going to be charged to 1979/80, when by rights, it should be charged to 1980/81.

MRS. HAWE: This request started in April. This will be offset against last Fiscal year 1979/80, not this present Fiscal year.

MRS. GUROIAN: Why? We don't accrue receivables.

MRS. HAWE: All I can tell you is that if we don't approve this, there will be a deficit in this account. The bills are going to be paid anyway.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm not arguing whether they should be paid or not, I'm just trying to find out why it's being charged for a previous year, when the books on that are supposedly supposed to be closed.

MRS. HAWE: I don't think the books from last Fiscal year are quite closed yet.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. DeNICOLA: Maybe you can answer a question for me. On this breakdown, it says; "Of the approximate \$84,000. spent thus far for 1979/80, \$60,019. was for the Sewage Treatment Plant litigation. Can I get an answer for that?"

MRS. HAWE: I'm sorry I didn't understand the question.

MR. DeNICOLA: We have spent \$60,000. of the \$84,000. to one firm. So, if we get four or five of these cases, we're going to end up broke.

MRS. HAWE: The Sewage Treatment Plant is quite a case of its own, it's an enormous....there are millions of dollars involved in it and this has been going on for quite a few years; there is no other case like it and it's doubtful I think it will be. It involves potential loss or gain to the City of quite a few millions of dollars. York Research is also involved in this. This is the research firm, the technical firm involved, working with Tyler Cooper.

MR. ZELINSKI: Again, I don't mean to belabor this, but I have correspondence that we all received, it was addressed to the Co-Chairpeople, Mrs. Hawe and Mr. Esposito, it's dated July 7th. What concerns me is that in the list of papers here pertaining to this item, it has different figures from the figures we received tonight on our desk. What I'm referring to are two particular areas, one is Sewage Treatment Plant, Rep. Hawe, do you have that letter so you could follow me, it's dated July 2nd, Professional Services, it lists the four areas and the breakdown....

MRS. HAWE: Are you referring to July 7th or 2nd?

MR. ZELINSKI: The letter is dated July 7th, and it has about five or six sheets of paper, and the second to the last sheet is dated July 2nd, and says; "Inter-office Correspondence, Law Department", it just gives the breakdown of the estimates of the outstanding bills for Professional Service Account, 230.5110. Tonight I received on my desk and I'm sure everybody else did, the same type of inter-office correspondence memo dated July 30th and the same thing for the breakdown. What concerns me is that their figures are different.

One, is the first one dated Sewage Treatment Plant, the memo dated July 2nd refers to an outstanding balance of \$39,921.16. The information we received tonight, that particular item has \$41,184.60. I feel badly having to ask you this because, again, this came from the Law Department, but do you know why there is a difference in the Sewage Treatment from July 2 to July 30th being supposedly a close-out of June 30, 1980 in the Fiscal year.

MRS. HAWE: I had put these on your desk. This is what we have gotten in Committee last week. The paper you're referring to July 2nd. At that time, all the bills were not in, and the Law Department estimated as best they could, that the combined total for Tyler Cooper, which is the Attorney for the Sewage Treatment Plant, and York Research, would come to \$39,000. However, Mr. Cookney, specifically mentioned when we discussed this in committee, that the bills for York Research came in quite a bit higher than they had anticipated.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...So now, the final bills are in. This paper that was on your desk tonight is broken-down, shows \$31,000. for Tyler Cooper and \$9,000. for York Research. That was in particular, the bill that came in quite a bit over the estimation. That's why the difference is, the one on July 2nd was the best estimation at that time. This is the final bill; this is what the bill they have in hand is.

MR. ZELINSKI: In other words, I can believe that the original estimate on July 2nd, those figures were simply what bills they had outstanding as of July 2nd.

Mrs. HAWE: Yes, what they had outstanding, plus an estimation of what they knew would be coming in soon, they knew that York Research had done more work, they hadn't gotten the bill and were estimating, but, they were a little off as can happen with estimations. These are the actual bills that they have, the paper we got tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI: But, in other words again, the inter-correspondence memo here, July 2nd, those figures were the bills as of then, and as you said some more came in since then and that's why there is a difference.

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MR. ZELINSKI: That clears that up. One final question. The only thing that again concerns me, the same memo, July 2nd, has the Police case; I'm not going to mention names; it's the last item on that page, has \$ 5,000; the one on our desk tonight has \$3,218.41., the difference of about \$1,800. less than what was said on July 2nd. If we have passed at our last Board Meeting, we would have passed an additional \$1,800. I guess that was the wrong estimate. Right?

MRS. HAWE: Just as the estimate for York Research, maybe I didn't make this clear, on July 2nd memo, it was bills that they had from York Research, plus an estimation of bills yet to come in, the same was the one with the Police case. As it turns out, they had estimated low for York Research and estimated high for the Police case. The Police case bill only came in at \$3,200.; York Research came in at \$9,000. as it turns out, it averaged out about the same, but, the estimation was high. This July 2nd, was an estimation, some bills were in but they also hadn't gotten all their bills for the year, so they estimated what the bills would be, they didn't know for sure.

MR. ZELINSKI: (some part missing due to change of tape)...can ask because what if someone moves the question before I have a chance to ask my last question...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You've mentioned a few last questions, please let this be the last question.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: This is the last and final and I'm sorry to belabor it, but, it does concern me. I don't know how the Law Department operates, I would assume that before they go out and get an outside consultant or an outside attorney to be hired, was it ever brought up in Fiscal that a figure is decided upon, or are we just going out and saying we're going to hire somebody "carte blanche" and then they are going to come in with estimates and bills and we're going to end up paying thousands and thousands of dollars. Do they do this or do you know what the procedure is? And that's my final question.

MRS. HAWE: I think, as far as I know, in some cases a limit is put on, however, a person's work might continue from one fiscal year to another. It's not sure how much of that limit might be spent in one fiscal year and how much in another. In others I don't think there is a monetary limit, I assume that discussion is had, .it's known in round figures or round numbers, how many hours will be spent but, in any particular month, I don't think it can be determined exactly how many hours will be spent on any particular item.

Plus, in addition, with the Sewage Treatment Plant case, for example, if one of the partners in the firm works on the case on some very complex matter, his price per hour is much higher than a junior attorney. It's not always known each month what the ratio of work is, so I don't think that the bills that are going to come in each month are known exactly to the dollar.

MR. WIDER: I seem to be battling with past action of this Board. Am I to understand, through you to the Chairman of Fiscal, that the Board of Finance acted on \$47,000.

MRS. HAWE: Correct.

MR. WIDER: This extra \$1,377.52 was not acted on by the Board of Finance, was it

MRS. HAWE: No, but we're only voting on the \$47,000.

MR. WIDER: What do they mean by bill up-date?

MRS. HAWE: When they sent down the appropriation request in April, it was an estimate of what their bills would be to the end of the Fiscal year. The estimate was slightly off, they need \$1,377.52 more than they had requested back in April which was several months ago. \$47,000. is the only number before us, we can only approve that or approve less or approve none at all. So what would happen to the additional \$1,377.52 is that it would be entered as a deficit at the end of the Fiscal year.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to remind the Board members that we are talking about bills that were incurred in Fiscal year 79/80. We are now in Fiscal 80/81 and these bills are outstanding and I think it's irresponsible for us not to pay our bills. If we allowed our taxpayers to withhold payment of their taxes to this extent, we would be screaming our heads off and the City would come to a screaming halt. I think we should pay these bills and stop quibbling about it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Just a question to Mrs. Hawe through the Chair. This memo dated July 30th which indicates the bills of \$48,377.52. Is that for monies that are already incurred or is there any estimated sums included in that?

MRS. HAWE: These are actual bills; this is it for last fiscal year. These are the bills, this is the total that is owed for last fiscal year. There is no estimate.

MRS. McINERNEY: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will vote on the main question, \$47,000. for the Law Department which has been MOVED and SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote)

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF ORDER. I believe Item #10 should be on the Consent also, if I'm not mistaken.

MRS. HAWE: I can answer that. In the Resolution we have to pass, there is a slight change, so I didn't put it on Consent for that reason.

(2) \$ ~~46,810.00~~ - MUNICIPAL SALARY INCREASES FOR NON-CLASSIFIED (NON-CIVIL SERVICE) EMPLOYEES - Various departments - to receive same as MEA - details to be provided. Board of Finance approved June 18, 1980. RETROACTIVE to July 1, 1979.

F/Y 7/1/79 - 6/30/80	\$14,178.00
F/Y 7/1/80 - 6/30/81	<u>32,632.00</u>
	\$46,810.00
DEDUCT	<u>1,875.00</u>
	\$44,935.00

MRS. HAWE: Item #2 is a request to fund the Municipal salary increases for Non-Classified employees. We have received a detailed breakdown of the various departments and positions who will receive these increases. The Committee has however, reduced the request by \$1,875, bringing the appropriation down to \$44,935. We have taken \$90.00 from the increase slated to go to the part-time investigator in the Fair Rent Commission. This is because this person only worked part of the last Fiscal year and, therefore, should not receive the full retroactive increase. We have also removed \$677.00 from last Fiscal year and \$1,108. from this Fiscal year from the W.I.C. account, A lab technician divides her time between the W.I.C. Program and the Drug Forensic Lab. The portion of this individual that works for the W.I.C. participated in the recent W.I.C. raise which we approved on May 5th. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed and one abstention and I so MOVE.

MR. BLUM: Secondary Committee concurs 5-0.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If you have no further elaboration and there is no further discussion, we will proceed to a vote. The question is on \$44,935. that is the new figure as presented by Fiscal for Municipal Salary Increases for Non-Classified employees. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote)

- (3) \$ 3,374.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - CODE ENFORCEMENT - Code 551.7559 - WINTER ENERGY GRANT - This is additional money received from State in grant (award was \$77,647 but actually they sent \$81,021), and will fund program beyond the 6/30/80 original deadline. Per Mayor's request 5/2/80. Board of Finance approved 6/18.

MRS. HAWE: Item #3 is \$3,374. for the Health Department - Code Enforcement - Code 551.7559 - Winter Energy Grant. Fiscal voted 4 in favor and 1 opposed. This was sent back to Committee last month pending investigation by the Secondary Committee and Mrs. Santy will now comment on this.

MRS. SANTY: Health and Protection held a meeting on July 30th, and although I did not have a quorum, Miss Brewster came and explained the Grant and answered all our questions. I had a meeting this evening at 7:00 with the Committee and we voted 4 in favor and 1 abstaining on this Grant, and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: And Mrs. Hawe, your Committee?

MRS. HAWE: 4 in favor and 1 opposed.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: So that will serve as a SECOND.

MRS. MAIHOCK: May I ask when it says it goes beyond the 6/30/80 original deadline, how far ahead does it go then?

MRS. SANTY: Probably a year, nine months to a year.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no further question, we will proceed to a vote. The question is on \$3,374.00 for the Health Department. (Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Guroian will be noted as NO votes; Mrs. Perillo is abstaining). It has been PASSED.

- (4) \$ 3,000,000.00 - CLASSIFIED PENSION FUND - Code 293,1410 - Additional Appropriation from 1979-1980 Surplus per Mayor Clapes' letter of 5/30/80 and Finance Comm. Hoffman's letter 5/30/80. Board of Finance approved 6/18/80.

MRS. HAWE: Item #4 is a request for an additional appropriation of \$3,000,000.00 to the Classified Pension Fund, Code 293.1410. At the Committee Meeting, we heard from Finance Commissioner, Dr. Oscar Hoffman, and Mr. Fred King, who was invited to attend as a member of the former Charter Revision Commission, which had put into effect the stipulation that the pensions be funded each year according to actuary's recommendations.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...Fiscal has voted to deny this request; 2 in favor of denying, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions. In fairness, I will try to briefly sum up the arguments for and against, and those on the Committee who feel those ways can speak if they want.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Hawe, before you proceed to speak on it, in keeping with the procedure of this Board, we will need a motion to accept, while knowing that the Committee is coming out with a negative report on it.

MRS. HAWE: I so MOVE to approve this request for \$3,000,000. for the Classified Pension Fund.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED by Mrs. McInerney.

MR. FAUTEUX: The Education, Welfare and Government Committee voted none in favor; 2 against, with one abstention; and accordingly recommends against paying an additional \$3,000,000. into the Classified Pension Fund.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The primary and secondary committees came out with negative opinions on that appropriation.

MRS. HAWE: Those of us who were opposed to this appropriation felt that since taxpayers must absorb a deficit, whether it is a result of over-expenditures in Fiscal year, or due to a lower return on investments, or whatever the reason, the taxpayers must absorb this. Therefore, they should get the benefit of a surplus as well. The Pension Funds are now being funded by Charter according to the actuary's recommendation. The City is on a pay-as-you-go system and this should apply to surpluses as well.

Those who were in favor of this appropriation felt that this was a good opportunity, since we had realized such a high return on our investments last year, to put money into the Classified Funds and reduce our obligation. They felt that building this one-time surplus into the tax rate was not proper, and would probably result in a double increase in taxes two years from now.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no discussion before us, we will proceed to a vote. The question is on \$3,000,000. for the Classified Pension Fund. Both the primary and secondary committees have come out with negative reports, but we will be presenting a positive motion. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 7 in the affirmative and 24 in the negative, with 5 abstentions. The MOTION HAS BEEN DEFEATED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'd like to make a motion to have a letter directed to the Board of Finance indicating that this particular item was rejected based on the fact of the Fiscal Committee's report that the taxpayers must absorb deficits and should benefit from any surpluses. I think that very clearly indicates that would be the opinion of this Board.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no objection to those sentiments, we can send such a letter to the Board of Finance. There is none, Mrs. McInerney.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (5) \$ 162,700.20 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Additional Appropriation requested to fund 1980/1981 portion of contract with STAMFORD AIDE ASSN., per State Statute 7-474(d), submitted by B. R. Reed, Asst. Supt./Bus. Aff., Bd. of Education, Board of Finance approved 7/10/80.

MRS. HAWES: Item #5. The Committee voted to HOLD this item pending the answer of the Corporation Counsel to Rep. Blum's request that he has sent and we voted 5-0 to HOLD this.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to indicate the Board has received Corporation Counsel's opinion in relation to this and I assume it is on everyone's desk tonight. If it is not on the desk, I know that they had the opinion as of this afternoon, but I suppose they didn't have time to run it off for everyone. This will be held in Committee for another month.

MR. WIDER: Being aware that the Board does not have to approve this contract, I see absolutely no reason we should keep it in committee. This ruling came down four years ago to the Fiscal Committee, so I would like to move it out of committee and on the Agenda so we could get it off.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a motion to move Item #5 out of Committee and on to the Floor. SECONDED. This requires a majority vote. We will vote by the machine.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Let the record show that I'm not voting and leaving the floor.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Boccuzzi is going to leave the floor, Mr. Donahue is going to leave the floor and Mr. Dziezyc is going to leave the floor.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to speak before we vote on this particular motion of taking it out of Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, you can. First, let me just phrase the motion again. The motion before the Board is to take #5, the Board of Education, Stamford Aide Assn. contract out of Committee, It has been SECONDED and we may speak on the motion to take out of Committee.

MR. BLUM: Inasmuch as I being the one, Chairman of the Personnel Committee, who sent the letter to Mr. Cookney asking him for an opinion, and inasmuch as we just received, this evening, the opinion, I would say we would have to digest this opinion. Mr. Reed, who sent the letter to us, talking of Section 7-474(d) of the Connecticut General Statutes, does not speak of the entire Section of 7-474. In order for this to be interpreted, in my opinion, you must read Section B of the Law. I had our research person do some research for me. In the research, we found in 1971, this contract was approved by this Board. It was first rejected, and then approved at a Special Meeting. I'd like to read a section of the General Statutes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, I'm sorry I'm going to have to interrupt you. We are just talking about the merits of taking this out of Committee. If there are votes, and you have indicated that you don't feel it is right, and you have given your reasons for taking it out of Committee. If there are enough votes to take it out of Committee and put it on the floor, then what you are saying now is in order, so can you hold those remarks because we may never even get to that. I would urge everyone to take their seats because we are almost ready for a vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd just like to speak in favor of taking this out of Committee. I think it would be a disservice to the people involved in this contract to have to wait an extra month to receive their funds and I hope we can move it out of Committee and then I will discuss it further,

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote, there being no further discussion, we will vote by use of the machine. There being ten votes in the affirmative and 16 votes in the negative, this item CANNOT be taken out of Committee and we will proceed to #6 on the Agenda.

- (6) \$ 94,864.62 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - "ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS" - Additional appropriation requested from Admin., School Planning 6/13/80, for 100% Grant - for 3 teachers and 3 aides for Bi-Cultural Day, Holy Name of Jesus and Sacred Heart Elementary Schools. Board of Finance approved 7/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: Item #6 is \$94,864.62 for the Board of Education, English as a second language, non-public schools. This is a 100% Grant. It's for three teachers and three aides for the ESL Program which is a State mandated program. The money will go to Bi-Cultural Day School, Holy Name of Jesus School and Sacred Heart Elementary School. Grades 1 to 8 are involved in this. Fiscal voted 4 in favor; 0 opposed and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MR. FAUTEUX: Education, Welfare and Government concurs unanimously 3-0.

MR. BOCCUZZI: One question to Fiscal. I see it requires three teachers and three aides. What I'd like to know is when we approved the money for the Board of Ed's budget, were these three teachers and three aides in the budget at the time?

MRS. HAWE: These three aides were not included in the budget for City funds. These are aides; teachers and aides that are paid by grant. It's not in the school budget per se; does that answer your question?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Not quite. I'd like to know if the three teachers, who are going to teach English as a secondary language, and the three aides, when the Board of Education submitted the budget to us, were these three teachers and three aides included in their figure?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: As far as I understand, these teachers and aides who work under these programs that are paid for by grants are included in the budget but, also in the budget are listed the revenues that would come from the State; the revenues from the State would be off-set in the budget against this. We didn't appropriate money for this. They were listed in that big book that we got, but also listed was this money that was coming from the State.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask through you to Mrs. Hawe, why this particular item is before us when it's a 100% grant. I read a memorandum that came to us in which the Board of Education voted that where there are 100% grants, that they would take care of the grants and it didn't have to appear before us on the Board of Representatives. Now, I'm asking, here's a 100% grant and it appears before us this evening.

MRS. HAWE: You're very correct. What it is is if the grants are 100% prepaid grants, in which the money comes from the State or the Federal Government, or whatever, comes up front, we do not approve it. However, this is a 100% reimbursable grant, which means the City spends the money and it is then reimbursed. It has to come out initially out of the general fund. If it's a prepaid grant, we do not approve, and that was what the memo has said.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'd like to ask a question on this also. Mrs. Hawe, what happens when the grant runs out, or say the grant isn't approved next year?

MRS. HAWE: You mean if the State does not give us the money next year. Well, this program is State mandated. The Board of Education has to provide this program for the non-public schools and so there is no question that we have to provide it. If by any chance we turn down this grant application tonight, it would mean that the Board of Education would have to come up with the money themselves. If we pass it, it means that the money will come from the State. What the State usually does in this case, or cases of when they mandate programs such as these, is that they also fund them. I assume it's conceivable that the State could mandate it next year and not fund it, but, we have to provide them, it's mandated that the Board of Education provide this program; this ESL Program,

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The question is on Item #6, \$94,864.62 for the Board of Education - English as a second language, non-public schools. The MOTION IS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, (voice vote)

MRS. CONTI: Let the record show that I have abstained on this vote,

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Conti and Mr. Donahue have abstained from the vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (7) \$1,511,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - DIVISION OF COLLECTION - Code 350 - RECONSIDERATION OF DPW DIVISION OF COLLECTION - 1980-1981 OPERATING BUDGET; Approved by Board of Finance 7/10/80 (Per Court stipulation - in an amount not less than \$1,250,000.00).

	<u>Mayor's Request</u>
350.1110 Salaries	\$1,156,400.
350.1121 Differential 7½%	23,000.
350.1201 Over-Time	312,900.
350.1221 Clothing Allowance	10,800.
350.2310 Maintenance of Facilities	2,000.
350.2330 General Materials & Supplies - FAC	600.
350.2352 Protective Clothing	4,700.
350.2740 Telephone	400.
350.2930 Stationery and Supplies	200.
	<u>\$1,511,000.</u>

MRS. HAWE: Item #7 is \$1,511,000. for Public Works Department - Division of Collection, Code 350. reconsideration of Department of Public Works - Division of Collection 1980/81 operating budget.

Fiscal recommends no reduction in this budget. This budget includes the operating cost to collect refuse for the existing stops for 1,961 one-family and 74 two-family new stops which had previously been picked up by City Wide Refuse Company, and 681 one-family stops recently acquired because of newly sewerred areas. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and none opposed to approving this appropriation. I did not ask to put it on Consent because we do have a Resolution that we have to pass and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We're going to need a motion to waive the secondary Committee report. SECONDED. CARRIED. I need a second for Mrs. Hawe's motion. It has been SECONDED. Mr. Pollard, do you still wish to speak.

MR. POLLARD: I'd like to recommend a reduction of \$224,355.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Are you making a motion to that effect? Can you please give me that number again.

MR. POLLARD: A reduction of \$224,355.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there a second to Mr. Pollard's motion? There is no second. Is there any other discussion on this motion?

MR. BLUM: I would just like to say that I intend to abstain from this entire proceeding for I feel that in the very beginning when this came before us, an opinion was given by the then Corporation Counsel Mr. Cookney, this Board tended to not even listen to it. Now, today, because of a Court opinion, all of a sudden Mr. Cookney's opinion becomes the Holy Gospel, I feel at that time when we acted upon the budget, we should have acted upon...in fact, I think we acted upon the budget inasmuch as the Charter said by not taking a vote on that particular part of the budget, we in a sense approved it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BLUM: (continuing)...Therefore, I feel that we should all abstain because at that time, came July 1st we still had garbage collections. There was never a time when the garbage collection was ever interrupted. Therefore, I am going to abstain on any motion pertaining to this particular item.

MR. POLLARD: I'm going to vote against this motion. As many of you know, I have spent a lot of time analyzing the analysis that was submitted by Public Works Commissioner Spaulding. I've had a lot of conversations with people who work in the Division of Collection.

Unfortunately, the day I was leaving on vacation, a week ago, I had a call from a fellow who told me of days where men are receiving not only time-and-a-half, but triple time in order to maintain a minimum standard of collection. Until I have a chance to get a more thorough explanation from the Commissioner, I'm going to be completely opposed. I firmly believe, on the basis of the analysis that I have done and the information that I have received, in the long run this program is going to cost the City money despite the Commissioner's claims that he's saving money every week. I'm just going to ride this thing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There being no further discussion, we will proceed to a vote. The question is on #7 on the Fiscal Committee Agenda, It's for \$1,511,000. for the Public Works Department for the Division of Collection Reconsideration of the Division of Collection. We will vote by use of the machine. Mr. Rybnick will be recorded as abstaining.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The vote is 31 in the affirmative, 1 in the negative and with 4 abstentions. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED. I am going to ask the Members of the Board to please take their seats. I'd like to proceed and we cannot. The next order of business will be a Resolution in relation to the appropriation just passed. Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. HAWE: Would you like me to read this? This is an amendment to Resolution 1309 which was the resolution by which we adopted the budget in May. (Mrs. Hawe read the Resolution; see copy at end of minutes)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Hawe, I think that would suffice. Is there a second to Mrs. Hawe's motion? SECONDED.

MRS. GUROIAN: What is the number that is going to be put in the blanks?

MRS. HAWE: I don't think we know the number of the Resolution yet.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Guroian, that will not be part of the Resolution that we will be passing. We will put in that number, but it is not necessary as part of the Resolution.

MRS. GUROIAN: I want to know the new dollar figures and the out come of the vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will look at the records of the Special Meeting and determine in that manner how many people were there. There is a motion to approve the Resolution as read by Mrs. Hawe. Is there a second to that motion? SECONDED. CARRIED. (3 abstentions: Mr. Blum, Mr. Rybnick and Mrs. Guroian)

- (8) \$ ~~22,250.00~~ - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - Code 281.2360 - RENT -
 11,125.00 PARKING LOTS - Additional appropriation requested 6/30/80 by Traffic Director Winkel and Mayor Clapes. Parking lot rent increased from \$2,800 to \$4,500. at Railroad Station parking by Transportation Plaza Associates. Retroactive to 5/15/80. Board of Finance approved 7/10/80 after reducing total sum from \$24,650.00.

MRS. HAWE: Item #8 is for \$22,250. for the Department of Traffic and Parking rent for the Parking Lots. This is to go to T.P.A. to rent the Railroad Station parking areas. The rent has been increased from \$2,800. to \$4,500. a month and is retroactive to May 15th. Fiscal is recommending reducing this appropriation by one half, since it appears that the State will take over the Railroad Station sometime within the next few months. We feel that one half of this amount will be sufficient and in the unlikely event that more is needed, Mr. Winkel said he would come back for an additional appropriation. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed of approving \$11,125. for this Code 281.2360 and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Does Transportation concur, Mr. Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Transportation did not take up this, so we will have no report. We did not meet.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Then I will accept a motion to waive the secondary report.

MR. BOCCUZZI: So MOVED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED. CARRIED. Is there any discussion on Mrs. Hawe's motion?

MR. ZELINSKI: First, I had a question and then I'm going to make an amendment. The first question through you to Rep. Hawe, the original request from the Mayor's office that I have, asked for an appropriation of \$24,650 and I see that on our Agenda it's \$22,250., a difference of approximately \$2,400. Do you know where that difference is, and which is the correct figure?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, the Board of Finance reduced it.

MR. ZELINSKI: I see. Then I would like to amend, if I may at this time, to reduce it by half, which would be enough funds to pay according to again the request, maybe I should check this before I make the motion, so I take that back. The request states that this new contract is retroactive to May 15th of 1980.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mrs. Goldstein, I think Fiscal already made that motion,

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Well, first I asked a question and then I'm going to make an amendment, if that would be proper,

MRS. HAWE: May 15th.

MR. ZELINSKI: May 15th, so in other words, if this were to be approved for the six months, it would be from May and the next five months. Then I would like to make an amendment to that to reduce it by half, which would be \$5,562.50 for the purpose being.,.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there a second to Mr. Zelinski's motion? SECONDED, Mr. Zelinski, your motion is to reduce that to \$5,562.50.

MR. ZELINSKI: If I may, I'd like to tell my rationale and I'd like to thank the second for allowing me to do this. We've been invited to a meeting tomorrow in the Mayor's office pertaining to the take-over of the Railroad station by the City of Stamford and I can't see where, if this would take place rather soon, that we would have to get a refund from Transportation Plaza Associate, so I would just as soon pay them through July and then if need be if we do not take it over and there is an additional month or two, then the Traffic and Parking Department can come back but, in the meantime, I can't see paying it out when we may, in essence, having to get it back again in another two months if the take-over takes place within the next month or two. That was my rationale, rather than pay out the City funds now and then get it back later.

MRS. HAWE: First of all, the City only pays Transportation Plaza month by month. They're not going to pay out several months in advance. They're only paying them out month by month. I talked to Mr. Winkel and he felt that cutting it in half was reasonable and the Committee concurred with that. Certainly, Transportation Plaza is not going to get extra money. They are just being paid month by month.

MR. ZELINSKI: If I could ask you, if it does happen say this month that the City does take it over, then there will be an additional \$5,562.50 in this particular code in the Department of Traffic and Parking, which would be in excess of what they may need for the future, correct?

MRS. HAWE: Well, I really don't know if that's the exact amount that will be in there, because I don't know whether the payments stop immediately upon State take-over, and we have May, June, July and August. Already we have three months back that we owe. The Committee thought it was reasonable to cut it in half and that was the Committee's feeling on it.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, again, there is a meeting tomorrow and I don't know if at that meeting there is going to be some announcement to actually say, maybe this month, maybe next month; again, I can't see...it's a small amount, \$5,000, but still appropriating funds to a department which, in essence, they may never spend and just have in there, I'd just as soon not pay in advance, rather, have them come back if it does happen to drag out a month or two more, then just have them come back. That's my motion. I would hope it would be approved.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BLUM: In essence, what I see of this, that Mr. Winkel believes that the turn-over of the Station will not take place in a sense until September and that's what I hear. I'd like to know exactly what we are paying. We are now paying \$2,800, and the rental is going to \$4,500., is that true, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: That's correct. The Transportation Plaza Associates had served the City with a notice to quit possession of the Railroad Station Parking areas. The Corporation Counsel and the Director of Traffic and Parking negotiated a new contract, and the new contract was in the amount of \$4,500, a month.

MR. JOYCE: A question to Mrs. Hawe. I don't understand the aspect of the retroactivity on this. Perhaps, it's something you could explain. What is the expiration date of that lease and how come it's retroactive to May 15th?

MRS. HAWE: The length of the lease is to the end of this Fiscal year. I assume that the negotiations have been going on for several months since the City did not feel at this time that we should lose our commuter parking, and it was on around May 15th that the Transportation Plaza served the City with this notice, that they had to quit possession of the parking areas. Therefore, the increase is retroactive to that date.

MR. JOYCE: In other words, am I to understand unilaterally, the City, presumably the Traffic and Parking Commission, made a new contract with Transportation Plaza?

MRS. HAWE: The contract was approved by the Traffic Commission, which is the procedure. The Corporation Counsel and the Director of Traffic and Parking negotiated it, and the Traffic Commission approved the contract.

MR. JOYCE: That contract never came before this Board then?

MRS. HAWE: That's not a personnel contract; it's not a union contract. We don't approve those kind of contracts.

MR. JOYCE: So in other words, we are bound to pay the bill, but we have no say in the actual control of the negotiations of the contract between the City and the Hoffmans, who are the Transportation Plaza Associates, Is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: That is correct.

MR. JOYCE: In that case, I would vote to eliminate the entire amount.

MRS. PERILLO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED, SECONDED, CARRIED. The question before us is on amending Mrs. Hawe's motion on the Department of Traffic and Parking to \$5,562.50.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Rep. Hawe had mentioned it went from \$2,800, to \$4,500. Just one quick question. Is that per month?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry that is out of order. I have already stated the question. Let us proceed to a vote. It has been seconded. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 8 in the affirmative, 25 in the negative. The MOTION TO AMEND HAS BEEN DEFEATED. We will now proceed to the question before us, which is on \$11,125.00 for the Department of Traffic. Is there any further discussion?

MR. WIDER: (speaking without his mike on, Cannot make out what he said)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Thomsen is here to take care of it. How do you wish to be recorded on that vote, Mr. Wider? Do you want to vote yes or no on that.

MR. WIDER: I was voting no, but the fact is,..(again, mike not on).

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will take care of fixing your machine, Mr. Wider. We need your vote. We have the question before us of \$11,125.00.

MR. RYBNICK: MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Item #8 for \$11,125.00, SECONDED, CARRIED with 33 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions,

- (9) \$ 2,370.00 - PAYROLL DEPARTMENT - Code 246,1110 SALARIES -
 Reclassification of Account Clerk Trainee to Account Clerk I per additional appropriation request of Mayor Clapes and Dr. Hoffman 7/1/80, Board of Finance approved 7/10/80,

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (10) RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE APPLICATION FOR FUNDS ENTITLED "PAYMENT-IN-LIEU-OF-TAXES FOR STATE FINANCIAL MODERATE RENTAL HOUSING -
 to cover 100% of the ad valorem taxes on Housing Authority Moderate rental units which become due during the fiscal year. Last year received \$591,507. This year, due to mill increase, City entitled to \$608,798.03, but State budgeted only \$585,940 for Stamford. Our application will be for \$608,798.03. Mayor's letter July 17, 1980.

(Note: There was a loss of dialogue due to a tape problem at this point)

MRS. HAWE MOVED for approval of Item #10 with a change of wording from "by the Town Council" to "by the Board of Representatives", SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Item #10 and the item CARRIED with one abstention (Ms. Summerville). The rest voted yes (voice vote) with a few off the floor.

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

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE GREENWICH LAND TRUST, INC. for 10.059 ACRES CONVEYED TO THEM BY FRANCIS D. CLYNE on 12/17/79 - located on Farms Road, Stamford. Held in Steering 1/2 and 1/21/80; and in Committee 3/3, 4/10, 5/5. Held 6/2 for re-drafting by Law Dept.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Legislative and Rules Committee met on Monday, July 28th at 7:30 P.M. in the Legislative Chambers.

PRESENT were Reps. Blum, Fasanelli, Corbo, and myself, John Zelinski.

ABSENT were Co-Chairman Anthony Conti, and Reps. Donahue, Loomis, Pollard and Wiederlight.

We also had representatives of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Mr. Mike Fisher and Mr. Mike McFarland present. Being that we did not have a quorum, we did not act on any of the items.

But there are three items that I would like to MOVE out. The first one I'd like to make a motion that we MOVE for FINAL ADOPTION Item #1 for tax abatement for the Greenwich Land Trust. We did vote for publication last month and I now MOVE for Final Adoption.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: First let's move to take it Out of Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: So MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said there are two opposed to taking Out of Committee, being Mrs. Guroian and Mrs. Betty Conti. MOTION has been CARRIED. We will now go on to discuss Final Adoption.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED for Final Adoption. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked if Corporation Counsel had approved this ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI said it had been approved by the Corporation Counsel.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote and the final adoption was APPROVED with two No votes, being Mrs. Guroian and Mrs. Betty Conti; the rest voting yes (voice).

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE ON ELIGIBILITY LIMITS AND MOVING AND RELOCATION EXPENSES ON CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski 6/13/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would now MOVE to take Out of Committee Item #2 which is a routine matter, for final adoption a proposed ordinance on eligibility limits and moving and relocation expenses on condominium conversions. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there any discussion on taking it Out of Committee?

MRS. McINERNEY: To Mr. Zelinski. Did your Committee have an opportunity to hold a public hearing on this item?

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, we did announce in the newspaper that there would be a public hearing from 7:30 to 8:00 the night of Monday, July 28th.

MRS. McINERNEY: You had the meeting? People were present?

MR. ZELINSKI: No one came to the meeting. It was publicized in the paper for the second time to have the public hearing, but no one did attend.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote on taking #2 Out of Committee.

MR. POLLARD: I apologize. You have a public hearing and nobody comes. It suggests to me that nobody has an interest in this thing, so why pass a law if nobody is interested in it?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You can answer that but only if it is taken Out of Committee. That would be a legitimate question if the Board votes to take this Out of Committee. The Nays have it; this will NOT be taken Out of Committee. (Note: This item will be Reconsidered later in the evening and will be APPROVED for Final Adoption, just before the Sewer Committee Agenda.)

MR. ZELINSKI: The last item I would like to MOVE Out of Committee is Item #8 for tax abatement for Bell St. and Tresser Blvd. SECONDED.

Before we proceed on Item #8, the other items Held in Committee, for the record, are:

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE SAFETY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT INCLUDING CRANES - Submitted by City Rep. Zelinski 5/14/80. Text to be submitted.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE CODE OF ETHICS (CONCERNING GIFTS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY). Submitted by Mayor Clapes 5/19/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF ORDER. As long as it's still being Held in Committee, I feel that this is an important matter and in reading it, I find problems. I would like to request if it is in order that Legislative and Rules arrange a meeting of the entire membership of this Board with Corporation Counsel at which time we may ask any questions that we have with regards to this Ordinance. There are some areas of it that I do not understand the language.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, that is a good suggestion. I forgot to mention that Mr. Cookney did attend our L&R meeting on Monday and did answer some questions, and I had planned on inviting him to our next meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will inform the entire Board of that, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. McINERNEY: I was just going to suggest with the follow-up to Betty, that it might be appropriate to have a Special Meeting for members of this Board who would like to avail themselves to that one item of L&R.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will discuss that further.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE ON "ENCLOSING SWIMMING POOLS" - (text to be submitted) - On 7/7/80 a Resolution was adopted by this Board regarding swimming pool safety. On 7/17/80 Rep. Zelinski restored proposed ordinance item to agenda.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR RESIDENCE OF ASSISTANT PASTOR OF ZION LUTHERAN CHURCH LOCATED AT 17 FENWAY - Also requesting refund of taxes paid - 3/31/80 letter. Text to be made up. Held in Committee 4/21, 5/19 and 6/23/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

- (7) FOR RE-PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR SOUTHWESTERN CONNECTICUT GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC. 1/21/80 letter from Paul F. Jacobson, P.C. Published 11/13/79. Property consists of 8.098 acres contributed by Frederick S. and Ann B. Wonham to add to Camp Rocky Craig, the Girl Scout Camp which already has tax exempt status. Held in Committee 3/3, 4/10, 5/5/ 6/2 and 6/23/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR BELL ST. AND TRESSER BOULEVARD PROPERTY (parking lot) - submitted by Mayor Clapes 5/29; by Asst. Corp. Counsel John E. Smyth 5/22/80 stating this is from Atty. Gaynor E. Brennan, Jr., and property is owned by St. John's R. C. Church, and used also for municipal purposes. Held in Steering 6/23 for August agenda.

MR. ZELINSKI: The last item I wish to MOVE Out of Committee would be #8
SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: Is this the property whereby the City is now renting municipal parking spaces? And being that it is income-producing, have you checked with the Tax Department to determine if they are still legally able to get 100% tax abatement, or would it have to be done proportionately?

MR. ZELINSKI: In answer to your question, I did not talk to the Assessor's Office, but this was drafted by our own Corporation Counsel's office. Mr. Smith, the Asst. Corp. Counsel, did draft this up. The legality I would assume would be legal.

MRS. McINERNEY: Based on the fact that the Tax Assessor has not been queried on this item, I would hope that the other Board members would move to keep it in committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We'll take a vote on taking it Out of Committee. Let the record show that Mr. WIDER is using Mr. Kunsaw's seat. The vote is 7 yes, 19 no. This will NOT be taken Out of Committee. Motion is DEFEATED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR GRADUAL INCREASES IN ASSESSED VALUES FOLLOWING REVALUATION per Connecticut Public Act #80-427 (Substitute House Bill 5960) submitted by David Blum 7/15/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

- (10) LETTER 7/16/80 FROM REP. AUDREY MAIHOCK REFERRING TO ADVOCATE ARTICLE 6/26/80 "RULING PERMITS CITIZENS TO SUE OFFICIALS" (U. S. Supreme Court decision) - Ms. Maihock feels this Board should have legal counsel whose primary responsibility would be to the Board of Representatives. (This news item also mailed 7/11/80 to Board members at request of Rep. DeLuca 7/7/80)

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I assume, Mr. Zelinski, that concludes your report. Mr. Blum, Personnel Committee, please.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - David I. Blum, Chairman

- (1) PROPOSED CHANGES TO MERIT RULES SYSTEM (CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS) - Personnel Commission held one public hearing 4/24/80. Held in this Committee to hear Personnel Commission member Arthur Leary to give his minority report. Held 7/7/80.

MR. BLUM: Personnel Committee met Thursday, July 31st in the Main Meeting Room. We took up two items. The first item was the proposed changes to the Merit Rules System. Since Mr. Leary, who was supposed to have given us a minority report, has not attended this second request of this Committee, it was decided by the Committee to remove this item from the Agenda. If you want, Mrs. Chairman to bring this before the Board and remove it by a vote, I would suggest.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Blum, if you have nothing further on that one particular item, the next time it comes before Steering, you can make a move that it be taken off the Agenda.

- (2) REQUEST THAT THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE LOOK INTO THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AND PROGRAM OF THE CITY. Submitted by D. Blum 6/18. Held 6/23.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Blum, just hold it a minute. Right now we don't have enough members on the floor to have a quorum; either we come out of the caucus rooms or we'll just call a recess until everybody gets back out on the floor.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM: Inasmuch as I submitted this item to Steering, and there has been considerable discussion on this subject, I turned this particular item over to the Vice Chairperson to handle. I did not leave the floor but I presented a list of questions to Ms. Lyons to be asked of the Personnel Commission. I would like Moira to give a report on this item.

MRS. LYONS: The Personnel Committee held what was really a fact-finding meeting in order to look into the Affirmative Action Policy and Program in the City. Rep. Blum had sent in a letter as he said, with a series of questions to be addressed to Mr. Bernstein concerning the AAP. These various questions were presented and were answered. Among some of the questions brought up were the number of minorities employed in relation to the entire work force, the job position breakdown of minority groupings.

I think the final analysis of the meeting was the City is currently compiling a rather inclusive report on their AAP which will be finished around the end of September. They will send us this particular report which will give us a good breakdown of the statistics according to the way the minorities are within the job workforce. We are going to wait for this in order to come to some conclusion in finding out exactly what the AAP program is in the City. However, we did ask the City where it stood in relation to other municipalities and they said the City is in Federal compliance and their standing was quite high in comparison to the other municipalities.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Point of Personal Privilege. I would like to thank Mr. Blum and his committee for handling what could have been a very emotional issue, for handling such an issue in a diplomatic and tactful way.

MR. DIXON: That meeting was also held on July 31st but I had the opportunity to sit in on a portion of that meeting while I was waiting to get my own Appointments Committee meeting started. I believe that was a very successful and informative meeting. I, too, would like to thank Mr. Blum and the Personnel Committee for their perseverance in this matter because I do believe now that something very informative and fruitful will come out of this whole matter.

MR. BLUM: That completes my report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

- (1) PROBLEM OF TRUCK STORAGE - RESIDENTIAL ZONES - Letter 5/2/80 from James J. Sotire, Sr., Bldg. Official and Zoning Enf. Officer, advising of problems residential property owners are having with heavy trucks parking on their streets. Held in Committee 6/2 and 7/7.

MR. DONAHUE: The Planning and Zoning Committee met last week, and at this time we are still waiting for a draft of an ordinance concerning truck storage in residential areas from Corporation Counsel. We expect that next month we will have something to present to the Board.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Everett Pollard and Alfred PerilloNO REPORTHEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

- (1) THE PROBLEM OF VERY LOW WATER PRESSURE, INADEQUATE FOR FIRE PREVENTION OR FIRE-FIGHTING, which Dolphin Cove Assn. sent to Fire Chief Vitti; submitted by Rep. John Boccuzzi. Held 7/7/80 for further study and report from Water Company.

MRS. SANTY: Mr. Thornhill's letter addressed to me regarding their final decision raises many unanswered questions. I am calling a meeting on August 13th at 7:30 in the Republican Caucus Room inviting the Mayor, the Finance Commissioner, and the Corporation Counsel, or a representative of these people, plus the Health and Protection Committee, Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. Dixon and Mrs. Goldstein to attend, in order to address these questions. I think that we have to resolve this problem as soon as possible. I will keep this item in committee until it is satisfactorily resolved.

Although I did not have a quorum, we did meet tonight at 7:00 P.M. with the Committee and the Committee voted to go along with this report and to hold this meeting on August 13th.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE DISSOLVING STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY'S AUTONOMOUS STATUS AND FORMING ONE OR TWO GOLF COMMISSIONS - with all revenues going into City's General Fund. Submitted by Rep. DeLuca. Held in Steering 2/19/80. Held in Committee 4/21, 5/19 and 6/23. Work being done currently on text.

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on July 30th and again this evening, on August 4th. The first meeting we did not have a quorum; and at the second meeting, I have to say that with Rep. Perillo here, we had 100% attendance. On Item #1 regarding ordinance relating to Sterling Farms, unfortunately due to an over-loaded schedule, Corporation Counsel was unable to prepare an ordinance; therefore, we voted 5-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE, and hopefully sometime this month we will have an ordinance to vote on.

- (2) PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES - Sec. 14-4, b-h; Sec. 14-4.6 - Changes in Park Curfew Hours as per 7/9/80 letter from Parks Supt. Robt. Cook.

MR. DeLUCA: Item #2 should read "FOR PUBLICATION". The Committee voted 5-0 for publication and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: At this time I would like to make a proposal. It's very short. Line 6, where the proposed ordinance reads "whatsoever" referring to the closing of City parks, or should I read the whole thing?

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing): It presently reads "whatsoever any City park between the hours of 9:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M." I would like to have it read "WHATSOEVER ANY CITY PARK AND/OR RECREATIONAL FACILITY" because I notice that many of our functioning parks are not operated by the Parks Department. They are operated by the Recreation Board, and they have the same type of problems with vandalism, and I do think it should be covered in this one ordinance. SECONDED.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of Information. Mrs. McInerney, when you say a place of recreation, suppose when a school is being used for some recreational activity, are you going to close it at 9:00; or say that the Glenbrook Community Center is open for recreational activity. Are you going to close that at 9:00 also?

MRS. McINERNEY: Perhaps, Mr. Boccuzzi, I should have it read "and/or recreational parks" instead of "facility", because we do indeed have two or three parks that do all have the same problem. I MOVE my amendment to read "any City park and/or recreational park". SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask if this brings Carwin Park into this ordinance.

MR. DeLUCA: No, it does not, because Carwin Park is not under the jurisdiction of the Parks Department. As of the present time, Carwin Park comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department.

MR. BLUM: Why can't all the parks in the City come under this proposed curfew amendment?

MR. DeLUCA: Because right now we are just trying to regulate what is to be controlled by the Park Commission and the Parks Department. I am sure that once Carwin Park comes under their jurisdiction, we could modify the ordinance to take that into consideration. Carwin Park has other important and immediate problems to attend to, in addition to curfew.

MR. DIXON: In light of what Mr. DeLuca has just said, I think the word "City" should be eliminated. If that is not a park that is controlled by the Park Dept. , then it is in fact controlled by the City, and it is a City park. It is not a private park. You're saying City or recreational. I believe you're using the term "city", aren't you? Well, then Carwin Park is definitely a City park. It is owned and controlled by the City. It is not privately controlled, so it would have to be included, unless you eliminate the word "City".

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would just like to make one observation. This ordinance is for publication. All of these words can be ironed out at the next meeting of the Parks and Recreation Committee. We can vote on Mrs. McInerney's amendment, and then when this is published, we can make whatever changes in terminology that Parks and Rec see fit.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA: I agree with you that this is just for publication. I am sure there are many other suggestions that would like to be made, and rather than belabor the point tonight, I can guarantee that we can publish this, and prior to voting on this at our September meeting, we can have a meeting and hopefully all interested parties will be at that meeting. We can take our time diligently and come up with the proper terminology that is acceptable to everyone. Rather than just coming up with all kinds of suggestions tonight, and messing this ordinance up, I would like to see us just publish it as it is and meet at our next meeting to iron out all our differences.

MR. RYBNICK: I just wanted to state that this is a request from the Parks Department. Any other parks still have to come in and make a similar request for any other park in the City of Stamford.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm not sure exactly where we stand on this because I am hearing two things. I just heard the Chairman of that Committee say that we would be able to work out the language and terminology after it has been published. I recall another meeting when we were having a debate about rather something should be published and then when it comes back to us, we do it over. And it was stated, point blank, that once something goes out for publication, that's the reason why you publicize it; and when it comes back to us, it is for either our approval or rejection.

My interest in this, in Carwin Park, and I know this is not the time to bring it up, but in light of what has just been said, one of the problems we are having with Carwin Park is that it is not being treated like a park. My understanding is that it is Public Works. I just hope that Mr. DeLuca and his Committee hold to their word and that we will have a chance to have input into this.

MR. DeLUCA: We will keep our word on it. We will welcome all the input anyone wishes to make. I believe you have received correspondence about Carwin Park and how the Parks Department is trying to rectify the problems there. I understand there is a resolution to hold a public hearing on August 21st, to correct some of the problems there.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to clarify something. When something is published only if there is a major change, does it require re-publication. If it is not deemed a major or substantive change, re-publication is not required. Mrs. McInerney, do you still wish to have your amendment put in?

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I do.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We are voting on Mrs. McInerney's Motion to amend line 6 to read "Any City park and/or recreational park". It has been SECONDED. CARRIED with one in opposition (voice vote - No vote not determined).

We will now proceed to the main question which is the publication of the proposed amendment to the Code of Ordinances as amended by Mrs. McInerney. If there is no discussion, we will proceed to a vote. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote) for publication.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER ST. - Sept. 15th through Oct. 4, 1980 from Barbara J. Soroca, Genl. Mgr., Stamford Symphony Orchestra. P. O. Box 3263 - to advertise concert being held Oct. 4, 1980.

MR. DeLUCA: On Item #3 to hang a banner across Summer St. for the Stamford Symphony Orchestra, we voted 5-0 in favor and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice).

- (4) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER ST. - Oct. 20th to Nov. 3, 1980 - To publicize the 12th Annual Antiques Show of the Women of St. Francis Episcopal Church, 2810 Long Ridge Road - 6/30/80 letter from Betty F. Orsey, 73 Dundee Road.

MR. DeLUCA: On Item #4 to hang a banner on Summer St. from Oct. 20th to Nov. 3rd for the Women of St. Francis Episcopal Church, we voted 5 in favor, none opposed, and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice).

MR. DeLUCA: Although it is not on the report, each one of you received a copy of a letter I prepared regarding banner locations. I would urge each and every member here who is interested in banner locations, to submit your suggestions in writing so that action can be taken in the immediate future. That is the end of my report.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

- (1) PROGRESS REPORT - to be given by Reps. Robert Fauteux and John Hogan on the Price and Waterhouse Review and Evaluation of the Personnel Practices of the Board of Education.

MR. FAUTEUX: I'd like to direct the attention of the Board to the report which was placed in front of them earlier this evening. It's rather a lengthy report and I would like to take the liberty of just going through the summary section, which is the first page and three-quarters. I would recommend that you do go through the total report, as it is very indicative of how we came up with our summary, conclusions and recommendations. This is a report concerning the review and evaluation of the Personnel Policies and Practices of the Stamford Public School System.

I might start off by saying this is the summary. In December, 1979, the Board of Education retained Price, Waterhouse and Company to study the personnel functions of the Stamford School System. The result was an in-depth study of existing policies and practices, and was carried out in a professional, objective, and well-documented manner for the five-year period 1975-1979.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX (continuing): A primary conclusion from the final report is the policy level dereliction of the Board of Education in not keeping current with the demands on the personnel function imposed by broadening statutory and contractual requirements, and the heightened interests of public and community groups over the five years.

At the administrative, working level, a professionally incompetent performance by the Personnel Department was identified with non-performance particularly in the area of up-grading personnel practices to stay in step with changing demands.

The action by the Board of Education in commissioning the Price, Waterhouse study resulted from a bona fide concern that a major revamping of the activities, performance, and image of the school system's personnel function is critically needed. This review had to be done by a reputable, non-connected party. In this case, the use of an independent, outside party with established credentials in management services consulting has turned out to be a good, pragmatic business decision by the Board.

The Price, Waterhouse Study did not directly substantiate any of the allegations concerning improprieties of past personnel actions. Instead, it provided a description of a system which lacks the controls to prevent such occurrences from happening.

There were 54 recommendations made in the report; and it was urged that they should be implemented as quickly as possible by the Board of Education. It was further indicated that once the groundwork for upgrading policy and practices has been laid, the improved system could be functioning within six months. At the present time, the Board has in place a six-month implementation schedule addressing all recommendations, and has directed the Personnel Department to begin the implementation process. The Board is continuing to hold working meetings, further defining the actions needed on major policy or organizational changes.

It is the conclusion of the Board of Representatives members submitting this report, based on direct participation in the study, that the Price, Waterhouse Personnel Policies and Practices Review was objective and the recommendations made were meritorious and substantive. Accordingly, the propriety of Price, Waterhouse being retained by the Board of Education to do this task is justifiable.

The results of this study do not provide a direct basis for developing substantiation for the allegations of past misconduct and wrongdoing in the personnel functions of the School System. Accordingly, there are no facts to provide the grounds for initiating a special investigation of the Personnel Department of the School System.

However, it is the intention of the Education, Welfare and Government Committee to continue to remain involved with the implementation of the recommendations resulting from this study. It will monitor and prompt, where appropriate, the progress in upgrading the personnel policies and practices of the school system.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX (continuing): It is the recommendation of the EW&G Committee that aggressive action continue to be taken by the Board of Education to make right its personnel system. This study has resulted in a major step in that direction. The public has an interest in being assured that our school system has a well-run and honest personnel office where appointments, promotions, and other job actions are made on merit. Political or personal influences and racial or any other kind of discrimination, whether alleged or actual, cannot be tolerated in any form.

That is the end of the summary. I would like, also, to read a transmittal letter that I drafted to send to Dr. Weber, President of the Board of Education, with a copy of this report. The letter is dated August 5, 1980 and it is to Dr. Weber, President of the Board of Education.

"Dear Dr. Weber:

"Enclosed is the report made to the Board of Representatives on August 4, 1980 concerning the current status of the Review and Evaluation of Personnel Policies and Practices project for the Stamford School System.

"John Hogan and I wish to express our appreciation in being able to participate in this project and look forward to continued participation in this vital activity. As indicated in the report, and in past meetings, there are a number of areas we identify and urge for strong Board of Education action.

"If we can provide any assistance to the Board in its deliberations, please let me know.

Very truly yours, Robert Fauteux."

I might end up expressing my appreciation to John Hogan in his participation in the activity so far, and also to the other member of the EW&G Committee, Mary Lou Rinaldi. That is the end of my report at this point.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you very much for that very complete report.

MR. DARER: I'd like to suggest that this Board, well, on my personal behalf, I'd like to thank Mr. Fauteux, Mr. Hogan and Ms. Rinaldi. This is one of the best reports I've ever read, coming out of a study group from this Board. I think they have done a superb job on it and that ought to be noted in the reco

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask through you to Mr. Fauteux, your committee was formulated to take care of this particular item as a result of a request by Rep. Florenzio Corbo, who asked for an investigation of the Personnel Practices of the Board of Education. I would assume that your report just sort of finalizes only to the point that you will be keeping close tabs as to whether they finalize the 54 different personnel matters to be corrected at the Board of Education.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM (continuing): I read that confidential report, and I feel that report in a sense, is a "white wash" of what was supposed to happen. There were some people here in this City government who might have even done less than this Personnel Director, that are no longer in that Personnel Department.

There was a challenge of sorts made that certain allegations were made by the Black Community that the Board of Education, in a sense, was not living up to their Affirmative Action Policy. And, nowhere, only in a little spot, do I see anything to do about the Affirmative Action Program of the Board of Education.

Let me tell you this. If this man was a professional personnel manager, it should never have happened. The 54 allegations are simplicities as far as professionals are concerned. Little items such as keeping records, or promotions, other record-keeping, can't find records, people who have put in an application for a teacher only supposed to be limited to be kept on file for one year, placed in somehow two and three years, why, why, for what reason? I don't think enough was done, and I don't like the report that I heard tonight. It's nice. It's a "white wash", and that's my opinion.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm not going to call the report of Price, Waterhouse a "white wash", nor would I dare to say that the work that our colleagues have done is a "white wash". But one thing I will say and that is, there has been a definite demand that the people who are responsible for Price, Waterhouse coming up with 54 recommendations, and as Mr. Blum says, it goes into detail and it states "simple personnel files".

I'm no personnel manager, but things I would take for granted are kept on record and documented. They were not done. And by all means, this shows gross incompetence by someone that's handling the personnel matters for the Board of Education. The people are demanding that this kind of incompetence be taken to task.

I don't find my colleagues on the EW&G Committee making any definite recommendations along those lines. Maybe it's not in our power, but one thing is in our power, and that is to give the people of Stamford the truth as it is. If we have this kind of incompetence in our Personnel Department in the Board of Education, then it is time this kind of thing be brought to a halt. Any time we have to spend that kind of money to have a group come back and tell us that the Personnel Department should conduct all applications, screenings, and matching; of course, they should be doing that already!

I think Price, Waterhouse did a good job of pointing out exactly what the people have been saying, and that is, the Personnel Department in the Board of Education is not giving us our money's worth. They have not been fair and equitable as they have handled their business. I am upset with a report of this nature. I don't believe we have gotten to the heart of the matter. I do feel that some of us on this Board of Representatives should take another look at this and perhaps come back to the Board, to our Steering Committee, with other recommendations as to how best to pursue this matter.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON: I think the entire community of Stamford and certainly this Board of Representatives have satisfactorily represented or registered its complaint concerning the Waterhouse report and the 54 different recommendations. The thing that I'm disturbed about right now is how are we to be sure that the recommendations coming from the Waterhouse report will be implemented.

What further action can this Committee of this Board do to follow this through any further? You stated here in the report that your intentions are to monitor the recommendations as implemented by the Board of Education, but how, and with what do you have to follow up on this? This appears to me to be a final report coming from the Committee, which the full Board set you up to do.

If this is your final report, and I see nothing else that you have to report on then what authority do you have to continue anything in the way of monitoring or following up?

I think further action by the Board is necessary for this Committee to even have further authority or extended authority to continue in any type of monitoring the recommendations or implementation of the recommendations by the Board of Education. I think by all means that implementations are necessary, but what assurance do we have that the Board of Education will follow up on any type of implementation? Apparently, they were satisfied with what they were doing in the first place! There is nothing to say that they must implement anything. The Board of Education, as I understand it, never really had an Affirmative Action Program. They never really knew what an Affirmative Action Program consisted of.

I had a talk with the Director of Human Rights just a couple of days ago, and I gained knowledge from the little conversation that I had with him that the Board of Education really didn't know what the AAP was all about. They may have plans now to make improvements, but I don't know anything about this; and I don't know about either their willingness or their ability to implement the recommendations that were made to them. I think some further action should be forthcoming from this Board, whether it's to give further consideration to a Special Investigation, or to extend the powers to this committee to continue, or to monitor the implementation of the recommendations by the Board of Education.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Fauteux, I will permit you to answer those questions that Mr. Dixon raised.

MR. FAUTEUX: Rep. Dixon, I thought that we had made clear in the report, John Hogan and myself do intend to remain involved with the implementations schedule that was indicated by the Board of Education to go forward and implement the 54 recommendations. We have also been invited by the Board of Education. They have asked us specifically to continue to participate in their review and working sessions. We have accepted this invitation.

At this point, I would like to go back to the description of this report on the agenda which indicated it was a progress report. I think that we would be very positive in saying that there will be further reports as to the progress of the Board of Education in this vital activity.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX (continuing): I would like to comment on one of the aspects of the three comments on the report. It's very difficult to disassociate these activities from the specific to the general, particularly in concern with the allegations, the past allegations of wrongdoing. I think John Hogan and myself share the indignation of the past three speakers about the gross incompetency of the personnel function in the Board of Education. There is ample evidence to indicate that they just weren't doing their job, as it was indicated. Perhaps it wasn't even worth the money that they were being paid to do so. I think the Board of Education, however, has taken a very positive action toward rectifying the situation that we see there.

In particular, the Affirmative Action topic comes recurringly, and it's a very important one. However, it is not the only item that is of concern to ourselves and the Board of Education. As much as you say about the past laxness of coming up with a full program of Affirmative Action, yes, I think there is some evidence to so indicate.

However, at this point, there is very considerable evidence that the Board of Education is going to go forward, set up a positive program in this action; they have some very good indications coming forward from Price, Waterhouse, and also the SACIA group, as to how to structure such a program. It is by all means a very high priority section of their action at the present time. All I can say in ending at this point is that we, John and myself, do intend to continue to be involved with this, and we will be reporting back periodically as to how effective the implementation is coming along and when we can see some end in sight for this whole activity.

MR. WIDER: I certainly would like to thank Mr. Fauteux and Mr. Hogan for the great deal of work that was put in. I certainly give them great credit for putting together a real report.

I must express some concern because I have known about these deficiencies for 25 years, and I know that they won't be changed overnight. Your report won't change them. I'm afraid that you brought back exactly what we expected you to bring back. We didn't expect you to bring back any more.

You're dealing with Price, Waterhouse, which is an auditing firm, and we were talking in terms of personnel policy. They are two separate fields altogether. They worked on some of the matters that we were concerned about, but they didn't work on all of them. If they had to work on some of the past experiences that personnel had gone through with the Board of Education, and hinged their investigation on that, then they would have come up with a more positive final analysis of what was going on.

I could have helped them on that because I was a part of it. I know where you were coming from, and I know where you're trying to go, but you've got a rough way to get there because you only have the information that the Board of Education wants you to have, and you're not going to get any more. You could follow up all you want. This is going to be your nicest final report. I think we ought to appreciate it, but I also think that we have some more work to do. I certainly want to thank you for doing it up to this point, but you can't get the rest; someone else will have to get it.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to thank Reps. Fauteux, Hogan and Rinaldi for the fine job they did. They must have put in many, many hours of conscientious effort, and we all appreciate the fine work that they did. I'm very sad to see a few words in the second paragraph of their summary.

They are very serious words, and I think they were meant to be there. Words like dereliction, incompetent performance, non-performance. These are very serious charges, and they must be followed up. They must be followed up in two ways (1) the individuals who are culpable must be brought to task; they cost the City many, many, many thousands of dollars. Something must be done. I think at this point the sentiments of many colleagues must be followed through. This must be brought up at our next Steering Committee meeting and discussion must ensue to see just what the Board of Representatives is going to do to echo the feelings of the community.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I cannot congratulate you on your report because I have not thoroughly digested it. I would like to suggest to the President and the Board that because of all the controversy that you're having with the Board of Education in this City, I think you should, from the Board of Representatives, have a minority sitting on that panel that's coming from the Board of Representatives. I think that would clear up some of the doubtfulness, some of the things that when it comes to Affirmative Action Plan, which is very sensitive to the minorities in this City, maybe we could understand it better if we could sit in and have input as a Board of Representatives member, and not so much as saying already the Board of Reps has their minority representation.

From this Board, I would like to recommend that you seriously look at putting a minority from this Board on the Committee, and I'm not suggesting either one of us, which one of us, that we should be seriously given consideration as being a part of it.

I'm not saying that I'm not trusting your judgment Mr. Fauteux, or yours, Mr. Hogan, but I am very sensitive when it comes to Affirmative Action; and I think that's where my expertise stands. I would do my best, if I were the person who was selected from this Board, and I think I speak for the three minority persons on this Board, that they would be just as fair to all as you are, but we do want representation, and I would like to see one of us sitting on that panel from this Board.

MR. CORBO: The whole thing was precipitated by a request from me to investigate the whole system. Now, if I go back to the fourth paragraph of this, they did a beautiful job of reporting to us whatever the history of the Board is going to be but chronologically speaking by the request of us for the past, not for the present. I would like to know, as I requested, the practices of the past, speaking chronologically, not the future recommendations.

This report, in other words, is not going to start from the days to see what generated that type of a condition that exists now. We have to investigate for the foundation is solid in order to build this report. Do we have qualified personnel, do they have the expertise on this Board to carry out all of these recommendations: That's a conclusive point that the report should have come to, but going back to what I was saying, the whole thing was precipitated by my request for investigating, for looking into the whole operation of the School Board.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. CORBO (continuing): If I go back to the fourth paragraph where the Committee, Mr. Fauteux, Mr. Hogan, Ms. Rinaldi, it says: "Price, Waterhouse study did not directly substantiate any of the allegations concerning improprieties of past personnel actions."

THAT was what I was looking for; that was the answer I was looking for, really, when I put the request through this Board. The Steering Committee was so willing to approve and put it on the Agenda. That was the key of the question, really. All the other recommendations are consequential to looking more closely to that matter which I requested be looked into.

I believe that first of all the request has been changed. On the agenda, the request should have been the way the original item was, but at the last minute, I don't know how the Steering Committee changed it or why - it will be a progress report by the committee, the study committee, or the investigating committee, or the Price, Watergate Committee.

Like some other Board member said, Price, Waterhouse investigation was oriented channeled only to the financial aspect to that. I don't think there was proven anything that we had expected to have proven by them. At this point, I would like to have noticed that there is one recommendation that I would like to put through, which is that the personnel system be unified under the supervision of really qualified professionals in personnel management. The organization of the whole Civil Service System should be under one banner in the City of Stamford. We can't afford any more to have anyone under a separate type of organization controlling the Civil Service. All of the School Board employees are covered by the Civil Service. Why don't we allow the Personnel Commission of the City control them professionally. And I think at this point I would like to make another fourth or fifth request, whatever the case may be, that this Board will look further into the area of investigation requested by me in the original request, and come up with more substantial answers and report.

I do not believe that we will have to allow this confusion, this non-professional type of a department within the School Board. We should go back, if they don't have the expertise, go back to the Personnel Commission and ask for their advice, ask if it is not possible to unify the two systems under one set of guidelines; ask for the guidelines from the Personnel Commission and see what's what. Well, I formally request tonight that this matter be brought to light, as I requested for the fifth time, that this could be investigated through an investigating committee formed by and with elements and members of this Board, or outside more qualified professionals if we don't in searching within our Board, find the elements able and capable to carry out my request.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will note that your request will be placed on the Steering Committee Agenda. There are still some speakers who have not spoken for the first time, and I'm going to permit them to do so.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I wish to agree with our Board members, that this report by Mr. Fauteux and Mr. Hogan is most important in respect to promoting better personnel practices, but it is even more important in assuring the City of the best possible education and the best possible selection of teachers we can have for our children. They will be the primary beneficiaries for any improvements that are made.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX: I think this is a subject, a very controversial one that we could spend many, many hours discussing. I might suggest that those members with a great many questions about what we have in the report, please go into the report with some detail and thought about it. I think John Hogan and myself will entertain questions either individually or severally.

In response to two of the prior speakers, Price, Waterhouse is a very accomplished consulting firm in other fields than financial auditing. In their management services division, which is a very large part of their business, they do other types of studies, such as engineering studies, work measurement, personnel practices, and policy studies, many other kinds of management consulting. I'm sure if they would go check the outside world and particularly the business world, with Price, Waterhouse they'd find that there is a great deal of acceptance of Price, Waterhouse, plus other auditing firms in this kind of activity.

As I indicated, Mr. Hogan and myself were fully satisfied that the individuals who were provided by Price, Waterhouse were competent in the area being studied, and came forward with very substantive and good conclusions and recommendations. I must point out also that the five-man group from SACIA, which was made up of professionals in the personnel management field, also participated with Price, Waterhouse in preparing the study and the recommendations.

In summary, I would like to say, but one other point first, I would like to comment on Rep. Corbo's observations. I would like to correct him in saying that we did not have a mandate as I read it, to go forward into the Board of Education to investigate specific allegations of wrongdoing.

If his memory would serve him right, he would recollect that it was a concern that the Price, Waterhouse study did not set itself up as a "white wash" in the area of getting the Board of Education off to some of these past bad practices. I'm not saying anything that may have come out of the study which would have proved or disproved the allegation was incidental, but it certainly was not a major part of our mandate to go to the Board of Education for this study. In closing might I say that I recommend the study be looked at very closely by the Representatives and this will be an on-going item and we would entertain any further inquiries that may come forward.

MR. HOGAN: I'd just like to add to what Mr. Fauteux has said, that the Committee was commissioned by this Board to follow up the audit of Price, Waterhouse. Price, Waterhouse did not go into specific allegations because Price, Waterhouse was not retained by the Board of Education for this purpose. We followed up the Price, Waterhouse audit, and I can only echo what Mr. Fauteux has already said. We were very impressed with the report of Price, Waterhouse. We think it was a very thorough audit, but if the members of the Board think, and I don't want them to be misled into thinking that Price, Waterhouse didn't do their job because they did exactly what they were commissioned to do, they were not commissioned to go into specifics; they were commissioned to do an audit of the Personnel Department, which they have completed. I think as far as the audit went, that they did a very commendable job.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT (continued)

MR. DARER: So now we've heard from everyone or most everyone, and I say to myself, where do we go from here. What is the role of this Board in the future. I think that's what we should direct our comments to in regard to what's come out of this study in regard to the Board of Education. To me, having served on this Board now for three years, I felt up to now, or up to the time that this study was made, that the only time we had any contact with the Board of Education was when they came to us for money. I might say that this is a very important role because at the end of the day, it's the money that the Board of Education comes to us for that gives us the power to talk to them and to deal with them.

I think the vehicle on this Board is the EW&G Committee. I think we should give a mandate to this committee to act in a much stronger role with the Board of Education. I think we should have a minority member put on that Committee to work with the present committee in this direction.

I would say that one gets things done by working with people in a positive fashion not in an adversary relationship. If we go out and try to reconstruct the areas of the past, that's one level; we can do that in an investigating committee if the Board thinks that's a wise action to take. I, for one, would prefer to look to the future, to look to positive action directed from the EW&G Committee with a mandate from this Board to work with the Board of Education as Mr. Wider and my committee now work with the City's Housing and Community Development. We have a good relationship. We get things done, we think, and I think with a positive role by EW&G with the Board of Education and a liaison role which this Board never had, to my knowledge on the time I served on this Board, could be developed, one that would help to bridge the gap between all races in this City so that the questions and feelings of distrust and mistrust that have allowed to develop under whatever allegations that have taken place, can somehow be bridged.

I don't say there have never been wrongs. I think from reading this report, words like, well, I won't even go into it because they have been mentioned before, there is some very, very strong language here and I wonder whether the Board of Education shouldn't look at themselves very closely and make their own judgments as to how they'll clean their own house.

I think this Board can play a very strong role. They come to us for millions of dollars each year and I think we just sit there and we vote after many hours of discussion. Many times I think we have nothing to say. Maybe it's not line items we should be looking at but policies, and maybe, maybe, through EW&G and developing a liaison, and a conversation, and even monthly meetings with the Board, something like Mr. Wider and I do with the City now, you can get under their skin a little bit and they can get under yours, and you can work together. And if you've got a gripe or complaint, you do it before you come up for the budget, and when they come for the budget, they know that we know, and we're in a position to do something about it; not a line item for \$20.00, or desks, or something ridiculous like we've done in the past out of frustration more than anything else.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT (continued)

MR. DARER (continuing): I really feel this report can be the cornerstone in the beginning of a role that can be very formidable if we choose to mandate that committee to have that role, if we put the minority member on, because I think that's a very legitimate request. It will also, in my humble opinion, open that committee up to the kinds of questions which need to be raised; and also put a positive direction, hopefully, if the Board of Education is smart enough to realize that we're coming from a non-adversary relationship, but a relationship that wants to work for the future in a positive fashion.

MR. BLUM: I would like to read from the Price, Waterhouse report some of the weaknesses. We're talking about a Personnel Department and I assure you we are now within the City Department having professionals running our City Department. I'd like to read some of the things that are the weaknesses that in any Personnel Department should have been observed a long time ago. I just wonder, no reflection about -- I want to say this to the EW&G committee. Yes, they did a good job on what they were assigned to do, and yes, Price, Waterhouse was assigned to do a certain duty, but not the right duty.

Weaknesses observed, job descriptions are revised as a part of the hiring process, recommendations, the Personnel Department should prepare and maintain job descriptions, professional, if he was a professional, etc. That's the "A" of the ABC's in a professional management, in labor relations. Weaknesses observed, an applicant file for an administrative position is maintained by the Personnel Department. Recommendations: the Personnel Department should develop and maintain an administrator applicant file, ABC, industrial, labor relations, ABC of a personnel manager. We need a professional in the Personnel Department of the Board of Education.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are no further speakers. There have been many interesting suggestions. There is another speaker. There have been some very interesting suggestions made in relation to the committee. They will be taken under advisement. Mr. Fauteux, I want to thank you once again and your committee for the hard work that went into this. Mr. Flounders?

MR. FLOUNDERS: I don't know whether this requires a formal motion or not, but I would like to recommend that at the next meeting of the Steering Committee, the question of appointing a minority member to the EW&G Committee will be well worth doing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is no necessity for a motion to that, Mr. Flounders.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER AN ITEM

MR. JOYCE: I MOVE to RECONSIDER Item #2 under the Legislative and Rules Committee. I voted on the Prevailing Side. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Joyce has Moved to Reconsider an item under L&R, #2. Mr. Joyce voted on the Prevailing Side, which was against bringing it Out of Committee, because I assume that what you are Moving is to bring it out for reconsideration.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER AN L&R ITEM(2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE ON ELIGIBILITY LIMITS AND MOVING AND RELOCATION EXPENSES ON CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. I just want to take one moment to check the vote. The question on the floor is to reconsider Item #2 under L&R, to take it out of committee. It has been moved by a person on the Prevailing Side and Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI: Just for the benefit of the members. This was for Final Adoption. Last month we published it. This was a State bill which allows municipalities to set the limits, and all we're doing is setting the limits. We did have two public hearings. Granted the second one was not attended by anyone, but the first one we did have several people that did speak in favor of this. It's a routine matter of setting the eligibility limits and moving and relocation expenses. If we do not pass this tonight, and in the meantime, some elderly person, 62 years of age, or handicapped, which is what this bill covers, were to get a notice of their apartment going condominium, if this isn't passed tonight, and they get that notice, and if we pass it the following month, it wouldn't have any effect and not offer them any protection, so I really think we have to pass this urgently this evening and I please ask my colleagues to vote in favor.

MR. POLLARD: Again, I speak against this. At the earlier hearing, only a very few people showed up. Obviously at the second hearing nobody showed up. I don't think it's an ordinance that commands a great deal of credibility and I MOVE we defeat it one more time.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Well, if you will remember back to the public hearing that we had on the condominium conversion ordinance, there was a tremendous outpouring of people. I'd say this room, the gallery, was filled with about 20 or 30 people, all testifying on behalf of the L&R Committee for the Condominium Conversion Ordinance. The State, in essence, beat us, if you will, to passing an ordinance, and now this is the most that we can do for the people of Stamford; and I think there is a tremendous interest in the community as evidenced. I think we had two public hearings on this, not one, but two public hearings on this, with the people that came, and had you attended, Mr. Pollard, you would have seen with your own eyes the interest of the community.

MR. DONAHUE: I have to agree. Many of us talk, and I think the majority of the people in this room agree, at least at one point, that there was a need to control condominium conversions and protect people who are living in an apartment building in Stamford at this very minute. The State did pre-empt our action. This Board did pass a moratorium on condominiums and then had it over-turned by a State law. What you have before you tonight, and it's very important to pass, is the only thing left for us to pass to address this issue in an area where housing and availability of housing is declining daily. It's a very important ordinance to pass tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Remember, we're just voting on the Motion to Reconsider, not on the Motion for Final Adoption.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER L&R ITEM #2:

MR. LOOMIS: I would just like to support Mr. Zelinski, Mr. Donahue and Mr. Wiederlight. First of all, we had as was mentioned, this hearing where clearly a lot of people demonstrated their concern and need for this kind of measure; and secondly, in committee, at another meeting, we discussed this specific issue which Mr. Zelinski is now raising. I do believe it's needed, and I believe Mr. Zelinski is acting in accordance with the wishes and the votes of those members of the Committee and so I hope it is reconsidered and approved.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The question before the Board is to Reconsider Item #2 under L&R, and the Reconsideration of taking #2 Out of Committee. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 25 in the affirmative; 6 in the negative; 4 Abstentions. The MOTION TO RECONSIDER has been PASSED.

We will now proceed to the Main Motion, which is to take it Out of Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: WE will use the machine. The vote is 25 in the affirmative; 7 in the negative; and 3 Abstentions. The MOTION TO TAKE #2 OUT OF COMMITTEE HAS BEEN PASSED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I MOVE for FINAL ADOPTION. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask Mr. Zelinski who is in power to enforce the provisions of this Ordinance?

MR. ZELINSKI: The Attorney General of the State of Connecticut.

MRS. CONTI: How are the complaints to be brought to him, and in other words, what is it going to cost to enforce this?

MR. ZELINSKI: I'm sorry, I don't understand your question.

MRS. CONTI: Well, what will be the expense of enforcing this Ordinance. In other words, if this is to be done by the Attorney General, but yet the problem is at the local level.

MR. ZELINSKI: We have a Human Rights Commission and a Fair Rent Commission here, so anyone that would be aggrieved as a result of this, that is if they would be evicted and come under the guidelines of this particular bill, then they would file there, so there would not be any more expenses needed under the existing City agencies.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, but you're talking about the expense being the burden of the landlord. You will probably have to litigate. You would have to drag them to court in order to collect this, I would think.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER L&R ITEM #2:

MR. ZELINSKI: That would be the Attorney General's office as I said, but the person who would be aggrieved would file with either the Human Rights Commission or the Fair Rent Commission, and then of course the Attorney General's Office will be brought into this, and they would be the prosecuting person in this case, so there will not be any additional expense incurred by the City or the State, because we have the City agencies and the Attorney General's Office and his staff available right now.

MR. WIDER: By way of information, since I am a member of the Housing coalition for the City of Stamford, all cases pertaining to senior citizens and low-income people, the paperwork is done by the Legal Services of the City of Stamford. By chance, if anyone had to move out of a condominium, and there was legal service to be given, Legal Services is available for them.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no further discussion, we will proceed to a vote on Final Adoption of the ordinance on eligibility limits and moving and relocation expenses on condominium conversions. We will use the machine. The vote is 26 in the affirmative; 5 in the negative; 4 abstentions. The ordinance has been PASSED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I just want to sincerely thank my fellow colleagues for passing this tonight and I'm sure the people of Stamford appreciate their actions.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP #4 OF L&R (CODE OF ETHICS)

MR. CORBO's microphone was not working properly, but he requested to be permitted to make a Motion to Suspend the Rules to take L&R #4 (Code of Ethics) Out of Committee and to have the Board vote for publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN : Well, you don't have to Suspend the Rules, you have to... I would just like one moment to consider this, Mr. Corbo. I am going to agree...I have just spoken to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and they feel and I have to agree that it would be Out of Order to take it up now, because we have finished the report, and I am going to so Rule, that it is Out of Order to take that item up now.

MR. CORBO's microphone again not working properly, but cleared up sporadically. I will CHALLENGE the CHAIR. I think this is an important matter. We should approve for publication. I want to have more input from outside citizen groups. If we publicize this item, everybody can get educated on it and they can come to us if we have a public hearing. If we have to change the terminology, legal terminology, we can publicize once again. I don't think there is any harm to publicize. It is just publication, let's put it that way. That way the people can participate in the public hearing and we would have more knowledge and background after they have had a chance to read the whole proposal.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Corbo, let me tell you why I'm so ruling. Number one, there was no quorum at the L&R meeting. The entire report was given. Mrs. Conti addressed this for a moment and then we passed it. This will be put on the agenda and addressed at the next meeting, and it will be published. And I think, just in light of the fact that there was absolutely no work done on this, and it was the first time on the agenda, that it would be out of order to publish it tonight, despite the fact that I think there are many people here, myself included, who will be 100% in favor of this item. You are free to Challenge me, Mr. Corbo.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP #4 OF L&R (CODE OF ETHICS):

MR. CORBO: Well, the only reason I am challenging this is because it deserves more knowledge out there to the public. I don't think there is any harm to publicize, they can get involved with it, they can read it, they can study it, they can analyze it; like I said, if the terminology has to be changed, or revised, we can republicize the item; there is no harm with it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there a SECOND to Mr. Corbo's Motion to Challenge? It has been SECONDED. Is there any discussion on the Motion to Challenge the Chair?

MR. BLUM: I would like to speak on the fact that I was present at the L&R Committee when we did not have a quorum. Inasmuch as this in a very broad sense is a matter that regards the employees of this City, and many of the employees want to be heard before even the publication of this particular item, I feel that this Board needs more interpretation of this particular Code, and it has to be given by Mr. Cookney because there is a lot to be desired in my opinion, so therefore I would be against this.

MRS. CONTI: In this instance, I would have to vote to Sustain the Ruling of the Chair, because I find certain portions of this ordinance that I do not understand, and I am fairly conversant with the English language; and I feel that if we publish it in its present state, I'm sure the general public wouldn't understand it either. I think it would be better to hold it in committee, and as I asked before, to have a meeting with the full Board with Corporation Counsel, at which time we might clarify these sections which we do not understand.

MR. CORBO: I think it is fine to have a full Board meeting with Corporation Counsel to talk to us and explain to us these sections. (Rest is unintelligible due to microphone malfunction.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm going to take the prerogative of the Chair and speak just another moment on the issue. It is very painful to have to rule you out of order, Mr. Corbo, in relation to this, because I think that a Code of Ethics is sorely needed in this City, and needed immediately. However, by virtue of the fact that there has been no work whatsoever done by the L&R Committee on this, because of the lack of a quorum, I believe it would be out of order to consider it now and I must rule it out of order. The items that we suspended the rules to consider tonight from L&R were all items that had already been published and they were for final adoption. We can proceed to a vote now. Yes, Mr. Corbo, you may have a last word, but I'm supposed to have the last word, but you may.

(Unfortunately, Mr. Corbo's last word was lost due to mechanical failure.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote on Sustaining the Ruling of the Chair which is that the Motion to consider #4 of L&R is out of order. The vote is 28 in favor, one opposed, 6 abstentions. The RULE OF THE CHAIR HAS BEEN SUSTAINED. We have the rest of the Agenda to complete.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Point of Information. Who Seconded that last Motion?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It doesn't matter because even if you Second a Motion, you don't have to vote in favor of it. There was a Second to the Motion. It was Mr. Roos. The next committee is the Sewer Committee, Mr. Wiederlight.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight

- (1) PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR STORM SEWER EASEMENT TO HOLLY POND ASSOCIATES - Mayor's letters 6/24 and 7/3/80. For \$6 M. office building to be erected at East Main St., Weed and Waterbury Aves.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: On July 29, 1980 the Sewer Committee met. In attendance were Michael Wiederlight and Fior Corbo. In addition, Mr. Peter Underhill, the developer of the project known as Holly Pond Associates, the office building, and his engineer, Arthur Miller. Discussion ensued as to why we should and should not grant a storm sewer easement to Holly Pond Associates. It was decided that the developer and his engineer would appear today, being August 4th, in front of the Parks and Recreation Commission one more time to ask their permission for an easement going across the parkland. And if the Parks and Rec. granted the permission, they would make a recommendation to the Planning Board. We are keeping this open in our committee pending the ruling of the Parks and Recreation Committee and the Planning Board. No vote was taken and no further action was taken. That was the only matter on our agenda, and the meeting lasted approximately 30 minutes.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Lathon Wider

- (1) STAMFORD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM'S REQUEST THAT THEY SUBMIT SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS RATHER THAN QUARTERLY REPORTS.

MR. WIDER: Public Housing and Community Development met on July 25th at 7:00 P.M. in the Republican Caucus Room. Present were Moira Lyons, John Roos, Handy Dixon, Stanley Darer, and Lathon Wider. Item #1 was that the reports be submitted semi-annually rather than quarterly. We had as resource people, Mrs. Nancy Mitchell and Ms. Chris Evans. The Committee voted 5-0 in favor and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice).

- (2) PROBLEMS AT CARWIN PARK (SPRUCE AND WEST MAIN ST.) - submitted by Jeremiah Livingston.

MR. WIDER: On Item #2, present were Mrs. Herlene S. Mayes, Mrs. Nancy Mitchell, Jeremiah Livingston, Joseph Whittaker, Paul Dziezyc and Anne Summerville. After much discussion about the problems in Carwin Park, it was voted by the Committee that a resolution be drafted and presented to the Board to be sent to department heads, after it was defined that the Public Works Dept. was responsible for the cleanliness and etc. of the park, and the Police Department was responsible for the policing of the Park. We voted 5-0 to send a resolution which will now be read by Mr. Stanley Darer, my Co-Chairman.

MR. DARER read the resolution which is attached at the end of the Minutes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED AND SECONDED. I completely support the concept of this resolution. I have one question. Under the "Be It Resolved #2", who are we suggesting set the curfew?

MR. WIDER: This will be set and enforced by the Public Works Department and enforced by the Police Department.

MRS. CONTI: Does the Public Works Commissioner have that authority?

MR. WIDER: He does, since the property is in his full charge.

MRS. CONTI: Anything like that usually comes before this Board, doesn't it? To set anything of that nature?

MR. WIDER: Come before this Board?

MR. DARER: We are making a Resolution here, requesting that the Public Works Commissioner do this.

MRS. CONTI: What I mean is do we have to do it in the ^{form of a} general ordinance, as we ordinarily would? I'm wondering, in other words, and I support this concept, and I don't want it to be loose that it can't be enforced, because I think it should be tight enough that they can completely enforce it, otherwise it is just a piece of paper that is worthless.

MR. DARER: My only answer to Mrs. Conti is that I appreciate her support. We are anxious to move, as I said, as quickly as possible in this rather horrendous situation that exists there, and we probably, if necessary, will do any additional housekeeping; and we're going to have a public hearing at which time we're going to invite representatives of the community, the police force and the public works. But in the interim, the problem is very serious. It's a hot summer over there and we've got to do something quickly and this was our first step reaction. We think it's a good step. We think it will be helpful; from that point when we have the public hearing we will get input as a result of this resolution and can move forward if any additional ordinances or legislation are necessary.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would like to thank Mr. Wider and Mr. Darer and the rest of their committee for doing a fantastic job on paying attention to the problems of the people on the West Side. As maybe we all don't know, but people of the West Side have been littered with broken promises for a number of years; and one of the things that has to happen to this park is that it becomes a park like any other park in the City and comes under the jurisdiction of the Parks Dept. and the Recreation Dept. I want to thank this Board on behalf of the people of the 5th District for getting involved in the affairs of that park.

MR. FLOUNDERS: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote on Moving the Question. Seconded. CARRIED. We will now vote on the Resolution in relation to Carwin Park. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. WIDER: That ends my report.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

NO REPORT.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

NO REPORT.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

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

MR. JOYCE: This item is being HELD IN COMMITTEE pending the special meeting which is to be held Wednesday, August 6th, which I urge every Board member to attend. It is at Stillmeadow School and is being held by the Zoning Board at which time the matter of the City's zoning on heliports is going to be taken up.

I would further report that on our desk this evening we have copy of a letter sent to the Mayor from the State Bureau of Aeronautics signed by Robert Carrier concerning a Mr. Silver, that there is going to be a meeting sometime in August on an application made by Helicopters Assoc. of New Canaan in conjunction with the Mercede Plaza Enterprises to establish a commercial heliport at Canal and Ludlow Streets in the East Branch of Stamford Harbor.

At the present time we are planning to deal with this matter by zoning ordinance and to follow that up with an ordinance directed by this Board, irrespective of the opinion from Corporation Counsel such an ordinance would not be effective or legal. I don't agree with that and I've told a number of my fellow Board members and they are inclined to agree with me.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'd like the record to indicate that Mrs. Howe and Mrs. Santy, Mr. Rybnick and Mr. Livingston have left the meeting and there are now 32 members present.

ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE - Fiorenzo Corbo, Chairman

- (1) PROGRESS REPORT.

MR. CORBO: There isn't much to report at this time except that we are working very closely with Susan Brewster and Commissioner Spaulding preparing the documents that are needed for a grant application.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

- (1) Appointment of Committee members.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have already discussed the Charter Revision Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE.

PETITIONS - NONE.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESJUNE 2, 1980 REGULAR BOARD MINUTES

MR. BLUM: On the Minutes of June 2nd, I did attend the Steering Committee, it so notes in the minutes where I spoke, but yet on the listing, it doesn't show me present.

(Note from Admin. Asst.: Sorry for omitting you on attendance list. Mr. Blum came in a mite late and Mr. Michael Wiederlight handled the Personnel Committee Agenda.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will note that, Mr. Blum. I will accept a Motion to Accept the June 2, 1980 minutes as corrected.

MR. BOCCUZZI: SO MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

JULY 7, 1980 REGULAR BOARD MINUTES

MR. BOCCUZZI: I MOVE for the Acceptance of the July 7, 1980 Minutes. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION against HELCO (N.E. Utilities) rate increase application before P.U.C.A.

MR. ZELINSKI: This Resolution concerns the application by North East Utilities to the P.U.C.A. for rate increases. Our Board is opposed to the 18% increase for electrical residential uses and 14.7% for gas users, and I MOVE for its approval. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would just like to say that I received a letter from Mrs. Filardo in relation to the mill rate setting and this will be taken up. Her letter will be discussed at Steering and placed on the Steering Committee agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

MR. BLUM: I did want to bring this up in my report. I do hope, based on the letter that you sent off to us, that Austin Rinella has a speedy recovery.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, if we're still under Old Business, I'd just like to make note of the fact that the Water Company's request for an increase was denied and they have requested to file a special abbreviated quarterly rate increase which was also denied.

NEW BUSINESS:

MR. BOCCUZZI: The next Board meeting, the first Monday is a holiday, so I MOVE that the regular Board meeting be held Wednesday, September 3, 1980.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. JOYCE: I'd like to bring to the attention of this Board the fact that the Transportation Committee, also on the 6th of this month, unfortunately, because of prior commitments, it presents a conflict to the Zoning Board meeting, but we have a group of engineers coming from Europe to make a very detailed presentation on an automated transportation system which, based on a report that was done by our Planning Department in 1976, and we had here about a month ago, an American company gave us a price on the same system, which was in the magnitude of approximately \$25,000,000 (TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS) a mile.

This European company can give us the same thing for approximately FOUR MILLION DOLLARS (\$4,000,000) a mile. The significance of this is that now it may become feasible for this system to be considered operable to build several miles of this type of system within the budgetary restraints and the economics for which we have considered in the past. So, I do urge that as many Board members that can attend, and citizens, too, to attend this meeting on Wednesday evening, although I admit that it is a problem because of unfortunately the conflict with the Zoning Board meeting which many people may wish to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

MRS. McINERNEY: There being no further business to come before the Board, I MOVE that the meeting be adjourned. SECONDED. CARRIED.
ADJOURNMENT AT 12:35 A.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:SM:AK:CMT
CMT - draft copy.
AK - 5-23 final.
1-4; 24-63, et al HMM.

MEETING Regular Board Meeting
 Aug. 4, 1980
 Changes In Seating:

Disc./ Party	Members	Seac No.	Members
R - 7	1 CONTI, Betty	1	CONTI, Betty
R - 7	2 GUROLAN, Grace	2	GUROLAN, Grace
R - 13	3 FLOUNDERS, Burcdis	3	FLOUNDERS, Burcdis
D - 3	4 WIDER, Lachon	4	WIDER, Lachon
R - 13	5 DARER, Stanley	5	DARER, Stanley
R - 20	6 McINERNEY, Barbara	6	McINERNEY, Barbara
R - 17	7 POLLARD, Everett	7	POLLARD, Everett
D - 10	8 JOYCE, Patrick	8	JOYCE, Patrick
D - 4	9 ESPOSITO, Paul	9	ESPOSITO, Paul
R - 17	10 BOWLEY, Doris	10	BOWLEY, Doris
R - 10	11 ROOS, John	11	ROOS, John
R - 16	12 SARTY, Jeanne-Lois	12	SARTY, Jeanne-Lois
R - 15	13 STORK, Philip	13	STORK, Philip
R - 11	14 CONTI, Anthony	14	CONTI, Anthony
R - 14	15 DeLUCA, Robert Gabe	15	DeLUCA, Robert Gabe
D - 12	16 HOGAN, John J.	16	HOGAN, John J.
R - 19	17 MAHOCK, Audrey	17	MAHOCK, Audrey
R - 10	18 LOMIS, Ralph	18	LOMIS, Ralph
D - 1	19 LYONS, Moira	19	LYONS, Moira
D - 6	20 SUMMERVILLE, Annie M.	20	SUMMERVILLE, Annie M.
D - 5	21 LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	21	LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah
D - 2	22 SOCCIZZI, John J.	22	SOCCIZZI, John J.
D - 3	23 KUNSAW, John	23	KUNSAW, John
R - 14	24 CORBO, Florenzio	24	CORBO, Florenzio
R - 15	25 DZIEZYC, Paul	25	DZIEZYC, Paul
R - 20	26 FAUTEUX, Robert	26	FAUTEUX, Robert
D - 2	27 DLKON, Randy	27	DLKON, Randy
D - 6	28 FASANELLI, Richard	28	FASANELLI, Richard
D - 9	29 PERILLO, Mildred	29	PERILLO, Mildred
D - 12	30 BLUM, David I.	30	BLUM, David I.
D - 11	31 ZELINSKI, John	31	ZELINSKI, John
R - 13	32 SIGNORE, Mary Jane	32	SIGNORE, Mary Jane
D - 9	33 PERILLO, Alfred	33	PERILLO, Alfred
D - 2	34 DeNICOLA, Vincent	34	DeNICOLA, Vincent
D - 5	35 RINALDI, Mary Lou	35	RINALDI, Mary Lou
D - 4	36 RYENICK, Gerald	36	RYENICK, Gerald
D - 3	37 DONAHUE, Donald T., Jr.	37	DONAHUE, Donald T., Jr.
D - 16	38 WIEDERLIGT, Michael	38	WIEDERLIGT, Michael
R - 1	39 HAME, Marje	39	HAME, Marje
D - 16	40 GOLDSTEIN, Sandra - PRESIDENT	40	GOLDSTEIN, Sandra - PRESIDENT

CODE:
 Y = Absent.
 A = Abstaining.
 Y = YES vote.
 N = NO vote.

VOTING SUBJECT; MOTIONS, ETC.

TEST	Y Y Y Y Y A Y A O O Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	TESTING
	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y O O Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	TESTING
	N N N N N N N N O O N N N O N	TESTING
#1	A N Y A Y N N N O O Y N N O N N Y Y N N Y Y O A N N N N N N A N N N N N N N N A	MOTION to approve Fiscal #4 \$3 Million for Pension Fund - DENIED: 7 Yes, 24 No, 5 Abstentions. (1)
#2	N N N Y A A Y N O O N A A O Y N N Y N Y Y A O A A N Y N N N Y Y N A A Y A N N Y	MOTION to take #5 Fiscal OUT OF COMMITTEE \$162,700 Aide Contract funding. DENIED: 10 Yes, 16 No, 10 Abstentions. (2)
#3	Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y O O Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y A Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y A Y Y Y Y Y A Y A Y Y	Motion to approve Fiscal #7 DPW Div. of Collection 1980-1981 \$1,511,000. APPROVED: 31 Yes, 1 No, 4 Abstentions. (3)
#4	Y Y N N N N Y O O N N N O N N N N Y A N O A Y N N Y N Y Y N N N N N N N N N	Motion to cut Fiscal #8 to \$5,562,50 Parking Lot Rental TPA - DENIED: 8 Yes, 25 No, 3 Abstentions. (4)
#5	Y Y Y A Y Y Y Y O O Y Y Y O Y Y Y Y Y A Y O A Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Motion to approve Fiscal #8 \$11,125.00 APPROVED: 33 Yes, 1 No, 2 Abstentions. (5)

(continued on page 2)