

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1982

17th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

City of Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1982, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 P.M. by the PRESIDENT, JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Given by HANDY DIXON, Deacon, Union Baptist Church.

"May we pray, Our Father and Our God, we thank You for the glory and beauty of this another day and for all good blessings. As we come together in behalf of the citizenry of Stamford, give us wisdom and knowledge and understanding to do that which is needed to promote good government unselfishly and without hesitation. And as the hours go by, we ask for the benefit of Your presence and guidance that we may deliberate in an atmosphere of Peace. Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President Jeanne-Lois Santy.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville Called the Roll. There were 38 members present, and 2 absent. The absent members were Reps. Hogan and Flounders.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: There were some problems with the computerized voting equipment.

PAGES: RACHEL PAGLIARULO, 6th grade student at Stillmeadow School and niece of Rep. Dudley.

JANE CARLIN, 6th grade student at Stillmeadow School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late GILDA PERONE, age 88, of 117 Joffre Avenue, who passed away on Feb. 1st. She had 23 grandchildren and 19 great grandchildren. Submitted by Rep. Dudley.

For the late CYRUS ESAW, age 50, of 26 Chatfield St., who passed away on his birthday Feb. 11th. He was a 30-year resident of Stamford. He was Housekeeping Director at Stamford Hospital and a member of the National Executive Housekeepers Association. Submitted by Rep. Dudley.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

It was Moved and Seconded to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report. Carried Unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, January 18, 1982, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M., having been called for 7:30 P.M. The Chairwoman, Jeanne-Lois Santy, declared a QUORUM present, and called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman	(R)	Annie M. Summerville	(D)
Barbara McInerney	(R)	Audrey Maihock	(R)
Robert Gabe DeLuca	(R)	John Roos	(R)
Mary Jane Signore	(R)	David I. Blum	(D)
Marie Hawe	(R)	John Zelinski	(D)
Anthony Conti	(R)	Grace Guroian	(D)
Burtis Flounders	(R)	WSTC-Kevin Roache	
Paul Dziezyc	(R)	ADVOCATE-S. Costello	
Robert Fauteux	(R)		

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the name of Bruce Spaulding for Public Works Commissioner, being the second submission.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 16 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were 27 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. On one item being Held in Committee for the Parks Dept., Terry Conners Rink, the \$5,000 for Code 620.4201 Program Services was withdrawn, leaving \$4,500.00 Code 620.2650 New Equipment, to be considered at a future meeting, having been approved by the Board of Finance.

(3) SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda relating to the Rules of Order of the 17th Board of Representatives.

(4) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 5 items of the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were 12 items: (a) Proposed Ordinance regarding free use of any municipal recreational facilities, and this item to be resubmitted by Rep. McInerney; (b) Proposed Ordinance re sale of City-owned property at the Hurricane Barrier; (c) Proposed Ordinance re increased penalties for violators of dog leashing ordinance; (d) Proposed Ordinance to increase adoption fees at dog pound; (e) Proposed Ordinance amending Sec. 6-17(3) defining "gross income, etc."; (e) Proposed Ordinance re liability for ice and snow on public sidewalks; (f) Proposed Ordinance concerning tax credit for refuse collection where not collected; (g) Proposed Ordinance amending Sec. 8-18 annual pick-up of household and yard debris; (h) Proposed Ordinance revising Chapter 20 concerning

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(4) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS (continued)

traffic and parking matters; (i) Proposed Ordinance for tax abatement for Hanrahan Center; (j) Request for an anti-obscenity ordinance on cable TV by Mrs. Harold Block; (k) Request from Dolphin Cove Assn. for one mill rate throughout the City.

(5) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, plus two new items: (a) Re-submission - ratification of Firemen's Labor Contract; (b) Matter of the Management/Compensation Plan, Merit Rules (Civil Service Regulations) as they relate to Compensation of Non-Union Administrators.

(6) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

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

(7) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

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

(8) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items, two which appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda, and one new item being the matter of a fire alarm system at the Municipal Office Building. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the matter of hazards of microwave transmitters for cable TV.

(9) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

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

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(11) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution opposing an increase in water rates. Also ordered on, was a resolution supporting Poland and Solidarity. Defeated were two proposed resolutions, one regarding WYRS continuing to be a jazz station, and another regarding Halsey Moore.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

The Chairwoman of the Steering Committee, Jeanne-Lois Santy, announced that future meetings of the Steering Committee would be held on Mondays, and be called for 7:00 P.M., unless holidays or other conditions made it impossible or infeasible.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman  
Steering Committee  
17th Board of Representatives

HMM:MS

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Mary Jane Signore & Handy DixonMAYOR'S CABINET - PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSIONERTerm Expires

(1) <u>BRUCE W. SPAULDING</u> (R)	Re-Appointment	Nov. 30, 1983
126 Cedarwood Road		
Held in Steering 12/10/81; Denied 1/11/82;		
Second Submission; Held in Committee 2/1/82.		

MRS. SIGNORE: The Appointments Committee met on Thursday, Feb. 25th at 7:00 P.M. Present were Mr. Dixon, Mr. DeLuca, Ms. deGaetani, Mr. Tarzia, Mr. Conti, Ms. Summerville, and Mrs. Signore. Two members of the Committee were absent. Nine other members of this Board were in attendance, and many of them chose to participate in the interviewing process.

The first item on the agenda was the re-appointment of BRUCE SPAULDING as Public Works Commissioner. Mr. Spaulding is a native of Stamford, and a graduate of LeHigh University with a major in metallurgical engineering. After serving in the U.S. Army, he continued his education at Yale, where he received a Master's degree in Industrial Administration. His past employment includes Owen Industries, Westinghouse Electric Corp., and the American Iron and Steel Institute. He currently resides with his wife and two children on Cedarwood Road. The vote for his re-appointment was 6 in favor, none opposed, with one abstention, and I so Move.

THE PRESIDENT: There has been a Motion for a Roll Call vote. It has been Seconded. All in favor? There is a sufficient number. If there is no discussion, Clerk Annie Summerville will Call the Roll. It will also be recorded on the machine. Will the Tellers please come forward? Bruce Spaulding has been CONFIRMED by a vote of 27 Yes, 10 No, 1 Abstention, and 2 Absent from the meeting.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: May I make a Motion to Waive the Rules and take up another item on the agenda?

THE PRESIDENT: Mrs. Signore is in the middle of her report. She has one other name to bring up.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)MAYOR'S CABINET - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCETerm Expires

(2) PATRICK G. MARRA (R) (Unaffil-  
55 Tall Oaks Court iated)

Nov. 30, 1983

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Marra is a four-year resident of Stamford, living with his wife and children at 55 Tall Oaks Court. He holds degrees in Accounting and Finance from New York University and the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil. He is a Certified Public Accountant, and his resume gives you details on his employment affiliations. The Committee was unanimous in favor of his appointment with 7 in favor, none opposed, and I so Move. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The City of Stamford is indebted to Mr. Marra's predecessor, Dr. Hoffman, for his distinguished service to our City. Mr. Marra gives the impression that he will strive, also, to give his most conscientious effort and extensive experience, both domestic and foreign, to the position of Commissioner of Finance. We, in the 19th District, are very honored that both Dr. Hoffman and Mr. Patrick Marra, our prospective Commissioner of Finance, are from the 19th District.

MR. TARZIA: I would like to say that the other night at the special Committee on the Reassessment, Mr. Blais and myself, who serve on that as Representatives of this Board, managed to, and had the opportunity to spend three hours with Mr. Marra. We were really impressed with the way he helped that Committee do its work, and what he has done in the two weeks that he has been on the job. I have high hopes for Mr. Marra in these times of tight money when the City will have to make some tough decisions. I really think that we are fortunate to have Mr. Marra on board, and I am hopeful that this Board will give him its unanimous approval.

MRS. GUROLIAN: Mr. Marra comes to this Board with the highest of credentials, and I have been asking around to his fellow accountants, and his peers give him nothing but flying colors. I hope that the Board will vote for him unanimously. I think that he will do an excellent job.

MRS. McINERNEY: I Move that the Clerk cast one vote in favor of Mr. Marra.

THE PRESIDENT: All those in favor of the Motion, please say AYE. Opposed? Mr. and Mrs. Perillo Abstained. Mr. Marra has been CONFIRMED with 36 Yes votes, and 2 Abstentions (Mr. and Mrs. Perillo).

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I Move to Waive the Rules and bring up Item #4 under Fiscal for consideration at this point in our meeting. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT: The Motion is to take Item #4, \$59,220 for the Housing Authority out of Fiscal onto the agenda now. This will require a two-thirds vote. All in favor, say AYE. Opposed? Carried.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Would you let the record state that I am not voting on this item due to a possible conflict?

FISCAL ITEM #4 (continued)

THE PRESIDENT: It will be noted that Ms. Summerville left the floor for this vote, due to a possible conflict.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Out of Sequence)

- (4) ~~\$-63,698.00~~ - HOUSING AUTHORITY - Code 780.7564 - Additional Appropriation to fund 7 Security Guards for ~~-7-~~ 4 months at Southfield Village, Vidal Court & Fairfield Court, Wm. C. Ward Homes, Stamford Manor, Clinton Ave., Czescik Homes, Oak Park, Lawn Hill Terrace, Quintard Terrace, per Mayor's request 12/31/81 revised. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO: Item #4 under Fiscal is for ... the number should be revised to \$59,220.

Secondary Committee Report was waived.

MRS. CONTI: This is a minority report of Joseph Franchina and Betty Conti. The Stamford Housing Authority is an autonomous body, created by state statute and, as such, has never drawn operating revenues from local property taxes. The Housing Authority is supposed to be self-sustaining and should be kept that way. To vote for this appropriation would set an extremely dangerous precedent, and would open the doors for other housing complexes, both subsidized projects and privately-owned buildings, to demand the same preferential protection that this appropriation requests.

This \$59,220 covers only 13 weeks of this fiscal year for seven security guards. Rest assured, if this is approved, there will be an annual appropriation of \$200,000 next year with ever-increasing budgets thereafter. Once the Housing Authority is encouraged to depend on local property taxes for revenues, there will be no end to their request to the detriment of already heavily burdened local property taxpayers. The lid should be clamped tight and kept that way on this Pandora's box. This appropriation is to cover a service over and above that extended to other citizens of Stamford, and it is therefore discriminatory. If, however, these residents feel they are in serious danger without the added service, then they must indicate to their housing commissioners that they will be willing to pay an additional \$5.00 or so a month in rent so that the Authority can provide this added protection. In this way, there is no discrimination as they will be paying for it themselves; and the Housing Authority will remain within statutory requirements for autonomy.

Several statements were made in the Fiscal Committee meeting, and these should be addressed. The payment-in-lieu-of-taxes program, the agree-between the state and the city, requires only that the city provide the Housing Authority with the same level of service provided to the rest of

7. MINUTES OF MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1982, REGULAR MEETING 7.

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

the community. The city is already doing that without this appropriation, so there is no violation of the pilot program without this appropriation. Now, as to the crocodile tears shed in Fiscal over an additional \$5.00 or \$6.00 a month for the elderly - this is a fallacy. When the rent increases for any reason, the elderly, with the exception of Czescik Homes, continue to pay only 25% of their income for rent. The federal government, still the taxpayers, subsidize the balance. There is no added hardship for the elderly to pay the guard. As to Czescik Homes, these are not subsidized, so they would have to pay the additional. But those tenants have the option of transferring into one of the other senior citizens projects if they cannot afford the additional rent; or those few units could even be exempted from the rent increase. We urge you to vote No on Item #4 for the reasons stated. Thank you.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to correct something very briefly. Mrs. Conti said that this appropriation was for 13 weeks, and this is incorrect - it is for 18 weeks starting on March 1 through June 30.

MR. DIXON: I have received calls from Housing Authority officials, tenants and tenants' associations asking approval of this appropriation. And as I see it, the city of Stamford is in a very poor state when its citizens have to live in constant fear and at the mercy of thieves and robbers, dope addicts, vandals, and common criminals around the clock and in almost all parts of this city. This has become one of our biggest and most disturbing problem that simply must be faced and dealt with in a very positive way. Tenants and senior citizens who, unfortunately, have to live in high density areas such as those provided by the Housing Authority are always first to fall victim to that all-increasing problem. They are not safe in their apartments or in the hallways, elevators, or even in the streets. We know that security guards will not be the ultimate solution, but it will be the first step in this needed and most immediate cause to reach that end. There are many areas in the public housing complexes that are off-limits to our regular police, so I just hope that you will vote favorably with this appropriation. But we shouldn't stop there. We should legislate laws and urge every city official and department to use every ounce of force necessary to remedy this distasteful situation.

MR. LIVINGSTON: One of the things that we should recognize and that is, what is the duty of government. The chief function of any government, be it city, state or federal, is to protect its citizens. In our city we have a ghetto that's absolutely under seige. And when I use the word 'ghetto', I don't want anyone to misinterpret and think that I'm speaking in ethnic terms. We have an economic ghetto; and if you don't believe it, you pass by Bongiorno's and you see that Berlin Wall that's been built to keep vandals out while honest and decent citizens are allowed to shop in peace. One thing we've got to recognize, and that is it is our duty to protect our citizens; and if we dare put our heads under the sand and pretend that this is a problem that belongs to the Housing Authority or pretend that it is a problem that belongs to the citizens that live in these various areas, then we are wrong and we are doing them an injustice. If we support this, I recognize it as an inexpensive first step to give the people protection. But the facts are: the people who live in these areas and people all over this city, have the right to demand that our government hire the policemen to protect all of its citizens. I ask my fellow Board members to consider this. If it was your area or your street, are we going to go back to the days of hiring vigilantes to protect our

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

streets or are we going to face up to the crime factor ourselves? And we must keep in mind that crime is crime, regardless of where it takes place; and it's not an isolated thing. And I hope that we give the people of Stamford the minimum protection they're asking for.

MRS. MAIHOCK: It is unconscionable that citizens in Stamford need more police protection all over our city, and their needs have not been met by our city. This item before us is not the real answer to the problem. The police department should put a task force in this area until this problem can be properly investigated and a resolution be made. Chief Cizanckas did this and it was an effective tool in one area. In tonight's Advocate, a resident of the area expressed concern that this may not be the real answer to the problem. I think this situation needs the police department's immediate attention. There is no reason why anyone cannot live in our city without fear.

MR. DUDLEY: Mrs. Conti's proposal for a rent increase, or a \$5.00 or a \$10.00 increase, in my mind is absurd. Some of these areas are low-income areas and people trying to make ends meet. Many senior citizens are living on social security and fixed income, and I don't see how we can ask them to pay for these services. Rent increases are absolutely absurd; I just can't comprehend that. I'd like to refer to an incident in one of the senior citizens' housings, that a handicapped woman was attacked inside the door of the senior citizens' housing. To put a price tag on one's safety is absurd, and I urge everyone here to support and vote in favor of this amendment.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you, I would like to ask some questions to Rep. Esposito. First of all, will the security guards be armed?

MR. ESPOSITO: They are not security guards. We have been using the wrong term; they are special police with all the powers of special police and trained as special police.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you. That would have been my second question, what kind of training. I think it's important to know exactly what we're voting for this evening. Final question, Paul, do you know how the patrols will be utilized over the various housing authority complexes and what their actual functions will be. Will they be patrolling, for example, just the outside grounds or the hallways or just exactly what? I think it's important for us to know this evening what their actual functions will be, and then I have a statement.

MR. ESPOSITO: I have a complete list of exactly which housing projects will be serviced and the time of day that they will be serviced. As far as where they will be patrolling, it depends on the nature of the project. Where there are high-rise projects, yes, they will be patrolling indoors and outdoors. In projects like Oak Park, they would be patrolling only outdoors and parking areas, the same with Lawn Hill Terrace.

MR. ZELINSKI: I believe that we have an obligation to our citizens in Stamford who reside in the housing authority complexes. They're there not by choice but because of circumstances; and I personally know for a fact that there have been cases of robberies and muggings and so forth, and I believe that tonight we have an opportunity to appropriate funds that will

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

be utilized hopefully to better protect the citizens who reside in these complexes. The Stamford Police Department does an outstanding job, but there's only so much manpower. In this situation, yes, it does cost money and yes, we do have to be concerned with dollars; but I feel this should be a top priority. The people must be protected at all costs and I believe that tonight we should pass this appropriation. If it will defray or stop a burglar or a mugger or so forth, or stop anyone from getting physically hurt, or God forbid, worse, I think we must take this action tonight; and I would sincerely urge my colleagues to vote in the affirmative and pass this appropriation so the people that reside there can have peace of mind and live without fear of their lives or their property.

MRS. GURORIAN: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question is moved. There has been a motion for a roll call vote.

MR. ESPOSITO: What was the vote on moving the question? You had 12 opposed, and 19 in favor. Don't you need 2/3 for moving the question?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, we do. I am sorry. The question is not moved. Back to debate.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to clarify a few issues. One of them has already been clarified about the security guards not being security guards but special police. The other one is the issue of the pilot program, payment in lieu of taxes. The Housing Authority does not get the full service for this payment in lieu of taxes that has been indicated here. In the past, and I don't know if this practice still continues, but it has been the practice in the past for the police not to patrol the Housing Authority properties and issue tickets and summons for illegally parked cars. That has been the responsibility of the Housing Authority. This is a service that is provided all other parts of the city and has not been provided for the Housing Authority. Garbage collection is an issue among the Housing Authority property as well as in condominiums. Some Housing Authority properties do have the front-loaders and they are not serviced by the city; they therefore have to pay private garbage collectors. There may be many other issues that we haven't thought about, but the \$602,000 that is received in payment in lieu of taxes does not all go for the services that every other citizen gets in the city of Stamford. In addition, I feel that the government has an obligation to protect its citizens; and sometimes this requires special services. I don't view this as discriminatory; it's a necessity. We do not view the existence of a harbor patrol and a scuba diving team as discriminatory against those people in North Stamford because they don't live on the shore. This is a special need that needs special protection and special funding. The citizens in public housing have a higher rate of vandalism, a higher rate of street assault, a higher rate of burglary, and also a higher rate of senior citizens who need this protection. This requires special protective measures. I would like to point out the cost effectiveness of this particular program. We are getting 7 police officers who are special police officers, trained as city police are trained by the city police. And they will be patrolling only in these specific areas, foot patrols, mobilized patrols, in those projects that require a greater mobility. This is concentrated intensive patrol.

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

If we, as has been suggested, depend on the city police, and the suggestion has been made that we hire more police and have more intense patrol by the city police, what we are paying on a yearly basis, this would come out to about \$180,000. It would cost approximately \$250,000 to do the same work with the city police. It simply costs more money to put city police in there with the fringe benefits and salaries, etc. It is more cost-effective for us to put the special police in where the greatest need is and to have them there at all the hours that are high crime hours then it would be to have city police patrolling the areas in their normal course of action.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a couple of questions. One is, it says in the budget, there are some stars and it says mobilized patrol. If you look at the preceding page, it says that the Wm. C. Ward homes, the Elderly Stamford Manor, Clinton Avenue, Czescik Homes and the East Side Oak Park, Lawn Hill Terrace and Quintard Terrace are double-starred. Does that mean that they are mobilized patrol? What kind of mobilization is it? Who pays for the vehicles? Who pays for the gas, the upkeep, and it's not in the budget. Can you explain this?

MR. ESPOSITO: First of all, the reason for the mobilized patrols is that this enables the police officer to get from one project to another even if it's not a project, as a garden apartment dwelling. The vehicles that are used are all Housing Authority vehicles; they are pick-up trucks and any other vehicles that they might use for the daily activities. Since most of the police officers work in the evening, these trucks are typically not used by the Housing Authority during the evening so that the special police will be using them. The Housing Authority picks up the cost for the vehicles and the gas. That's why they're not in the budget.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It is indeed a sad commentary on our society when we have to ask for more police protection for our housing. The minority report as given also is a sad commentary on fiscal conservatism. In reference to getting Chief Considine to add more police protection to these areas, I am sure that if the Chief did have the police power, and I mean the people power, to do so, he would do so. Were the Chief here, I am sure that he would tell you that he is stretched thin as it is and he is maximizing his people at this point in time. With the opening of the new downtown business area, it will stretch his police patrols even thinner. He would, I am sure, do what he could do; however, he can't. In reference to passing on this expense to the tenants, unfortunately, it cannot be done. Because, according to the state and federal regulations, any rent increase must pass through the state and the federal government, HUD and whatever other committees in the State have. It is implied within these two bodies, the state and federal government, that police protection is to be provided by the municipality; and they will not approve any rent increases to pay for police protection. In all due conscience, I don't see how we can deny these people proper police protection. It is a sworn duty and obligation of us to provide proper protection and safeguards for these people, and I don't see how anybody can vote against this.

MR. WIDER: As I sit here and listen and look back over the last five years that I've been Chairman of the Public Housing Committee, I wonder how long can we listen to citizens of our city cry for help. And then we sit up and argue about a few dollars. I'm really surprised at some of these people because some of these people at one time were yelling for the same thing that these same people are asking for now. But now they can't see any sense to yell it. I am a taxpayer and I hate to pay additional tax. But

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

it is a pleasure for me to pay tax to serve citizens who are practically in captivity because half of them won't come here to meetings at night because they are afraid to go back to their apartments. I have met with those people time and time again, and we have tried to soothe their minds; but I think it's time that we do a little bit more than soothe their minds. I think it's about time we do something for them. Because when I lived there, I was glad to walk up the lane and see police walking down, even though it was much safer than it is now. I happen to be one of the people who lived in public housing, and it was safe, nice, a decent place to live. But in the meantime, I was glad to see police at night when I was walking down. I ask you, let's give these people something for their cries. They need it, and I think we owe it to them.

MR. BLUM: I see the next item in the order of business, #5, talks of buying three-wheel police vehicles for the Super Block. I have always believed in justice for all and equal treatment of the law. I believe we just passed only last month to give added police protection for the Super Block. Certainly, our citizens in the Ward Homes, Czescik Homes, Lawn Hill Terrace, Quintard Terrace, are in need of protection as well as the Super Block. Think... Think...before you vote, with justice for all.

MRS. McINERNEY: Before I make my comments, I would like to direct a question to Mr. Esposito. When these guards are hired, am I to understand that the money that's being requested is strictly for salaries?

MR. ESPOSITO: Yes, I don't know if you have the revised budget. In the old budget, there was room for fringe benefits; but the Housing Authority has gone back and looked over the entire budget, reduced it in light of the reduced amount of time, and this is for a straight salary.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then my next question would be, if one of these men were patrolling on Housing Authority property, if they were mugged, if they were shot, who then would be liable for their medical benefits, who would be liable to their family if they were hospitalized or killed? What kind of protection is being provided other than salaries?

MR. ESPOSITO: I don't have that information here, but if you'll give me a few minutes, I can try to find out.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to know the answer. I think this is a tremendous problem to ponder. I would rather hold my remarks until after I hear his answer.

MR. TARZIA: The comments made by some of my fellow colleagues are well-taken. I agree with Mr. Blum, Mr. Wider and a few others. However, the problem as I see it is this. We have about 4 months left of this fiscal year. We are really making a long-term commitment. What we are approving tonight has to be a commitment long-term, not just for the next 4 months. It isn't really the \$59,000 we're talking about. I don't think come July 1st, we can tell these people we're no longer going to provide for the guards. My point is this: In 60 days, a budget is going to be given to us by the city. Why don't we do things the way they should be done? In other words, let's look at the total budget of the city. Let's set up our priorities. Yes, we should care about the elderly. We should care about these areas where security is a problem. At that time is when we should make a commitment whether we should

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

spend a quarter of a million dollars a year or not. Not piecemeal, not for 3 months. You know, these games, I don't see where you have fiscal responsibility by doing it this way, I really don't.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Now we can go back to Mrs. McInerney's question. Mr. Esposito, do you have the answer to that at this point?

MR. ESPOSITO: Yes, they would be covered under workmen's compensation, but I would like to defer this to Mr. Wiederlight who has the other insurance.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: They would be covered under the statutory benefits as offered under the workmen's compensation since they will be direct employees of the Housing Authority, which includes death benefits, also.

MRS. McINERNEY: Who would pay those workmen's compensation benefits for these people? The premiums...

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The premiums are paid by the Housing Authority.

MRS. McINERNEY: The Housing Authority would have the money to pay the premiums for the workmen's compensation?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: That's correct. They should, they have to.

MRS. McINERNEY: And yet they are not paying the salaries of these people. Is that what I'm understanding? That they would be agreeable to pay one thing but yet not another?

MR. ESPOSITO: That is correct. They are also contributing the automobiles, the gas, the maintenance of the mobilized vehicles as well.

MRS. McINERNEY: I have great difficulty living with the fact that one entity, the City of Stamford, is writing a paycheck for some people and another entity, which is totally autonomous from the City of Stamford, the Housing Authority, would be paying workmen's comp benefits and premiums. I would say that if this came to a legal battle that the city of Stamford would indeed have some responsibility in the event there was a problem in the future. But I will carry on with the rest of my remarks. Yes, Mr. Wider, we do listen to citizens of our city crying for help. People all over Stamford are crying for help. People living in fear are living in fear all over the city of Stamford. Women, shoppers, children are in fear of coming to downtown Stamford at certain periods of the day. Crime is no stranger to the city. We are all held captive by crime. Not one area, not one segment of this city is free of fear, free of robbery, free of mugging, free of vandalism, not one section of this city. I have problems, as I indicated, with the liability. I have problems listening to the citizens of our community screaming. I have spent time at the Board of Tax Review. I have seen people 86 years old pray that they die in their home, and you say what's \$2.00, what's \$3.00. To those people, \$2.00 and \$3.00 could amount to \$150.00. This is not going to be an easy year for this city. We have seen Reaganomics, we have seen state cuts, we are going to be bearing the brunt of this. This Housing Authority item - that was once paid for by the state.

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

That was once in some areas paid for by the federal government. They have copped out of their responsibility. Yes, we have a problem. I think Mrs. Maihock's suggestion was ample, was fine, for the time being for the rest of the fiscal year. Let the police set up a task force, working jointly with the Housing Authority, and the people who live within the Housing Authority. Because this is not a commitment for six months. As Mr. Tarzia indicated, this is a long-term commitment. It's not a commitment for seven security guards. That's just the tip of the iceberg. You see what they have in New York City. You haven't seen one security police force in the Housing Authority in New York City have seven security guards. Think more in terms of 200 and then look at the realities and see whether the city of Stamford can presently adopt this for six months. Let's be fair to the people who want this service. Let's not give them piecemeal. If we're going to do it, let's go ahead with the total commitment, but let's go with our eyes open. Let's provide full service, but let's also remember that we have a city out there that's crying for full service as well.

MRS. SAXE: I have yet to hear to whom will these special police report. From whom will they take their orders? And who will set their schedules?

MR. ESPOSITO: From the Director of the Housing Authority Security Force, Mr. Cece.

MRS. SAXE: May I ask also, will he be able to process any tickets or any of the crimes that might be stopped down there, or are we just going to slap people on the fingers and say don't do it again.

MR. ESPOSITO: Well, they go through the criminal justice system. If they arrest someone, they have to go to the Stamford Police Department and go through the appropriate channels.

MRS. SAXE: Then why would not the Stamford Police Department be the person they report to and take their orders from?

MR. ESPOSITO: Because they're special police. They're being hired not by the Stamford Police Department but by the Housing Authority, and therefore they are responsible to the Housing Authority. As police, the only way they can function administratively if they do arrest someone, if they do ticket a car, is through the appropriate channels. That would be the police department, the arrest procedure, the criminal justice system. The Housing Authority cannot become an agency for also adjudicating offenses.

MRS. SAXE: I don't think the Housing Authority should become the police department either.

MR. DeLUCA: To begin with, I think that Representative Esposito is wrong as far as the special police. I talked with Chief Considine in years gone by and even recently I was always under the impression that special police are under the jurisdiction of the police department, number one. Number two, it will look confused that these people are going to be special police. They've been trained by our city. If memory serves me correctly, all special police are trained and sworn in by the Police Commissioner, trained by our Police Department. They are obligated to spend at least 10 hours a month for volunteer services to the city of Stamford. If we're expending funds

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

to train these people, then we should recoup some of our benefits from them. As past remarks indicated, this is just the tip of the iceberg. If we were to vote on this this evening, you can rest assured that low income, moderate income, housing all over the city will be coming in for funds. Number two, we constantly hear remarks whenever something has to do with the elderly or the low-income housing, like Southfield, Vidal Court, the Ward Homes. Some of us are not cognizant of their needs, that we live in our own little corner of the city. And, as Representative McInerney stated, people all over the city are crying for help. We heard comments about the fear of people coming down to meetings. It's not only the people who live in the Ward Homes, or the Vidal Estates, or Southfield Village. It's people that live up in North Stamford, people that live in the 14th district, the 18th district, every district; someone is afraid to come down and listen to meetings. They fear leaving their homes because they wonder what will happen when they get back. This is a cry all over the city looking for protection.

Yes, I believe that we should provide protection. But, like Rep. Tarzia says, let's wait till we get all the facts. I can remember going back prior to my getting on the Board of Representatives, when the city approved pensions for the police and firemen twenty years, not even realizing what the economical effects would be in the future. You can see what has happened in New York City, Cleveland, and other cities where you have twenty-year pensions. Talk about seven police, special police -- are they going to patrol the whole area? I dare say not. I believe that we should hold this until the next budget comes out so we can really see what the physical impact is going to be. Once again, people have sat down till 2:00 in the morning to try to get the re-assessments knocked down a few thousand dollars so they can save a few dollars along the way. I have received phone calls from people saying I'm tired of my wife and I working. She cannot stay home with the kids; we need two jobs, two pays to come into the house to support ourselves. The re-assessment taxes will be going up; inflation keeps going up. I could foresee an impact over here eventually where this budget may hit \$400,000 or \$500,000; taxes will go up. People are struggling now. They cannot stay home with their children because they have to exist by going to work, just to barely exist. We talk about people living on fixed income. Most families, if the husband or wife happen to lose their job, they're only a few months away from bankruptcy themselves. What will happen to their homes? I think everyone must share in this expense. I plan to vote against this this evening, because I have received phone calls that vote against it. This is just the tip of the iceberg, and I don't believe Stamford can afford this. The federal government has refused to fund this project anymore. The state government has refused to provide funds. Now the city is being asked to take over.

In closing, we lose. We will eventually be strapped with the same thing when we take over the buses and the railroad station of this town. The State had it; it lost money, and the city's being saddled with it. I could see the same thing happening here.

MR. GAIPA: Through the Chair, I would like to ask Mr. Esposito, in the next fiscal year, is there any money in the budget for this item? Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1982?

MR. ESPOSITO: From what I have heard, and this is only hearsay because I haven't seen it yet, yes, there is. Approximately \$180,000.

FISCAL COMMITTEE #4 (Continued)

MR. CONTI: There has been a lot said about pro and con this evening, but I haven't heard a single bit about this. The Housing Authority is autonomous. If we are going to give them this amount of money, we cannot tell them that they must hire seven guards, they may hire two, and use the money for other purposes. Now this is something we can't control. We cannot tell them how to spend the money after we appropriate it and give it to them because of their autonomy. So how do we know that we are going to get control over the situation?

MR. ESPOSITO: We have the power to constantly re-appropriate money. As I just indicated, they will be coming back to us in two short months for a full year's service. If, upon investigation, we find out that they've only hired two, then they're accountable to us; and it is at our discretion then to never fund this again if we decide that we want to fund it tonight. That problem exists throughout the city. In many departments, we have appropriated money for salaries; and we don't know exactly how many people are hired and when they are hired. Many times, although we've approved funding for a particular position, that position has never been filled and we have to ask ourselves, where does that money go? Sometimes it's transferred out and we never even see it because we don't handle transfers.

MR. CONTI: Mr. Esposito said that we are talking about two months, and yet the agenda says seven months.

MR. ESPOSITO: When the item was first presented to this Board many months ago, prior to the organization of this Board, it was seven months. It is now four months, March through June 30th. That is the correct figure, regardless of what the agenda says. It is four months, March 1st through June 30th.

MR. CONTI: He just mentioned, if I may, two months just a few moments ago, then you mention four.

MR. ESPOSITO: I'm sorry. I said in two months we are going to be reviewing their budget. In May, come two months from now, we will be reviewing the budget for the next fiscal year, at which time we would have the right, if we so choose, not to fund this for the full year.

MRS. SIGNORE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Question is going to be moved. There's a request for a Roll Call Vote. There are 37 members present on the Board. There is a question on Robert's Rules about abstentions. Ms. Summerville has left the floor. She is not at the meeting. I rule that there are 25 votes needed to pass this. 2/3 will be 25 votes needed to pass this appropriation.

APPROPRIATION DEFEATED: 21 Yes; 15 No; 1 Abstention; 1 left the floor;  
2 Members Absent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now continue with the regular Agenda.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen B. Flounders & A. Perillo

- (1) THE MATTER OF DISCONTINUANCE OF CITY GARGAGE COLLECTION SERVICE TO COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN STAMFORD. Requested by Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi 7/8/81. Held in Committee 8/3, 9/9, 10/5 and 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held 1/19/82 at Special Meeting. 2/1/82 Regular Meeting, Committee recommending Lay on the Table.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) THE BROAD ISSUE OF GARBAGE COLLECTION - submitted by Rep. Flounders 2/1/82; to include collection at condominiums previously submitted by Rep. David Blum.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) LETTER FROM ROBERT S. WEISS & CO. REGARDING WHITAKER PLACE AND ROAD WORK NEEDED THERE, per their letter to Rep. Flounders.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Paul Dziezyc & Michael Wiederlight

- (1) PROPOSED CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR THE PURPOSES OF INSTITUTING ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT IN STAMFORD - submitted by Rep. Michael Wiederlight 12/3/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee Special Meeting 1/19/82. Held 2/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) THE MATTER OF THE MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING, 429 Atlantic Street, concerning fire alarm system - From Fire Marshall Carmine Sperenza 12/31/82 letter; also Supt. of Bldgs. & Grounds John Strat's response. Held in Committee 2/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) THE MATTER OF PROPER PUBLIC FACILITIES TO ACCOMMODATE THE HANDICAPPED - LETTER FROM MS. ZWERLING CONCERNING LOCAL HOTEL AT WHICH SHE STAYED AND THE ACCOMMODATIONS THEREIN. Submitted by Rep. Dziezyc.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) THE MATTER OF THE HAZARDOUS CONDITION OF THE STAMFORD PUBLIC SCHOOL PARKING LOTS DURING THE RECENT WINTER STORMS - request from Rep. Tarzia that H&P Committee go into this problem.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) REP. STORK'S REQUEST THAT THIS COMMITTEE LOOK INTO "THE MATTER OF NEGLIGENT LAW OBSERVANCE BY MOTORISTS AND POLICE ENFORCEMENT OF SAME IN STAMFORD" - his letter 2/5/82.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DZIEZYC: Drivers and pedestrians have to be constantly on the alert for those persons who break the traffic laws. Ever since the right turn-on-red after-stop went into effect, we encounter more and more drivers who do not stop at all and cut off motorists who have the right-of-way going through the green light. Abusers are the ones who by law have to yield, but it's the other way around. These same law-breakers being accustomed to not stopping at the red lights, now go straight through, jeopardizing the lives of good drivers. Chief Considine stated that he will institute a campaign to publicize and enforce these laws. He will make the public aware of the regulations and have a campaign to stop these abuses.

(6) REP. STORK'S REQUEST THAT THIS COMMITTEE LOOK INTO "THE MATTER OF MORE FREQUENT AND SLOWER POLICE PATROLS THROUGH OUR NEIGHBORHOODS IN AN EFFORT TO CURTAIL BREAKING AND ENTERING."

MR. DZIEZYC: Chief Considine stated that it's a difficult task to prevent these crimes. He wants to inform the people of Stamford that if they see anything suspicious or notice any strange persons in their neighborhoods, they shouldn't hesitate to call the police. This will prevent many breaking and entering. He has a program whereby he has six sergeants being trained in detective work for a period of six months; then they rotate six more until all the sergeants will be trained. This should make the Stamford Police Department more effective in solving this type of crime. The Chief appears at these committee meetings himself because if he sends an understudy to represent him, the city would have to pay the man a minimum of four hours overtime; and the Chief saves the city money by this action. Therefore, we wish to commend him for helping the taxpayers of Stamford.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Blum & Wider

- (1) QUESTION OF FINANCE BOARD POLICE #6-1 TO BE REVIEWED BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REGARDING AUDITING POLICY. Submitted by Rep. Lathon Wider at Steering 2/16/82. Text to be furnished.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - John Roos and A.M. Summerville, Co-Chairpersons

NO REPORT.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock, Chairwoman

MRS. MAIHOCK: We were the secondary committee on a fiscal item involving the EPB, and Mr. Dennis White and I attended this meeting where Marie Hawe, a member of our committee, was also present. When Miss Hawe gives her report, we will report further.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman

NO REPORT.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE

MRS. HAWE: I would like to make a Motion at this point to suspend the rules and take up Item #1 under Personnel.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE #1 (Out of Sequence)

PRESIDENT SANTY: It has been moved and seconded at this time to take Item #1 under Personnel Committee. Carried unanimously.

- (1) THE MATTER OF THE MANAGEMENT/COMPENSATION PLAN, MERIT RULES (CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS) - as they relate to Compensation of Non-Union Administrators - submitted by Rep. David I. Blum 1/18/82, and as relating to Fiscal item. Held in Committee 2/1/82.

MR. STORK: This package applies to Stamford's top seventeen administrators. This group is comprised of the following: labor negotiator, personnel director, assistant personnel director, purchasing director, Budget director, deputy commissioner of public works, recreation director, parks superintendent, deputy corporation counsel, four assistant corporation counsels, welfare director, assessor, health director, and the traffic director. The effective date for this compensation plan is July 1, 1981 to June 30, 1982, and will cost approximately \$154,000. This averages out to between an 11 to 13% increase per administrator. Passage of this plan will insure parity with the unionized MAA administrators in Stamford, as well as insuring salaries above that of their subordinates. As far as the merit evaluation plan is concerned, our committee was informed that of the last 300 reviews submitted, only two went to grievance. The Personnel Committee was quite satisfied that that statistic pointed to an effective and workable system. In their most recent review, none of the seventeen administrators rated below average. By a unanimous, affirmative vote of 7-0, the Personnel Committee voted for approval of the Management/Compensation and Merit Evaluation Plan, and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are several seconds that we adopt the Management Compensation Plan. We will move right to a vote. Passed unanimously. We adopted the Plan but will take abstentions now. Abstaining? Mrs. Conti, Mrs. Saxe, Mrs. Signore, Mrs. McInerney, Mr. Tarzia, Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Roos, Mrs. Perillo. Eight abstaining. Mr. DeLuca and Mr. Franchina are No votes.

MRS. GERSHMAN: It was my understanding that we passed this plan two years ago. I didn't think we were voting on an actual plan now.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork is moving for adoption of this plan.

The plan has been adopted. Mrs. Guroian has asked for a division of the house, so we will have a division. I am afraid we are going to have to use the machine. We are voting for the plan as presented by Mr. Stork from Personnel, not the funding of the plan, just the adoption of the plan. Since the machine is not working again, we can have a Roll Call Vote on this if you wish.

MR. ZELINSKI: Point of information or personal privilege, or whatever the proper salutation. Madam President, in all due respect, the vote was announced by yourself and the only question was that there were some people that decided they wanted to abstain; and I think that two or three after that decided that they wanted to vote No. But I think the vote was taken. I don't think you really have to take another vote on it. I really don't think it's necessary.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE #1 (Out of Sequence)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Guroian did ask for a division.

MR. ZELINSKI: After the vote was announced though. You can't take a division after the vote is announced.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let's not have any cross debate here. Now, the machine is set up once more. We could try it once more and just see how the machine reacts.

The print-out is not working tonight.

A roll call will be taken.

PLAN APPROVED: 23 Yes; 2 No; 11 Abstentions.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito

- (1) \$ 16,881.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 575 HYPERTENSION EDUCATION AND CONTROL PROGRAM - per Mayor Clapes' Additional Appropriation request of 12/14/81. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81. Returned to Committee 2/1/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO: This is the second year of this program that educates middle-school children on high blood pressure, not only in understanding the causes of it, but also how to measure blood pressure, etc. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, 2 opposed, and I so Move.

MR. DZIEZYC: I Move to waive the secondary report.

MRS. CONTI: This is the final year of the grant on this item, and what we must be concerned about is the possibility that the individual employed under this program is not absorbed onto the city payroll when the grant expires. The program itself is the same as it was last year. If it accomplishes anything at all, it is the distraction of children from their regular school curriculum and into worrying about their health. I can think of no better way to create a generation of hypochondriacs than to continue this grant. I would urge a No vote.

MR. TARZIA: My only question is I am a little confused as to the amount. Since we're voting on it this late in the year, is that for the entire year?

MR. ESPOSITO: Yes, it is.

MR. ZELINSKI: How many votes are needed for this to pass? It is a 100% reimbursable grant, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A majority of those, but not less than 21 of the membership.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Nothing could be farther from the truth to say that we're going to turn out a bunch of hypochondriacs concerned with their health if we pass this grant. Quite frankly, what it is, is educating our students

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

as I said last year at this time, to what hypertension is all about. For these students to come home and speak to their parents and simply say, "Dad and Mom, when was the last time you had your blood pressure checked? Blood pressure can kill you, high blood pressure can kill you." That's all we're saying. The program works because I've seen it work in person with my own child who's in Turn-of-River Middle School; and I think it's a grant that we're going to get back 100% of the money, and we're going to get many more dividends from this if we save just one life of one citizen in this community. And I urge you all to vote in favor of this.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to make mention of the fact that Dr. Gofstein made a very strong point that when this grant runs out, this person will not be retained, and he was unequivocal in that, that the grant ends on December 30, and the person's employment in this program and with the city ends on December 31.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We could attempt to try to use the machine once more if you think it is worth it. It is set up. We will have to proceed to a vote which is going to make it a little bit long here. Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Stork, I think you are going to have to take permanent seats up here this evening.

APPROVED (SHOW OF HANDS) 25 Yes; 7 No; rest Abstentions (Mary Jane Signore did not participate).

- (2) \$ 2,000.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 562 various - MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING  
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30/81, which sum is to be received in the form of a grant to provide initial competence and skill training in mental health nursing to City's Public Health Nurses. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. DZIEZYC: I make a Motion to waive the secondary report.

MRS. CONTI: This mental health training is another grant, one which has the potential for tremendous liability to the city. The training is very short-term and is extremely limited in scope. We all know that the field of mental health is a profound and complex one and certainly no place for amateur practitioners. With the limited training these nurses will receive, I fear the possibility of law suits resulting from their administrations through no fault of the nurses. But the negligence of the city in expecting them to deal with mental illness with inadequate training and experience, I would urge you not to put the city and the taxpayers in such a vulnerable position. I would urge a No vote.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to point out that this grant is to train the city's public health nurses who are hardly amateur practitioners. They are skilled practitioners who have undergone years of training. This is simply money that's being provided the city to provide these nurses with additional training in the specialty of mental health care. Due to increased de-institutionalization of people from mental health institutions, this is going to become increasingly a problem for all municipalities. The nurses will be trained in crisis

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

intervention, in the appropriate medication for the individuals and the administration of the medication, and hopefully will prevent any kind of contact that might occur between the police and these individuals before they become a danger to the city as a whole.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'd like to ask Mr. Esposito a question. How many hours of training do these people get?

MR. ESPOSITO: It consists of 10 2-hour session for 38 nurses.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I was going to ask how many nurses were trained. I would also like to know if the new personnel is trained, Is this an ongoing program and, if so, who's going to pay for new training?

MR. ESPOSITO: This is a grant that's been given to the city for the personnel who are currently on staff.

MR. TARZIA: A question through the chair for Mr. Esposito. Does Mr. Esposito know if these nurses include the nurses that are in the public schools and parochial schools?

MR. ESPOSITO: These are the public health nurses. I'm not sure whether or not the nurses in the public schools will be trained.

MR. TARZIA: The reason I ask that question is that I'm somewhat bothered these days with all these programs and all this training. Unfortunately, the nurses are taken out of the schools; and there are times when we have real emergencies, and the child is rushed to the principal or the assistant principal. I need only to remind you, for instance, that tragic incident we had at Stamford High School the other day. I assume the nurse was there in that particular case, but you have a similar case where the nurse is down at the Board of Health being trained, that is what bothers me with these programs.

MR. WIDER: Having worked in the schools for a few years, like 25, I have seen a need for someone who knew something about mental health. And if you just see one person, it doesn't have to be a child, don't think only children are susceptible to mental health, it can be an adult. Just having one person trained to know how to handle a person that is slightly mentally ill or chronically mentally ill means a great deal. One person would mean as much as this \$2,000, as far as I can see. Believe it or not, with the way that things are changing now, where they're closing up many mental health institutions and putting the people back in the community, we are going to need these people right here in our community. I would feel that this is a chance to at least get funds from somebody else in case we do have to use our own later on.

MRS. HAWE: We were told by Dr. Gofstein that it would include the school nurses.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Request to move the question. We will move the question. We are now voting on Item #2 under Fiscal, \$2,000 for the Health Dept. - Mental Health Training. I am going to have to ask you to raise your hands.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MOTION PASSED: 25 Yes; 4 No; 9 Abstained; Rep. Signore did not participate.

- ((3) \$ 11,169.05 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 561.1110 SALARIES and Code 561.1310 SOCIAL SECURITY - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 10/17 and 10/20/81 - to fund Salary Increases and Social Security for Psychologists, Social Workers, Speech/Hearing Teachers for School Health Program, cost to be reimbursed to City.

This required <sup>due</sup> to re-negotiation of BOARD OF EDUCATION Contract, effective 1/1/82-6/30/82. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Code 561.1110	Salaries	\$10,467.71
Code 561.1310	Social Security	<u>701.34</u>
		\$11,169.05

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA. Rep. Signore did not participate.

- ((4) \$ 59,220.00 - HOUSING AUTHORITY - Code 780.7564

THIS ITEM VOTED EARLIER.

- ((5) \$ 30,000.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - AMEND THE 1981-82 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING THREE (3) 3-WHEEL POLICE VEHICLES #410.061 TO BE FINANCED BY TAXATION - per Mayor Louis A. Clapes request 11/30/81 - to be used to patrol the SUPER BLOCK. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO: They hope to actually purchase four vehicles. These vehicles will patrol the Super Block, but let me define the Super Block because that might be misleading. It's going to patrol the entire downtown area from West Broad Street (Bloomingdale's) to the Railroad Station, up Bedford Street and Summer Street, as well as around the Town Center.

MRS. CONTI: This appropriation constitutes favoritism to the commercial segment of the community at the expense of the residential taxpayers who pay the greatest percentage of taxes in Stamford. These four vehicles are going to be used exclusively for the downtown area. They will never leave the central business district. We do not think that the homeowners of Stamford should be taxed to subsidize profit making commercial enterprises. If the downtown merchants want service over and above what the city supplies to the rest of the community, then a special assessment should be levied on them to pay for it. Over and over, the home-owning taxpayers have been promised that their tax burden would be lessened as urban renewal progressed; but let us be honest

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

for once. More and more of the home-owning taxpayers are being burdened to subsidize the URC area and we are opposed to these excess burdens being placed on our constituents. Now there is another consideration here. It is the safety of our police officers. There is far more risk of injury and loss of life to police officers on these vehicles than there would be in a patrol car. All things considered, I would urge a No vote on this appropriation.

MRS. MAIHOCK: We heard the concerns of our Stamford people living in the Housing Authority this evening who desperately need more police protection as do people in neighborhoods all over our city. It is not appropriate to vote for an item such as this for a commercial area when people in apartments and houses in our city are living in such fear. I would respectfully suggest that this amount of \$30,000 be applied to residential police protection, and that in the future perhaps it can be funded by private sources.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to point out that at some point in time or another, we all come downtown to the commercial district to shop. So, in essence, these police vehicles are providing us with the protection we need since we become the shoppers. Number two, are we to charge the people that go boating a separate tax because we have boats on the water? I mean, it can go on ad infinitum in applying that rule of taxation by usage; and it just doesn't work. As far as being in a safe situation, I wish to point out that we have motorcycles with two wheels riding the streets with our policemen manning them. That is a far less safe vehicle than a 3-wheel police vehicle. Are we to say, take off the 2-wheel motorcycles because they are not safe? The point is this: On one hand, we hear fear, crime, police protection. Now we're being given an opportunity to do something about it and put up, and I think it's about time we appropriated this \$30,000 to make that commercial area more safe for everyone.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Special note. Mrs. McInerney has left the meeting. There are now 37 members present.

MR. TARZIA: Through the Chair, just one question on the vehicles. If I understand it correctly, these vehicles are seasonal vehicles. In other words, due to inclement weather they will not be able to use them; and I assume that during the winter months they will not be used.

MR. ESPOSITO: We are led to believe that under extreme conditions, no, they wouldn't; and probably under the very extreme winter conditions, probably after Christmas, January, and February; but from March through December they could be used.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I am opposed to new programs as well as new personnel positions, particularly this late in the fiscal year via special appropriations. I would strongly suggest that this appropriation be brought in with the police commission's regular budget which is only two months hence. I don't really think that they're going to miss these vehicles in the Super Block in the next two or three months. I don't think the Town Mall is going to be that utilized in the next two to three months, and I would suggest that we do it properly in the 1982-83 budget.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: Just to respond to a couple of points. First of all, it is important if we are in favor of this, and I would urge, Mrs. Gershman, if she is in favor of this, to vote for it now simply because if we wait 'til budget time and it's approved through the capital projects budget which doesn't go into effect until July 1st, the orders wouldn't be able to go in until that time and the machines wouldn't arrive until probably late fall which, for all intents and purposes, kills their use for this entire year. If we approve this now, the orders can go in immediately and possibly they can be on the streets by the summertime. I want to also emphasize that this is not simply for the mall. It is for the entire downtown area. It is not simply for the commercial residents. As Mr. Wiederlight pointed out, if you walk downtown or you're downtown during the day, there are not just store owners downtown, there are taxpayers downtown. These taxpayers are shoppers, and they live in the Cove, they live in Shippan, and they live in Glenbrook, and they live in North Stamford, and they want protection when they're downtown as well. This particular appropriation does not mean there are going to be additional police officers. The number of police officers in the downtown area will not be changed. The number will stay the same. This just provides a different way of deploying those police officers. Back to the point I made on the Housing Authority police, special situations require special conditions. Downtown areas, you have high density population, you have people out of doors. For police officers during the warm weather to ride around on 3-wheel vehicles that are out in the open, they can respond to people who might be screaming if they've been attacked. These vehicles are capable of maneuvering in and out of alleyways that police cars cannot maneuver around. They provide for that maneuverability, they provide for greater awareness of conditions around the police officer. In the summertime, the police cars are air-conditioned, the windows are pulled up, and it's unlikely the police officer stopped in traffic in downtown Stamford listening to his police radio with the windows closed is going to hear someone shout for help if that occurs by a pedestrian.

Special tactics for special needs. The highway patrol orders special cars with special engines because that's what's needed for a highway patrolman. A downtown police officer needs more maneuverability. He needs to be out in the open more, and the 3-wheel vehicle provides that maneuverability.

MR. ROOS: I think Mr. Esposito said just about everything that I was going to say. There's only one reservation I have, and that is the cost of the vehicles. \$9,000 for a 3-wheel bike seems to me a terrific amount of money, and I question the cost and did we get bids on this and go through proper procedure? I hear that only one source has it available, but that is a tremendous sum of money for a motorcycle.

MR. BLUM: Here we are now talking again about the Super Block. We've had other merchants here at one time, and I assure you crime went on before the Super Block came around and there was also great need in the downtown area; yet we got no special favors for them. In fact, we saw and are seeing today that the old downtown merchants are leaving us. I sometimes wonder, as I said before, when we were talking about Item #4, is there really justice for all the people in this city. Is only the Super Block to be protected? Yes, we're going to have consumers coming from all of Stamford. Yes, there are consumers and there are people that walk in the downtown area in the south end, in the west side, and so on. The mugging and the crime goes on

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

all over. That \$59,000 could have been a help in the deterrent to crime in the entire community, but yet because it's the Housing Authority. I match the Housing Authority with the Super Block, and I therefore am going to vote No for this also.

MR. GAIPA: I concur with Mr. Blum. I don't see how this Board in good conscience can vote \$30,000 for police protection or police vehicles, not extra police protection, for an area which is already covered by police; and we turn down an appropriation of \$59,000 to our protecting many, many residents in housing units where there is no or little city police protection.

MRS. GUROIAN: In view of all the studies and all the reports and all the comments being made in the New York papers as to what actually deters crime, I would submit patrolling the streets doesn't deter the crime. It just shifts the crime to a different type of crime or a different area that the crime is being committed. For instance, when the argument was being made to patrol the subways, the counter-argument was made that the people who robbed in the subways were now going to rob in the streets where the police were not in such great force. So that, in effect, I would question whether it actually deters the crime or shifts the crime to outside the central area, either in the mass transit system or in homes and streets outside the central area. I don't feel as though this extra patrolling is going, number one, to deter crime; number two, I agree with Mr. Blum, I don't see why the inner area is to get preferential treatment. Because if the crime is then now deterred to the outer area, are we going to give them the same preferential treatment we gave to the inner area? I think the effort should be made to stop crime equally everywhere and not to limit ourselves over and over again to the inner core of the city.

MR. CONTI: I'm in agreement with what Mr. Blum and Mrs. Guroian and quite a few of the others have to say. I think what we're doing is setting up special task forces for different portions of town. Now, we turned down the Housing Authority because this would have been one force in itself; and we are going to take 3 or 4 policemen as it is and we are going to keep them in the general area of the new mall. I again feel that private enterprise should be able to take care of itself, and this should not be part of the task force to patrol a certain area. I think it behooves the police department to take care of the whole city in general. I would like to add one little comment, food for thought. In 1972 or 1973, I'm not sure which one, the traffic department did have 3-wheel vehicles. They deemed them impractical and sold them for a total amount of \$195.00 apiece. So if we're going to pay \$9,000 for these things and find it's not going to work and sell them for \$195.00, I think this is bad business. Bad business is one way of putting it, but it's not going to benefit the members of this taxpaying community.

MRS. SUMMERVILLE: I hope what I'm hearing from my fellow representatives is the wrong thing. I cannot believe what Urban Renewal has done to downtown that the Board members are forgetting that people live there. You talk about the outer areas and other places, everybody getting equal. But what about all the office buildings, where these people are living downtown? We're talking about people that are going to come into the city, not only downtown. You're not only giving the downtown people

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

protection. You're talking about some of the people that I'm sure here speaking against it are going to be the first ones in Macy's and Penney's when they open. And God forbid if something should happen, I wonder where your conscience will be. I think that we're being misled. I'm not saying give downtown special treatment. I'm saying what Mr. Esposito said, this is for everybody; we have to realize we do not have a little town anymore. Stamford is a city. We have a town center there, and it's going to stay. And we have to do something about trying to protect the citizens of Stamford, all citizens.

MRS. HAWE: I understand the frustrations of people who have spoken concerning the crimes in the residential areas of our city. I share that feeling because we have it in our area, too. However, I feel that it's very important that we do establish our downtown as a viable commercial and retail center. We have seen what has happened in other cities to malls where there is not sufficient or not visible enough police protection, and even more importantly if it becomes evident that downtown Stamford is an area that is ripe for criminal elements, then we will get an influx of such elements into the city. And this will not only be a detriment to the downtown, but also to all of Stamford itself.

MR. DONAHUE: I have to agree with what Mrs. Hawe has already said. The entire city of Stamford has a great investment in the downtown area. Other cities who have tried to renew their core areas have failed in that attempt because they didn't provide an atmosphere of security and an atmosphere where people could be comfortable in returning to the downtown area. A year ago or more, two years ago, when we added policemen to the force specifically for patrolling the downtown area, the point was made at that time that this would relieve the pressure put on outlying areas, such as the Cove, the west side, Bulls Head, from coming into the downtown to answer calls. Without police in the downtown area, the burden of patrolling the downtown will be placed on all these areas. The item in question is vehicles which are specifically designed to give police the flexibility they need to service the entire downtown and not just the mall. Mrs. Summerville has made a good point about the people who live here, about the people who work here everyday. These things have been considered. This item seeks to apply a device which will better patrol the downtown area and hopefully allow this city to succeed in its attempt to revitalize its downtown and keep it that way.

MR. RYBNICK: I am pretty sure if the shoppers could read police protection in downtown Stamford, they would come out to shop. If they read no police protection, I am pretty sure they would hesitate to come, and especially toward the evenings or nighttime.

MR. DUDLEY: How soon we forget; when we were elected, many of us heard the call for help, more police protection in every area of town. I don't want to see the city get to a state where we have vigilantes. I don't want to see the stage where the guardian angels are patrolling the mall. I don't want to see the mall become another Lafayette Mall in Bridgeport, where the mall is dying. I think you have to support this. I can't comprehend people turning down police protection. We've done it once tonight and I don't want to see it done again. I hope everyone reconsiders and votes Yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA: I don't believe anyone of us is voting down police protection. We're voting down the request for three vehicles. I believe it was about a year and a half ago, or two years ago, we voted for approximately 28 new patrolmen of which approximately 10 of them were to be used to patrol the downtown area. At that time there was no mention of using 3-wheel vehicles. I would also recall when I was first elected to this Board we had to approve funds for the new town garage, and at that time I was assured by the then chairman of the URC that the city would not be responsible for any additional funds for any type of security in the area. That was the only reason why I voted for that appropriation at that time. But now it looks that everytime we turn around something happens with the Super Block or the Town Mall. We have seen this happen with the traffic department when we spent approximately \$600 to put up signs which led to an uproar from the Bedford Street merchants which has now resulted in the Planning Board going back to revise their capital expenditures, to the tune of over one million dollars to be spent in the next fiscal year, all because someone found excess money to put up signs. It seems that the Super Block keeps looking for additional appropriations all over the place. Therefore, I plan to vote against this appropriation. I'm in favor of police protection which, by having foot patrol, we can get the same effect. This was one of the reasons why we approved the additional police officers two years ago.

MR. DIXON: I have no question about police protection, whether it be in the downtown area or uptown or with the Housing Authority or wherever, as long as it's needed. The thing that I would question though is the dollar amount involved here. It just seems to me that \$30,000 is a lot of money to pay for three-wheel vehicles. Then the other question that arises in my thinking is whether or not this so-called three-wheel vehicle is adequate to serve year-round, winter as well as summer. I just pose that question to whomever may be able to answer it.

MR. ESPOSITO: It has been indicated that during the very harsh winter months that the vehicle would not be used. That would be probably after Christmas, January, February; so that from March till about Christmas time the vehicles could be used in the area, except for days that are very wet and rainy.

MRS. CONTI: As I sit here listening to the fear and trembling about the terrible dangers about the downtown area, I think to myself, here we are sitting in the middle of the downtown area right in the heart of it. We come here several times a month; we come and go. We get no special police protection, so perhaps it isn't really needed.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would hope that nothing serious ever happens to anybody simply because we fail to adequately protect our city. One thing that disturbs me is that, and I honestly believe this, if we allow our new shopping mall to be stigmatized with a severe criminal element, it should be obvious to all of us that it's the city that's going to be the great loser. If this mall is to work and contribute to the city's economy as all of us for many years have been dreaming and we've all supported that in one way or another, it has to have adequate police protection. Again, it's the first duty of our government to protect its citizens. I would hope that we support this.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: I had a few questions, through you to Rep. Esposito. First question would be, do you have any idea as far as the actual location of where these vehicles will be patrolling. Will they be patrolling the sidewalks or actually inside the parking garage itself?

MR. ESPOSITO: Definitely not inside the parking garage. They will not go inside the mall or the parking garage whatsoever unless they are called by the security force because the mall is going to have its own security force. Unless they are called by the security force to make an arrest or because there's a problem there, they will not be inside the mall at all. They will be patrolling on the streets from Bloomingdale's all the way to the Railroad Station including around the Railroad Station, Bedford Street, Summer Street, the entire downtown area. I wish we wouldn't center and focus on the mall; this is not an issue for the mall. This is an issue for the entire downtown region, including everyone who comes to the Railroad Station.

MR. ZELINSKI: How far up north would the particular vehicles go? You mention as far as the Railroad Station, how far would it go as far as...

MR. ESPOSITO: Bulls Head.

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to remind my fellow Board members, we're talking about vehicles, not police protection. Further, I believe that it's been documented that foot patrols are much more effective than motorized vehicles. The police department is too diligent to allow an area to be unpatrolled. Again, let's not forget, we're talking about vehicles, not police protection.

MR. BOCCUZZI: We hear tonight about all the objection because some people seem to feel that the Super Block is going to get all the protection. Mr. Esposito has said on numerous occasions that it's more than just the Super Block. It includes much more of the city. But if you would really want to think about the Super Block and police protection, there's three things that's going to make that Super Block work. Number one is parking. Number two is traffic. Number three is police protection. If we fall down on either one of these three, the Super Block will not work; and everybody that's been complaining about the home owners paying taxes, they better remember that the home owners paid for that stupid block out there. If it goes to pot, it's the home owners' taxes that are going down the drain. I hear tonight where people are saying well, we didn't give it to the Housing Authority so we're not going to give it the downtown area, the merchants, the Super Block, and the people who are downtown. Two wrongs don't make a right. When you're voting, don't think just because those of you who have voted against one should vote against the other. I firmly believe that motorized patrol with a 3-wheel vehicle such as this to cover the area that they're going to cover could go past the same spot more times in one trip for 8 hours or 7½, whatever they work, than a foot patrolman can in 24 hours. I think we're going to be looking at this appropriation and we're going to be penny-wise and dollar-foolish here because there's a lot more at stake than just the amount of money that it's going to cost to put these 3-wheel vehicles on the road.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. OWENS: Could we move the question, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to move the question. We will use a roll call vote.

MOTION DEFEATED: 22 Yes; 13 No; 2 Abstentions.

- (6) \$ 8,000.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - Code 410.1224 PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30/81 for the purpose of testing recruits. Board of Finance reduced the original request for \$12,000 to \$10,000 and approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. DZIEZYC: I move to waive the secondary committee report.

MR. BLUM: I just would like to ask a question as to why the Health and Protection was made the secondary committee when this relates to personnel matters, testing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Blum, this should have been brought up at Steering and not on the floor with the Board at this time. It was assigned to Health and Protection.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will proceed with the vote.

APPROVED (SHOW OF HANDS): 33 Yes; 2 No; 1 Abstention; 1 Off Floor (Guroian)

- (7) \$ 19,400.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT AND POLICE DEPARTMENT - Codes Salary Account - to fund salary increases for Police Chief, Deputy Police Chiefs, Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chief. Held in Steering 12/10, 12/28/81 and 1/18/82. Approved by Board of Finance 11/12/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (8) \$ 5,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS FISCAL YEAR 19 / BY ADDING THIS SUM TO AN EXISTING PROJECT KNOWN AS #450.907 APPARATUS MODERNIZATION - to be financed by TAXATION - per Mayor Clapes' request 1/18/82. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (9) \$655,062.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Additional Appropriation requested to cover contract costs due to labor contract recently approved per Mayor Clapes' request. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA; with Howe & deGaetani abstaining.

- (10) \$ 8,441.00 - LONG RIDGE FIRE DEPARTMENT - Additional Appropriation requested to cover salary increases similar to those contained in City Firefighters' contract recently negotiated, per Mayor Clapes' request.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA; with Blais, Esposito, Summerville & Livingston voting No.

(After all fiscal items finished & vote taken on Consent Agenda, this item, due to 2/3 question, had a count taken, with 26 Yes, 4 No and 3 Abstentions.)

- (11) \$ 25,000.00 - DATA PROCESSING DEPARTMENT - Code 245.5160 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTER SERVICES - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30/81. Necessary due to inability to fill two vacant Programming positions, and require outside help. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee voted to deny this.

MR. BLAIS: Through you to Mr. Esposito, I would like to ask when the computer department was before his committee and the person that represented the computer department, did that person state whether or not he had the full scope of the intended services laid out and reduced to writing?

MR. ESPOSITO: No, he did not have it worked out.

MR. BLAIS: Did the computer department have the proposed work broken out by task?

MR. ESPOSITO: No, they did not.

M R BLAIS: Did they have or make any mention to the federal circular A104?

MR. ESPOSITO: I really don't remember.

MR. BLAIS: Therefore, I would urge my fellow representatives to consider further study of this work since the department itself has not properly evaluated the work to be done before they came through with a request for funds. I would like to make a Motion to move it back to committee.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I urge my colleagues to support this Motion. I don't feel that the proper credentials for passage of the \$25,000 appropriation were presented to both the Fiscal or the Personnel.

MRS. GUROIAN: That is out of order. We are voting to return it to committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: He is speaking to returning it to committee.

MRS. GUROIAN: He is asking us to vote for the main Motion.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Negative. I am speaking to return it to committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are speaking to agree with Mr. Blais to return it to committee. He is in order, Mrs. Guroian.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: As I was saying, I think this should be returned to committee for further study. There was no proper presentation before the personnel committee; and I think for \$25,000 a further explanation is necessary.

MR. FAUTEUX: I agree it should be returned to committee; however, I would like to make the suggestion that the people who have very specific desires or demands for data, make their desires known to the primary and secondary committee so that this information may be provided. I think there is too much in the way of backseat experts who sit in on some of these meetings and all of this, if it's going to be specifics, should be asked for directly.

MR. BLAIS: Since I'm the second speaker and there's no other first speaker, I will point out that at the Fiscal Committee the computer department was asked to formulate the scope of their work broken down by task and that they promised they would come back to the committee with such a document, and they have not, if I'm not mistaken.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now move to a vote on returning this to committee.

ITEM RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: (SHOW OF HANDS) 32 Yes; -0- No; rest Abstentions.

- (12) \$ 14,008.00 - DATA PROCESSING DEPARTMENT - Code 245.2651 EQUIPMENT RENTAL - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Louis A. Clapes. Approved by Board of Finance 1/19/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (13) \$ 3,500.00 - CONTROLLER - GROUP 24,5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 12/3/81. Reduced from \$4,500 original request; and approved by Board of Finance 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO: This is a bill from the American Appraisal Company for the accounting of the fixed assets. The procedure needed more time because of

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

the Board of Education assets. That's the request for the \$3,500, an additional bill that has been provided by American Appraisal.

MR. STORK: Personnel Committee voted to deny this.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I understand that Fiscal says this is a bill that was incurred?

MR. ESPOSITO: That is correct.

MR. BOCCUZZI: And Personnel denies it? How can he deny paying the bill?

MR. STORK: The rationale for denying the appropriation was simply a lack of information provided to the committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move to a vote bearing in mind that Fiscal did approve this appropriation and secondary committee did deny it.

MOTION DEFEATED (SHOW OF HANDS): 24 Yes; 5 No; Rest Abstentions.

MR. BLAIS: Point of Order, Madam Chairman. Earlier this evening when Ms. Summerville was off the floor...

PRESIDENT SANTY: She officially asked to leave the floor for that vote.

MR. BLAIS: I believe there is no difference.

PRESIDENT SANTY: If the representatives do not care enough to vote for this item to leave the floor and it loses by one vote, then it's their prerogative.

- (14) \$ 47,712.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM - Code 761 various - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and Jeanne Ellis-Hudgens 2/2/82 for an additional 50% of annual budget (25% having been passed previously \$28,068.00), pending the passage by Congress of the grant, which has not yet been done. This \$47,712 will give the program 90% of its budget enabling them to operate through 6/30/82, by which time they will have come back to the Boards to fund the remaining 3 months of their budget year. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (15) \$ 5,887.70 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 104.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund position of URBAN DESIGN ADMINISTRATOR, A-8 at annual salary of \$23,551; effective 4/1/82, funding required \$5,887.70, per Mayor Clapes' request 1/6/82. Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. STORK: Personnel Committee voted 5-0 to deny this appropriation.

MRS. CONTI: This is essentially the same new position that we eliminated from last year's annual budget, but the Board asks leeway to vary the description somewhat. Downtown is already an existing mass of incongruity, and no amount of planning now can change it. While we would all love to see Stamford an architectural masterpiece, that is just a utopian dream. The fact remains that an army of planners cannot alter the fact that anyone can build anything he wishes on his property so long as he conforms to the building code and the zoning regulations. It can conform to these and still be an aesthetic nightmare. Let's not mislead anyone that a new planner is going to change the face of Stamford. If we appropriate this money, it will be in the annual budget forever after. The taxpayers do not want increased taxes, and it's about time we listen to them. I urge a No vote on this new position.

MRS. HAWE: I would really urge the Board members to vote yes for this appropriation. The Planning Board has been understaffed for quite awhile, and it is vital that this department have enough people in order to enable Stamford to grow in an organized way. If, as Mrs. Conti said, our city is an existing mass of incongruity, I don't see why we want to add more problems to those that we already have. Hopefully, we can start to solve some of them with a position such as this. I really would urge the Board members to seriously consider, if they are considering voting against this, the importance of such a person in the planning department and to vote Yes for this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rybnick has left the meeting. There are now 36 members present.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to provide some background for this. First of all, this \$5,887 is predicated on April 1st starting date with an annual salary of \$23,551. The Urban Designer, according to the Planning Department and the Planning Director, is needed for planning many, many projects, those that are not completed. Mrs. Conti is absolutely right; the downtown area is in many respects incongruous; in many respects, an architectural disaster. But it's not complete; there's a lot of damage that can be done yet. If we leave it up to chance, who knows what might happen downtown. For example, the entire Railroad Station area has to be dealt with. We're not only talking about the Railroad Station per se but we're talking about the area surrounding the Railroad Station. If the entire downtown or the work that has been done already has produced problems, probably one of the reasons it has produced problems is because there's been no one around with the architectural background on the city staff to concentrate on these issues. Why allow that kind of situation to continue. This person would be reviewing site plans, especially in public areas downtown. They would be reviewing coastal area plans. The people in Shippan don't need another reminder as to the consequences of not having an urban designer. The Urban Designer would also aid in developing and helping the Planning Board and the Zoning Board in the master plan in comprehensive re-zoning. They emphasize that there's an awful lot of construction that's going to be done in the next ten years, and there are many areas of this city which are underdeveloped and are ripe for developing. The city, at this point, doesn't have the staff, the personnel, and the expertise of the architectural expertise to guide and direct that, especially in the public areas. And that's why this position is desperately needed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: I just don't understand how effective an architectural designer can be working for the Planning Department. The type of building that is erected on any property conforms to zoning regulations and zoning laws. I don't see how an architectural designer is going to have any impact on the type of building that is going to be built. If he's going to be concerned with neighborhood planning, that's one thing. But I cannot see where an Urban Design Administrator, which sounds very fancy, can be effective at all, especially since they'll be in the Planning Department, which in effect has no control or very little control over what is actually built. They can only recommend; they can't deny anything except subdivisions and things like that. I really don't think that this is the type of person which is going to help the Planning Department in changing the face of the type of construction that's going to go on in the city in the future. I would vote against this. Perhaps I would vote for someone, an additional person on the Planning Board staff, if I could see where that person will have an impact on the future planning of this city; but I don't see where an Urban Design Administrator, as you describe his duties, is going to have any impact at all. I'm going to vote No.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I think this position is a very important one. The Urban Design Administrator will take care of the work that will be done downtown. We've appropriated money for the Delta Group to design, make recommendations, for a complete renovation, including all kinds of improvements for the downtown; and this person, a good portion of this person's time will be spent in administrating this. I don't believe that now is the time to do something halfway downtown, especially in an area that is going to be severely impacted by the mall. Every effort must be made to plan what is going to happen down there to the best of the city's ability. I hope this Board will vote for this Urban Design Administrator.

MR. WIDER: For those who don't know it, they're getting ready to do the same thing to the south end they did to Summer Street, just rip it up. Without some kind of urban planner, I think we are in trouble, so I would hope that we could add this person to kind of oversee the plan and development of our areas that are now being taken by corporations who are getting ready to build three buildings in my district.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Through you to Mr. Esposito, I would like for him to further elaborate, and be precise, about the duties of this new person. Mrs. Guroian said some very, well, they could be concluded to be, damaging statements. I think that should be cleared up, and I'd like for him to respond to that.

MR. ESPOSITO: I have a breakdown of his duties, but I would, before I even go into that, spell out some very specific issues that were mentioned. Mrs. Guroian is right. In terms of development of private property, there's not much the city can do in terms of architectural design, appropriateness of the building, so on and so forth. That is subject to zoning regulations. But there are many public buildings which have to be dealt with. For example, there have been some inquiries about Rice School. There have been some inquiries about other schools, and the appropriate development of those facilities. Before the city gives up on those buildings, they want to know exactly what's going to be done with them and the appropriateness of any design that might be used for that building

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

or that property. This is something the Urban Design Administrator could do. It was pointed out that Mr. Jaffe has asked to trade some property downtown with the city. Before the city even considers any trade with Mr. Jaffe, they want to know what kind of buildings are going to be constructed and so on and so forth, and whether or not this would be appropriate with the downtown development. We might have used this person before the Ferguson Library was developed, and hopefully we wouldn't have disasters like that again. Specifically, in terms of the new position's duties, 25% of the time would be formulating schematic urban design area plans upon which prospective individual projects may be evaluated, 25% of the time would be to meet with prospective developers of significant urban sites, for example, in the central business district, to relate overall urban design objectives and respond to their projects that may or may not integrate well with the approved design objectives. 20% of their time would be to design and test graphically an otherwise appropriate standards emphasizing strong urban design elements for adoption as regulatory controls. This would be important in terms of comprehensive re-zoning, to have this particular professional person aboard. 10% of their time would be to analyze plans submitted for required approval under floor area, ratio requirements, coastal area management requirements, URC plan approve requirements; and 10% of their time would be to communicate and coordinate with other line departments such as the Public Works, Parks, and Community Development. Any of the community development work that's done would have to go through and be coordinated with the Urban Design Administrator.

MR. STORK: As you can see by some of the secondary votes the Personnel Committee has reported tonight, our committee will not be a rubber stamp committee. It's about time the Board of Representatives has respect for the budget cuts it makes every May during those two long evenings. The Personnel Committee will not look favorably upon funding new position during the fiscal year when this Board has previously seen fit to cut them from Stamford's annual budget.

MR. WHITE: The problem with this is that it seems to me this is typical Stamford dilemma. We're involved here in this stop-gap measure. I suppose I'll vote for it because it's better than nothing. But this goes back to the original foolishness of this Board in allowing the corporation counsel to render an opinion and call it a decision or ruling whereby an architectural review board, a perfectly solid institution, was discontinued. It seems to me perhaps we ought to think down the road a bit to re-instituting that institution or that organization, and in fact gain some control over what goes on here in Stamford in an effective manner.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Again, I must reiterate that I agree with Mr. Stork that we should not fund new positions which have previously been turned down except at budgetary time which is going to be in two months. I would like to answer some of the questions. I did inquire if this was perhaps the beginning of an architectural review panel and was told no, it was not. I would like to emphasize that this Urban Design Administrator does not have authority to say yes or no. This is an advisory capacity. I think that as far as the south end goes, I believe Mr. Wider was the one who spoke about that, that is a zoning problem and the zoning board can control, and I'm sure will control, what goes on in the south end. For instance, the new amendment that is going to come up on our agenda tonight. I think I would probably look favorably upon such an advisory person on the Planning Board staff but in the 82-83 budget, not at this time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. FAUTEUX: I will Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move the question. There has been a Motion for a Roll Call Vote.

DENIED (ROLL CALL VOTE): 18 Yes; 16 No; 1 Abstention; 1 Non-Vote.

- (16) \$ 400.00 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 104.2922 POSTAGE - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/7/82. Approved by Board of Finance 1/19/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (17) \$ 2,500.00 - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 530.2210 MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/29/82. Approved Board of Finance 2/9/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (18) \$ 1,500.00 - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 530.2610 MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 2/1/82. Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (19) \$ 9,500.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 530.1201 OVER-TIME - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 2/2/82. Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (20) \$ 9,400.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - Code 530.1130 PART-TIME - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/26/82. Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (21) \$ 874.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.1230 COLLEGE TUITION 1/11/82 Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

MRS. MATHOCK: I would like to know, could he explain a little bit more about this college tuition. For whom is it intended?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: This is a contractual obligation under the MEA contract. This is for two courses completed at Fordham University for a caseworker who is accepted into the graduate social work program and is currently nearing the completion of the two courses. At the time this was written, they were currently nearing the completion of those two courses; at this point, they have completed those two courses and got an A in each.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll now move to a vote.

APPROVED (SHOW OF HANDS): 32 Yes;

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe will continue with the Fiscal Committee report.

- (22) \$ 10,500.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.5130 PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL CARE - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/11/82. Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (23) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT WITH CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC ACT 79-607 FOR THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF BUS SHELTERS (State Grant approved for \$25,000) per Mayor Louis A. Clapes letter 9/15/81. Held in Committee 10/5/81, 11/16/81, 12/15/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (24) \$ 6,776.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - CONTRACT - PARKING GARAGES - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30/81. Approved by Board of Finance 1/19/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: As of this fiscal year, the traffic department switched to a flat, per-month management fee with Edison Parking. Last year it had paid Edison a management fee plus operations cost. The bills were paid when they came in. This was done on a cash basis of accounting and not the modified accrual plan employed by the city. It was thought that the June invoice was the final payment, but once Edison was audited, its accountant identified additional costs to be billed to the city; and hence these additional invoices came in in July and August of last year. This will not occur under the new system since a flat, per-month fee is paid to Edison Parking for these contracts with the garages.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Transportation Committee concurs.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I understand this is an old bill so I have no question about that. However, I wish to make a Motion that you, Madam Chairwoman, request the department of traffic and parking to investigate the inefficient operation of the parking garage as delineated in the Advocate as of this date and report back to us.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, at this time, this is out of order. If you could submit that in writing and submit it to Steering, we will consider it on the Steering Committee Agenda.

MR. CONTI: I'd like to pose this as a question to Mrs. Hawe. I believe when we started with the garage we turned it over to Edison for handling the garage situation, but after a certain number of years, the city was supposed to take it over after they learned how and they were supposed to run the garage. What has happened to that plan?

MRS. HAWE: I really can't answer. I'm not aware of that.

MR. CONTI: I was on the parking authority when this came about, and Edison was only supposed to be an interim arrangement and the city was supposed to take over again, I repeat, after they learned how, which was supposed to be a short period of time. Now this was '72 and '73 and we've been accepting this for 10 years.

MR. GAIPA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move the question. We need 24 votes to pass this. I'm going to ask for a voice vote at this time.

APPROVED: Except for 3 No: A. Conti, A. Perillo, A. Saxe  
1 Abstention: M. Perillo

- (25) \$ 15,000.00 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3160 STATE REAPPORTION-  
MENT - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor  
Clapes 1/29/82. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (26) \$138,899.00 - STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL  
PROJECTS BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 19 /19 BY ADDING THERETO  
A PROJECT IN THE SUM OF \$138,899.00 TO BE KNOWN AS  
"PURCHASE OF DUPUIS PROPERTY" (ADJACENT TO THE MUSEUM) -  
to be financed through the CAPITAL NON-RECURRING FUND -  
TITLE TO BE TRANSFERRED TO THE CITY OF STAMFORD, per  
Mayor Clapes' letters of 2/3/82. Board of Finance  
approved 2/9/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Madam President, I wish it to be known that I am leaving the floor for discussion on this and I would choose an alternative teller for this one item, please.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: In October, 1979, the Board of Representatives appropriated \$158,000 to the Stamford Museum to begin acquisition of 12.7 acres of land adjacent to the existing museum property. At that time it was specified that the museum was to sell off the houses and lots at the front of the property. The city would pay a share of the costs, and the city would apply for reimbursement from the federal and state open space acquisition program. Also, in the 1981 capital budget, the city appropriated \$81,000 to cover an annual \$72,000 payment on principal and \$9,000 payment on interest. This reimbursement, which the city hopes to get from the federal and state governments, is for 75% of the appraised value of the land which will be retained as open space. Under the suspension of the rules at the end of the agenda, I will Move that we consider the resolution which will enable the city to get this money back from the state government. The amount would be \$95,250.

MR. DeLUCA: PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE waive their report.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, is there a guarantee that we're going to be reimbursed for this money?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, this money has been reviewed by the state, and it is going to be coming back to us, the \$95,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move right to a vote.

APPROVED (SHOW OF HANDS): 30 Yes; 4 No; -0- Abstention; 2 Non-Votes.  
(No Votes: Gaipa, Guroian, Mr. & Mrs. Conti)

- (27) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL "FOR THE CREATION OF A SPECIAL CAPITAL FUND TO FINANCE CAPITAL PROJECTS" - requested by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 10/6/81 and 8/31/81 (to Finance Board). Returned to Committee 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81. Held in Committee 1/18/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (28) \$ 8,000.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Code 240.5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS - (to establish an Accounting Manual). Approved by Board of Finance 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10, 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (29) \$ 4,500.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - TERRY CONNERS SKATING RINK - Code 620.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request 10/30/81. Board of Finance approved 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81, and 1/18/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: This is to fund a new cash register which is also a computer and will provide financial control as required by the internal auditor. The cost includes the cash register, two printers, software, programming and maintenance.

MR. DeLUCA: I Move to waive the secondary committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion?

MR. DeLUCA: I just would like to recommend approval of this item because this is a result of an investigation that our committee did with Rep. Boccuzzi and a few other people. As a result of our investigation of Terry Connors Rink, an internal audit was done and this was one of the recommendations to rectify the problems; and it is an item that will go a long way<sup>n</sup> resolving many of the problems there.

MR. ZELINSKI: Just one question through you to Rep. Hawe, am I to understand that this \$4,500 is for a cash register?

MRS. HAWE: It's a cash register which is also a computer, and it includes the cost of the cash register, two printers, the software for the computer, programming for it, and maintenance.

MR. ZELINSKI: This seems like a lot of money just for a cash register and to correct I don't know what problem existed there, but could you go into a little more specifics as far as the rationale behind quite a large appropriation for that particular equipment.

MRS. HAWE: Not only is this a cash register but it also, as I mentioned, is a computer. It has the capacity to maintain the accounts receivables of the Terry Connors Rink. It can be tied into the city's main computer. The cash register which they're using now is nine years old, and at that time when it was purchased, it cost \$3,600. This is not entirely out of line whereas at first sight it would appear that it's an awful lot of money for a cash register. It was explained that it is a great labor-saving device. It will free up the one person who works there to spend their time on other things. The cash register that they have now is going to be utilized also because they'll use it in the parks department office where they have none, and they have been writing out receipts by hand. They'll be able to use the old one there.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Again, I feel that this is an appropriation that is coming before us two months before the budgetary process; and I think it should be included in the 82-83 budget. I see that the first request for it was last October 30, 1981, and they have gotten along all right this far without it. I would suggest they include in their next year's budget and let it be assessed in the total overall of Parks Department budget.

MR. BLAIS: Through you to Mrs. Hawe or Mr. DeLuca, since he addressed the question, I'm not quite sure on the computer software. How is this cash register with peripheral computer equipment going to enhance internal controls any more than the old cash register?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: I really am not familiar with the technical aspects of it, Mr. Blais.

MR. BLAIS: I would like to see that question answered before we vote on that, so I would entertain a Motion to move this back to committee.

MR. DeLUCA: I think I would have to be against returning this to committee for the simple reason that as we request our Internal Audit Department to do an audit for the facilities, they come up with a recommendation; and it was only because of the new board that we didn't have time to act on it, under the 16th Board. Therefore, it just got delayed for several months. If we're going to request our Audit Department to go out and do audits, they make recommendations, and because of delays on our part, I don't see why we have to keep delaying this any further and wait till July 1st. As far as the cost itself, our company just purchased three new cash registers going back about a year and a half ago for \$4,500 apiece; and therefore at this time, the request is not exorbitant. I think it behooves us that we act on this tonight.

MR. BLAIS: Just in response, I was trained and I am sure that most auditors are trained to reduce their recommendations in a manner that the layman can understand them. I believe in this case had they either reduced it to writing it that the layman can understand it properly, went before the committee to answer questions, that the committee would know the advantages of having this equipment vs. the other equipment for internal controls. I would think it would behoove the committee to study this question until they know the difference.

MRS. DeLUCA: Unfortunately, Mr. Blais, I don't think you were on board at the time, but a copy of the audit report was submitted to all Board members; and it was reduced to layman's terms as to why Bob Ruszkowski felt that we needed an additional cash register at the rink. I have a copy over here in my possession if you want to take a look at it.

MRS. HAWE: I think this Board has always been in favor of more control over financial matters in the various departments. It has been stated by our internal auditor that there is a need for this item. The auditor has stated that due to the increased program expansion down at Terry Connors there needs to be more control over these expanded operations. This new register will increase the financial control and provide closer supervision of cash receivables and balances due in a more timely manner. Financial reporting will also be facilitated by the electronic functions that are not presently included in the machine they have now. I think that this is sufficient information for the Board to decide that this is an item that is going to be very useful and very advantageous to be had down at the rink; and I urge the Board members not to return it to committee but to vote on it tonight.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on whether to return this item to committee.

ITEM NOT RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: 26 No; 8 Yes.

We will now vote on the main Motion, whether to approve this amount.

APPROVED (VOICE VOTE): 5 No; 1 Abstention, REST YES.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (30) \$ 4,350.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 610.2110 MAINTENANCE OF GROUNDS -  
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/5/82.  
Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: This amount is to reimburse this account for damages to a planter on Broad Street in the amount of \$2,700, to a hand-rail on Washington Blvd., in the amount of \$660, both caused by motor vehicle accidents, and additional hand-rail damage by vandalism, costing \$990. The law department is now actively pursuing insurance claims on these motor vehicle damages.

MR. DeLUCA: I Move to waive the secondary committee report.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you to Rep. Hawe, when did these accidents or damages take place, please?

MRS. HAWE: I really don't know exactly when. The request was signed by Mr. Cook on the 31st of December, so I assume it was some time shortly before that; but as to the exact dates, I don't know.

MR. ZELINSKI: Is there any dire reason why we have to appropriate this now rather than wait for the proceeds from the insurance claims to be submitted to the city?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know whether there's any dire need, but I would think that we would want to repair these things. Since the possibility is that we will be getting this money back, I see no need to hold this up. It's not something that we're not going to fix them; I think that we would want to have them repaired.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to point out that even if and when we get the insurance money, it requires an additional appropriation anyway. Any insurance money that's awarded to the city goes into the general fund and you can't have it fixed at any point in time unless you appropriate the money for it.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I think one of my questions was answered about when we do get the money where does it go. The other is, are the insurance claims for the entire amount?

MRS. HAWE: No, the insurance claims are for the damages caused by the motor vehicle. So that would be the entire amount minus \$990 which was done due to vandalism.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Through the chair again, may I ask a question, Mrs. Hawe, have you heard any time frame when it's going to be settled?

MRS. HAWE: No, we questioned Mr. Condon who was in from the Parks Department, and he said that it was being pursued by the Law Department and that it was in their hands; after it goes to the Law Department, the Parks Department or the individual department really has nothing to do with it except they get a notification when the claim has been paid. But he didn't know exactly the stage at which it was at this point.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to take a vote if no one else wishes to speak on Item #30, \$4,350, Parks Department.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY.

- (31) \$ 4,550.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 610.2332 PEST CONTROL - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/5/82. Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY.

- (32) \$ 382.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 610.2510 MAINTENANCE OF VEHICLES Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/29/82 to reimburse account for damage to truck by an auto. Insurance claim being filed by Law Dept. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: This is damage to our vehicle, do we have collision coverage on our vehicle?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, I believe we do.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: So why aren't we collecting from our insurance company less the deductible which would probably be like \$100 or \$250?

MRS. CONTI: I believe that they knew who created the accident so they preferred to try to collect from their insurance. They knew the individual who caused the problem.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It answers my question; however, it is commonly done in the insurance industry that if you have your collision coverage you collect from your carrier less the deductible and let your carrier segregate the entire amount including the deductible. I don't want to make a big deal over \$382, but this seems a little inordinate.

MR. ESPOSITO: It is my understanding that we have filed a claim with the insurance company, but it's the same situation. In order to fix the automobile, we have to have the money and the money has to be appropriated. When the insurance company reimburses the city, it goes into the general fund. It is my understanding that that is being done, but in order to fix the automobile, someone has to appropriate money.

MRS. GERSHMAN: My question is, for this very small amount isn't there money in the Parks Department maintenance fund to fix it?

MRS. HAWE: It is quite possible that they do have money left to last them to the end of the fiscal year; however, they were budgeted for maintenance that they expected, and this is something that came up that was not an expected expense that they had to incur. That's why they came in and asked for an additional appropriation. The money, if collected, will be going back into the general fund. It is impossible to tell at this point whether there will be money left in this account at the end of the year; and if there is, it will just revert to the general fund anyway.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on Item #32.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY.

- (33) \$ 1,050.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 610.2182 TREE REHABILITATION - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/28/82 to reimburse account for destruction of three trees by motor vehicles. Insurance claims being pressed by Law Dept. Board of Finance approved 2/9/82.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I'm sorry, but these insurance claims, I understand that we really want to collect from other people when they do the damage; but it does seem to me that there should be something in the budget to allow for these sort of things so that the Parks Department does not have to come to the Board. Perhaps they should look at their budget better for '82 and '83 and include something for insurance claims.

MR. ESPOSITO: There's \$4.80 left in that account right now.

MRS. HAWES: In answer to Mrs. Gershman, perhaps there could possibly be a better way to handle these kind of things; but as the situation stands now, this is the procedure. The money is appropriated out of the account. The funds are reimbursed into the general fund, and we have to go through this process for them to get the funds to do this.

MR. FAUTEUX: Mrs. Gershman, there is no place for contingency funds in any of the operating budgets. It's specifically identified that the contingency fund will be covered in this emergency appropriation procedure, so that's why we do have to go through these items this way.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on Item #33.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY. (PAUL DZIEZYC LEFT - 35 Present)

- (34) \$ 800.00 - CULTURAL EVENTS - Code 730.3345 COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCIL - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 12/17/81. Approved by Board of Finance 1/19/82.

MRS. HAWES: The original budget requested for this at our last budget appropriation session was \$1,800 and this was cut by this Board to \$1,000. Since that time, the council has opened its store-front information center and has become quite active in the community.

MRS. CONTI: Here again, this is an appropriation of \$800 which we originally eliminated out of last year's annual budget. I don't know why we sit here till the wee hours of the morning making cuts in budgets when they all come back to us. Actually, this is something which the community can live without. Things of this nature, cultural events, should be financed by the private sector, not the taxpayers. I am opposed to assessing taxpayers for frills when some of them are hard-pressed to provide even the necessities for themselves. I am voting against this and I would urge others to think about it, too.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to address the issue of cutting this from the budget back in May. I am aware of that because I am the one who made the Motion to cut it. The reason I made the Motion to cut the \$800 from their budget is because I had received information from people on the arts council that the arts council wasn't doing the work that it had originally been organized to do, and there was a lot of concern about that in May. Since that time, there's been new leadership, there's been new organization. There's a new store-front which just sits right below us down the street. They have become much more involved in the community. Apparently, they have gotten the act together and are doing an excellent job and whatever problems there might have been in May, they no longer exist. They're visible, right here on Atlantic Street, providing a service to all the residents of the city of Stamford; and I think at the time that cut was made for a particular purpose and that purpose has been resolved. The group is doing the job it should be doing, and I would recommend that we give back this money to them.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Would the minutes please show that I must absent myself from this vote due to a conflict of interest?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are ready to proceed to a vote. We need 24 votes. We are now voting on Item #34.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Madam President, Mr. Esposito has pointed out that I do not have a conflict of interest. I am on the board of the community arts council; but he says since I don't get money from it, it is not a conflict of interest. Therefore, I certainly would like to vote.

DENIED (SHOW OF HANDS): 23 Yes; 9 No, 1 Abstention, 2 Non-Votes.

- (35) \$ 13,641.00 - STAMFORD YOUTH PLANNING AND COORDINATING AGENCY - Request for an additional appropriation to be used for REGIONAL YOUTH SHELTER PROGRAM for expansion, coordinating and strengthening of services to runaway youth and their families in the GREATER STAMFORD AREA, and development of a supportive networking system within FAIRFIELD COUNTY to insure maximum accessibility, coordination and delivery of services to runaways, to be allocated to the accounts listed in attachment to Mayor Clapes' request of 1/12/82. \$9,443.00 to be received from the Connecticut Justic Commission; and balance of \$4,198.00 is the City of Stamford's share. Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE: 2 No; 1 Abstention; REST YES.

- (36) \$187,600.51 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET Fiscal Year -  
(Transfer) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD - BY THE ADDITION OF  
TWO CAPITAL PROJECTS AS FOLLOWS - TO BE FINANCED BY THE  
TRANSFER FROM THE CAPITAL PROJECTS AS INDICATED BELOW:

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

(36)	<u>Additional Projects - Transfer To:</u>	
	#110.084 Flood Forecast & Early Warning System	\$ 62,600.51
	#110.230 Design & Engineering Flood Control...	<u>\$125,000.00</u>
		\$187,600.51
	<u>Transfer From:</u>	
	#110.144 Hurricane Barrier.....	\$ 23,514.51
	#110.199 Cleaning Rivers and Streams.....	139,736.00
	#110.426 Design Flood Control & Drainage.....	<u>24,350.00</u>
		\$187,600.51

Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: The money will be transferred out of three accounts: Hurricane Barrier Account, Cleaning Rivers and Streams, and Design Flood Control & Drainage Account. These projects are remnants of projects that are already completed. The money will be transferred into two projects: Flood Forecast & Early Warning System - \$62,600.51; and \$125,000 will be transferred into Design & Engineering Flood Control, giving a total of \$187,600.51. The Flood Forecast & Early Warning System is a system that will monitor flood conditions city-wide. It consists of automated gauges from which readings of water levels will be sent into computer at the police or the fire station. This has been developed in conjunction with the National Weather System and will be tied to their computers. The purpose of this system is so that an 8 or 9-hour warning can be issued when a flood is imminent. The cost includes a maintenance plan for this program for this year. For the Board's information, on March 10 a meeting will be held with state, federal and local officials to discuss this system. Project Code 110.230, Design and Engineering Flood Control, is for the development of precise flood hazard boundaries and hydrologic information. This project is coordinated with and supportive of local flood-prone area regulations, the flood insurance program, city-wide drainage study, and the proposed Flood Forecast & Early Warning System, which was mentioned previously. I would just like to mention one thing about this Early Warning System. It has received wide support from the Public Works Department, from the Conservationists, from Chief Considine, who are all in agreement that this is a very important project for the safety of the residents of Stamford.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Those of you who voted for the North Street Senior Housing Project in the flood plain area should be aware that this system was considered very necessary to give early warning so that these elderly can be evacuated if necessary. The transfer amount of \$62,600.51 would need in the future \$17,400 more for the total amount for purchase and installation of this flood warning system. The total amount will be \$80,000.

MRS. CONTI: I am opposed to this item because it is transferring money into a new project in an insufficient amount to cover the project. It will require an additional appropriation before the money can be utilized. With the present restrictions on capital expenditures, which will be with us for the foreseeable future, I am reluctant to put existing capital money into new projects which are not extremely high priority, and especially if the amount is insufficient to

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

complete them. We have more pressing needs to address. I discussed this briefly in the fiscal committee, but the majority dismissed this on the grounds that capital money cannot be transferred from one department to another. I then discussed this briefly with Commissioner Marra the day after fiscal, and it is entirely possible that this is not the case. I would like to see this item re-committed to Fiscal in order to have Commissioner Marra in to discuss this prospect with the whole committee, and I would like to move to re-commit.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now entertain discussion on returning this item to committee.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to speak against returning it to committee. I think the point Mrs. Conti makes is interesting and it's something to pursue, this matter of transferring between department and capital projects. However, I think it all comes down to whether you feel that these are priority projects. For several years now, the Fiscal Committee has been urging, at budget time especially, that various departments consolidate their capital budgets, the old ones, eliminate them, find out what money they have left over, and try to find the projects that are top priority today, transfer some of this old money into new projects so that new money does not have to be bonded at the high interest rates now. This is exactly what Mr. Lubbers and the Environmental Protection Board have done. Obviously, they feel that these projects are important ones; and I think, especially what Mrs. Maihock brought out about the elderly project that we voted for and we were so concerned as to their safety being in the flood area at that time, that this early warning system is vital to houses like that and also all residences in that situation. Even though what Mrs. Conti brings up is something that we will pursue, I urge the Board members not to return this but to vote on this tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I believe that the reason Fiscal voted in favor of this was because it was a priority item according to Mr. Lubbers. It had very little to do, as far as my vote was concerned, as to whether this could be transferred to another department; but to the fact that not only has Fiscal over the years, but so has the Finance Department and the Mayors Office, been urging the department heads to prioritize that capital projects budget, and that is just what Mr. Lubbers did for Items 36 and 37. If we're going to have any respect for the professionalism of department heads, it would seem that we would vote for what he considers his priority.

MR. LIVINGSTON: It was also pointed out in our Fiscal Committee that we borrow this money at very low interest rates; and if it has to be returned to the general fund or wherever it's going to be returned and we have to come back and borrow money again, my understanding is it's going to be at much higher interest rates. As Mrs. Goldstein just said, this is something that we in Fiscal have been insisting upon right along and finally we have someone who is setting priorities, getting rid of some of the old things in the capital budget. Really, the man should not be punished for doing what we've asked him to do.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to point out that if we were not to approve this transfer tonight, we don't save any money. The money doesn't go into the general fund; it just sits there. It sits in the capital project budget; it sits in those projects which the administrator here has already decided are not priority projects. We have really then negatively sanctioned someone for doing exactly what we've asked all department heads to do. I just want to emphasize that we're not saving money, and it would just sit there. Nothing would happen with the money.

MR. DeLUCA: I would have to agree with the comments of Paul Esposito and Sandy Goldstein. I heard this for years, at least since I've been on this Board, we've been emphasizing the need to review all old capital projects, transfer of funds where needed; we have a professional staff with Mark Lubbers heading it right now. We have a good EPB commission, and they felt the need to go into this Early Warning Forecast System; and to return it back to committee for our new Finance Commissioner to pursue to possibly transfer it to other departments, I think that's something we can do later on. I am sure that Mark Lubbers and the EPB commission would not present this before our committee if they didn't feel it was a top priority item. Therefore, I would recommend against sending this back to committee. I think we should take a vote on it this evening.

MR. BLUM: My objection is this taking it away from the account of 110.199 Cleaning Rivers & Streams. That Rippowam River, when the nice heavy rainfall comes down, I think anyone that's alongside that river knows what happens. One of the appropriations this Board at one time made was cleaning the rivers and the streams. Why they are taking money away from that account is beyond me, because if we go on to the next (37) they found \$2,000 more to put into the next appropriation. Why didn't they take the full account away and put it into 36?

MRS. HAWE: Mr. Blum, the ongoing maintenance of our rivers and streams from now on is going to be in the operating budget. The only money that will be in the capital project budget for cleaning rivers and streams...

MRS. GUROIAN: Point Of Order. Are we talking about the main Motion or are we talking about referring it back to committee?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Referring it back to committee.

MR. FAUTEUX: I'll move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Tarzia has left, we now have 34 present. We are now going to vote on moving this back to committee. It is not returned to committee. Now we are going to vote on the main Motion.

APPROVED BY SHOW OF HANDS: 27 Yes; 3 No; 2 Abstentions; 2 Non-Votes.  
(No Votes - Mr. Blum, Mr. Franchina, Mrs. Conti)  
(Abstentions - Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Zelinski)

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (37) \$ 16,697.66 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET Fiscal Year  
 (Transfer) BY ADDING THIS SUM TO AN EXISTING PROJECT BY TRANSFER FROM  
THE CAPITAL PROJECTS INDICATED BELOW: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
BOARD

Transfer To:

#110.487 City-Wide Aerial Mapping.....\$16,697.66

Transfer From:

#110.199 Cleaning Rivers and Streams.....	2,000.00
#110.256 Mapping of Wetlands.....	4,559.97
#110.299 Setting Encroachment Lines City-Wide...	6,580.51
#110.425 Technical Assistance Wetlands Class....	750.31
#110.488 Mill Pond Restoration.....	2,806.87
	<u>\$16,697.66</u>

(The foregoing transfers will close out the projects listed.) Board of Finance approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Secondary committee concurred with that.

MR. GAIPA: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, why do we need another map? There are many aerial maps of the city in existence.

MRS. HAWE: We had mentioned that because a year or so ago we had appropriated quite a lot of money for Aerial Mapping which was to be used for tax purposes for the re-assessment. However, this is an entirely, much more detailed map. The scale is much more detailed. It is a topographical map; it's entirely different from the aerial map that we have now, and it could not be used for the purposes of the Environmental Protection Board which is to identify flood areas, wetlands, and things like that that they're involved with. This has to be done separately from the other mapping that the city has done.

MR. BLUM: What is happening to the Mill River Pond Restoration? That's still going on and yet they've found \$2,806.

MRS. HAWE: It might still be going on, but this money is not needed for that project; and those projects that are being transferred from will be closed out when the transfer is complete. The actual work might still be going on, but the Environmental Protection Board has determined that this money is no longer needed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It has been moved by Mr. Wiederlight that we Move the question.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE: 2 No (Blum, Franchina); 2 Abstentions (Owens, Gaipa); REST YES.

- (38) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM MAYOR CLAPES DATED 12/9/81 AUTHORIZING HIM TO FILE APPLICATIONS WITH U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DOT) under UMTA of 1964 as amended, FOR FUNDS TO ASSIST IN OPERATING DIAL-A-RIDE PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY. (No amounts stated). Funds requested are for one-half cost of Dial-A-Ride System; and applications are for 1980-1981 fiscal years. 1979-1980 application is pending. Held in Steering 12/10, 12/28/81 and 1/18/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE BROUGHT UP UNDER SUSPENSION OF RULES, WITH THE PROPER MOTIONS MADE AND APPROVED:

- (39) \$ 1,790.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - HEALTH FAIR. See request from Dr. Ralph Gofstein and Mayor Clapes.

MRS. HAWE: This money is anticipated to be reimbursed by private and corporate contributions.

MR. ZELINSKI: Is there any reason why we can't hold this one month? Is there an emergency that we must pass this before our next Board meeting?

MRS. HAWE: I believe the Health Fair is coming up; I'm not sure of the exact date. I think it's held in April or May, and I would say it's certainly not something that could wait till budget time.

MR. ZELINSKI: How come this wasn't put on the agenda then if it was that...

MRS. HAWE: The papers had come down, I believe, but it was inadvertently left off the tentative agenda. It's something that we do every year.

MR. ZELINSKI: I have no qualms about it. The only thing is that we had about 40 items on the Fiscal agenda the way it was. It's ten of one in the morning now, and now we have suspension of the rules to cover even more items.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you asking questions regarding this item, Mr. Zelinski?

MR. ZELINSKI: No.

PRESIDENT: We are now going to speak to the main Motion.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Well, I would certainly urge all Board members to support this. This is probably one of the best services that we can give our community, and I really feel each one of us should be indebted to the Health Department for putting this on every year so that many people who might not get to a doctor have some of their problems diagnosed free.

MRS. SIGNORE: This is truly good use of funds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move right to a vote.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (VOICE VOTE).

- (40) RESOLUTION FOR DAY CARE PROGRAM - ( Resolution on desk.)

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (VOICE VOTE).

- (41) RESOLUTION ON DESK TONIGHT FOR APPLICATION TO STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FOR PURCHASE PRICE OF PORTION OF STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER ABUTTING PROPERTY - DuPUIS PROPERTY - SO CITY CAN RECEIVE REIMBURSEMENT OF \$95,250.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued) - SUSPENSION OF RULES

MRS. HAWE: This would enable, as I said before, the city to get \$95,250 back from the State Department of Environmental Protection for the purchase of the DuPuis property.

MR. BLUM: I would just like to ask one question of the Chairman of Fiscal giving the report this evening. Why can't we have the resolution come in at the same time as the Fiscal item? I've seen it before where we have the resolution and the amount that we're asking for the same night. What's so different this holy night?

MRS. HAWE: We are doing it the same night. We've done the appropriation earlier, and now we're doing this.

MR. BLUM: Why does it come to a Suspension of Rules? Why isn't it on the agenda then?

MRS. HAWE: For whatever reason, Mr. Blum, the Resolution was not received by our office until after the Steering Committee; and since it is a vital part of the appropriation, the Committee felt that we would recommend suspending the rules. Whatever the hold-up was in whatever department, I don't know; but it was not received down here in time to put on the tentative agenda.

MR. BLUM: Don't you think the administration knows when you're passing a fiscal item in regard to a grant, they have to have a Resolution.

MRS. HAWE: The only thing I can say is nobody is perfect. We have it before us tonight. I suggest we vote on it.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE: 1 No (Mrs. Conti); 2 Abstentions (Wiederlight, Guroian);

REST YES

(42) ~~\$154,080.00~~  
\$110,649.00 - NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS' SALARY INCREASES, 11%, 13% PLUS EQUITY, AND RETROACTIVE. Held in Steering 2/16/82.

The following cuts were approved:	\$ 3,556.00 (Welfare Director)
	661.00 (FICA & Pension)
Approved UNANIMOUSLY. VOICE.	<u>39,214.00</u>
	\$43,431.00

\$154,080.00 Orig. Request
<u>43,431.00 Reductions</u>
\$110,649.00 APPROVED

MRS. HAWE: I would urge the Board members to vote for this as the matter has been dealt with by the Personnel Committee, and we have voted on that.

MRS. CONTI: I just want to speak to this. When we were discussing this in Fiscal, I did not realize that the Welfare Director is included here; and since we do not have a Welfare Director, I think this amount should be amended. However, in the back-up material, I didn't get any figures as to

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

what department, what amount was for what department; but I do think since the Welfare Director is included and we don't have him with us, we should reduce this appropriation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: By what amount, Mrs. Conti?

MRS. CONTI: I don't know because I didn't get amounts with my back-up material.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Correct me if I'm wrong, Chairperson of Fiscal, but I don't think you're going to get a breakdown of amounts by individual as was stated to us at the Personnel Committee meeting.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, we do have a breakdown for the Welfare Director for this year, not for the retroactive. But for this year it's \$3,556.

MRS. CONTI: I would make a Motion to reduce it by \$3,556 since we don't have the Welfare Director. As far as retroactive for the Welfare Director, we have been for some time without a Welfare Director; and there should probably be a reduction there also. I don't know how far the retroactive goes back; but if it goes back...

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're making a Motion to reduce \$154,080.00 by \$3,556.00?

MRS. CONTI: Plus whatever retroactive is in there for the Welfare Department also.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We've got to have a better Motion than that.

MRS. HAWE: The retroactive pay includes from July '79 to July '81. I really don't know how you would figure out with any accuracy how much belongs to the Welfare Director. However, I think if we just take the amount and subtract the \$3,556 we could have an amount that Mrs. Conti could make an amendment on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, I'm still waiting for an amendment to this.

MRS. CONTI: I will move to amend it by \$3,556 to decrease it by same to represent the current increase for the Welfare Director. If I knew what the retroactive was for the Welfare Department, I would like to reduce it by that also.

MRS. HAWE: If we subtract that amount, the \$3,556 for this year, for the Welfare Director, the new amount would be \$150,524. Now as to the retroactive, there's no way that now we can figure out.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now discuss the amendment.

MR. FAUTEUX: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, are we absolutely sure that the merit increases had been scheduled and those dollar amounts that you're stating here so that there will be no short-fall for these people?

MRS. HAWE: I'm sorry, Mr. Fauteux, will you repeat that?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. FAUTEUX: Yes, you're stating the figure of \$3,556...

MRS. HAWE: Yes, the merit, equity and merit salary adjustment for this year for the Welfare Director is that amount.

MR. FAUTEUX: And all the other positions are scheduled for like, similar, or they are identified amounts?

MRS. HAWE: Well, they're not like amounts, but they are all identified as to departments. For instance, the Law Department has 5 people and they're all lumped together but there's only 1 person in the Welfare Department and that's the Director and that's \$3,556. For that position, that's who it's for.

MR. FAUTEUX: I am satisfied that the amendment is in the accurate amount.

MRS. PERILLO: So I can vote intelligently on this, through you to Mrs. Hawe, is the Welfare Director included in this? How long has Mr. Canino been Acting Director up there?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, the Welfare Director is included. Mr. Canino has been there for 18 months, 19 months, something like that.

MRS. PERILLO: Mr. Canino is doing this voluntarily, he is not getting paid for this, so why are we giving...

MRS. HAWE: That's why I think Mrs. Conti is making the Motion to eliminate this.

MRS. PERILLO: I think he should be paid for the wonderful job he is doing. I think he should get the money.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to further amend the \$3,556 by another \$661 which would include a reduction also for the FICA which is 6.7% and the Classified Pension which is 11.9%. So with these two figures, you have roughly 18.6% times the \$3,556, which gives you an additional \$661 for a total reduction of \$4,217. Therefore, I would like to increase the reduction of \$3,556 to \$4,217 to include the reduction in the FICA as well as the Classified Pension.

MRS. CONTI: I definitely accept.

MRS. HAWE: Did you say what the appropriation would be if this amendment is passed?

MR. DeLUCA: The amount for approval would be \$149,863.00

MR. BLUM: Through you, I would like to ask how far are we talking about retroactivity because I have in my hand here dating back to January 8, 1979 on our agenda we passed merit and merit increases for certain MAA people that totalled \$99,000 for merit increases. Mrs. Hawe said in her particular remarks that we're talking of retroactivity back to 1979. I have in my hand here where we passed on January 8, 1979 MAA increases, merit increases, Thursday, April 10, 1980 we appropriated increases, and here is January 12, 1981, \$32,000.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: The retroactive goes back to July 1, 1979 and includes the period from July 1, 1979 to July 1, 1981. That's the retroactive two-year period.

MR. BLUM: Then what did we work on here when we have an Action Report here for April 10, 1980 and January 12, 1981, Merit Increases?

MRS. HAWE: I really don't know. Perhaps the Personnel Committee at the time, Mr. Blum, you were Chairman of it. I really don't know.

MR. STORK: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, is it possible that some of this, now \$149,863.00, had computed into it retroactive pay for the period of time when we did have a Welfare Director?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, it would, but I'm not exactly sure of the date when Mr. DeVos left; but it was certainly after July 1, 1979 so part of this would include that period, but how much it would I don't know.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY:

We are going to vote on the amendment to reduce the amount to \$149,863.00.

AMENDMENT PASSES: 22 Yes; 4 No; and 3 Abstentions.

MR. FAUTEUX: Madam Chairperson, I would make a Motion that this item be returned to committee for further study and accuracy of the amount we're talking about. At this point I think we're so confused about what is retroactive, fringe benefits, I think it can be held one more month to get the appropriate amount out.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It has been moved by Mr. Fauteux to return this item to committee.

MRS. PERILLO: I would also like to add to that, it was very confusing to try to vote tonight and listen to somebody tell you something. I was told this information was on our desk. It was not on my desk, and quite a few others. I would suggest that all the Board of Reps get the information so we could act more intelligently.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I don't know what anyone thinks is going to be done with any of the money if there's some left over. I can imagine that it would go back to the general fund, but for us to put this back into committee and deny long-time city employees the right of their raises, I really don't think we're really doing what's right. I intend to vote negative on that Motion.

MRS. HAWE: If the problem appears to be the amount that would be reduced because of the Welfare Director, I think that the Motion by Mrs. Conti and Mr. DeLuca to reduce the appropriation to \$149,000 is a reasonable one; and I would hate to keep these people waiting another month for their increases, and I would urge not to return it to committee.

MR. STORK: I, too, would not like to see this return to committee. These 16 active individuals at the moment were entitled to this money last July 1st. This is the ninth month they've been deprived of it. I'd like to see it move forward.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BLUM: I would be willing to give them the raise, but if we are talking about retroactivity, they have been paid three times. I'll pay them whatever they're entitled from July 1 of that date but with no retroactivity until this is really cleared up. Different Boards of Representatives met on and approved:

January 12, 1981	Approved on Consent	\$32,868.00
April 10, 1981	Approved	\$30,994.00
January 8, 1979	Approved	\$99,008.00

If we did meet those days, and here are the agendas and the consent forms, I say this is gospel. I'll give them the raise without the retroactivity. Yes, they are entitled to a raise.

MR. DIXON: I was just going to ask what the Motion is, to return to committee, or what?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion is to return to committee which is now reduced to \$149,863.00 because the amendment did pass.

MR. DeLUCA: I don't see any problems in returning this to committee for one more month. We fail to realize that we just approved a contract several months ago for the MAA people, and these people who are on the same level as the 17 we're about to vote on tonight, went without an increase for three years. So for one more month I don't see why there should be any problem.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I am not in favor of returning this to committee. I agree with Mr. Stork, and I believe it was Mrs. Hawe, who make very good points as to why it should be voted on tonight. Furthermore, the amounts have been verified by the Finance Department and by the Budget Director so that I have to believe that the amounts are correct. I hope we vote on this tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would be in favor of sending this back to committee. It's indeed unfortunate that we come to this hour of our meeting and we have to hold up these people's pay one more month. I do feel sympathy for that; but on the other hand, I don't see how I or any of us can vote intelligently when, first of all, we haven't got the information in black and white, now how can we intelligently vote on something at this hour of the morning, 1:15 a.m., without having information. If there are some mistakes or some amendments or some adjustments, I think it would behoove whoever to give us this information so we can vote intelligently. If not, I don't see how we can do that. We have no alternative but to put it back to committee one month, and hopefully between now and then get the information, so at our next meeting with due haste we can grant whatever is due these people.

MRS. CONTI: I am very much in favor of returning this to committee because I have the same minutes to which Mr. Blum is referring. There were raises; the problem is we're not dealing with the same 17 people. We're dealing with some of the same people but not all of the same people, so therefore I have minutes for January 12, 1981, April 10, 1980, January 8, 1979, where some of these 17 individuals did receive three raises in the three years that I mention. Therefore, the retroactivity should be corrected accordingly.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

There's not all 17 on here. It would appear that some of the 17 are entitled to a 3-year retroactivity, but not all. I am very much in favor of returning this to committee to straighten out the proper amount here.

MR. CONTI: I also am in favor of returning this to committee because I think this includes the Welfare Director's salary for the past year, which could be anywhere between \$28,000 and \$43,000 and this appropriation could be reduced by that amount.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I believe that just as a point of information, we received these figures in December (they are dated 11/30) under operating budget municipal administrators' pay adjustment for \$1,717,095 and this was part of that presentation. I believe, if I remember correctly, that we questioned the retroactive pay when we interviewed personnel in the Personnel Committee; and I've been trying to piece it together with Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Stork. I don't believe that the Welfare Director was included in the non-union retro, because he no longer works for us.

MR. WIDER: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to vote on the question which is returning this amount, which has been amended, back to Fiscal Committee.

MRS. HAWE: I would just like to make one suggestion. If there seems to be a problem with this retroactive pay, I would suggest that we approve the appropriation with the exception of the \$39,000 for the retroactive. We approve the rest of it, and we hold the \$39,000 in committee and straighten that out. So at least these people will be getting their pay for this year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, we already have a Motion here that we're voting on at this point.

We are now going to vote on returning this item to committee. This is Item #42 returning \$149,863 back to fiscal committee. MOTION IS DEFEATED: 16 Yes; 16 No; 1 Abstention.

We will now vote on the Main Motion, and there has been a Motion for a Roll Call Vote.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the attendance roll. Absent were: Reps. Flounders, McInerney, Hogan, Dziezyc, Rybnick. 5 Absent and 35 Present.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to amend this Motion to return to committee \$39,214, which represents the non-union retroactive pay, which would make the Main Motion \$114,866.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A little slower, Mr. Esposito. You are going to amend to decrease \$149,863.00 by \$39,214, bringing the total to \$114,866.00?

MR. ESPOSITO: The correct figure is \$110,649.00.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's been a Motion to amend to decrease \$149,863 by \$32,214 to \$110,649.

MR. ESPOSITO: Right, that's the Motion to return that portion to committee, not to cut it out.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are making a Motion to return \$39,214 to committee for further discussion.

MR. ESPOSITO: Representing the non-union retroactive pay.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll move right to a vote. The Amendment to return \$39,214 to committee. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will now go to the Main Motion.

MRS. HAWE: The Main Motion is to approve \$110,649.00.

MRS. GUROIAN: After all this discussion, all this confusion, because I have no documents in front of me to read, I would like the assurance of the co-chairman of Fiscal that that figure is accurate.

MRS. HAWE: All I can say is as far as I can tell, as far as I know, it's accurate.

MRS. GUROIAN: What I'm hearing is they can't assure me that that figure is accurate.

MRS. HAWE: As far as I know, it is accurate.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hawe and Mr. Esposito concur that it is accurate. We are now voting on that.

APPROVED BY SHOW OF HANDS \$110,649.00: 27 Yes; 1 No (DeLuca) and 7 Abstentions  
(Abstentions: Saxe, Franchina, Signore,  
Guroian, B. Conti, + 2 more)

MRS. HAWE: That concludes my report, but I'd just like to say that the contingency fund status report which Mrs. Guroian asked for last month as to how much was left in the contingency fund is on everyone's desk tonight.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to take on the suspension of the rules an item that is on the agenda out of order. That is the proposed resolution Re Jazz to be continued on local radio station WSTC.

RESOLUTION:

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE JAZZ TO BE CONTINUED ON LOCAL RADIO STATION - submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville 1/18/82. Held in Steering.

RESOLUTION #1 (Out of Order):

PRESIDENT SANTY: For your information, there have been 3 gentlemen all evening waiting for this Resolution. There has been a second to suspending the rules. We are going to consider the resolution as proposed by Ms. Summerville.

MRS. GUROIAN: I think this thing is improperly before us. I don't feel that this Board has the right with all the other important things on the agenda to tell a media what to put on their programming and what not to put on their programming. I would have the same reaction if we were telling the Stamford Advocate what to print and what not to print. I feel as though, first of all, there is no way we can implement what we pass. Second of all, we have no business interfering in their programming. Third of all, there are lots more important things to discuss than what the media should use and what it should not use. I'm certainly opposed to consideration of any controls over any media whether it be the radio or the news paper.

MR. ROOS: I think before we do anything on this we should get a legal opinion on whether we have a right to even consider this.

MR. BOCCUZZI: It is the right of any member on this Board to ask for a Resolution by this Board. Resolutions are nothing but a set feeling of the Board. There's nothing binding in it. It just lets the radio station know how we feel. They could listen to this or they don't have to listen to us. We're not telling them what to do. I've seen resolutions go in there where we make a resolution supporting the people in Oshkosh, and we have nothing to do with them. They go through. Now this is a local thing, and everybody is upset because we're trying to let them know how people feel.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to strongly echo the feelings of John Boccuzzi. We've made resolutions supporting the people in Poland. We've made resolutions supporting a reduction in electric rates. We've made resolutions supporting a reduction in ConRail fares. This is something right here at home; and if this doesn't take precedence over things we have on the agenda, our own radio station, our own media, things our own people listen to, I really shudder to think what really does.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The intent of this Resolution is not to impose upon WSTC. I would like to share with this Board that I haven't gotten one call from the management of WSTC in opposition, nor have I gotten one call from any citizen in the city of Stamford. I haven't gotten anything but positive response, and this Resolution is not to dictate to WSTC in no way. We're just expressing our feelings. I happen to like jazz and I think nothing is wrong with it because we're going to pass another resolution here tonight. We've passed banners asking the people to support different activities in the city. So it's the same kind of publicity. I am trying to say to WSTC that there are citizens out there who would like to say to them that we hope that they will continue to keep the jazz station going. That's all.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I also don't believe that this is imposing or any infringement on freedom of the press. For anyone who's listened to that jazz program on WSTC and it's been on now for a while, it's just a breath of fabulous music; and I certainly hope that we pass this so that WSTC understands how the people feel about this marvelous program.

RESOLUTION #1 (Out of Order):

PRESIDENT SANTY: It has been moved and seconded to move the question which is adopting the Resolution as you have on your desk.

APPROVED BY SHOW OF HANDS: 23 Yes; 3 No; 3 Abstention (Mrs. Gershman,  
Mr. Fauteux, Mrs. Maihock)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to make a Motion to adjourn.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now vote on adjourning. There is one item on Personnel, Planning and Zoning has two items, and Parks and Recreation has one item. I know it is not debatable, but there is emergency suspension of the rules. We are going to have a problem with one item and it is the Hike Bike and we have to okay it tonight. It is on March 28th. Ladies and gentlemen, this is something they never had to do before, but they have to get approval and they have been calling Gabe and myself for a couple of weeks.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I will withdraw my Motion.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to suspend the rules to bring up an item that is not on the agenda. It is an important item. It benefits the aid for retarded citizens of Stamford. It regards the Stamford Junior Women's Club requesting permission to have a Bike Hike.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Gabe DeLuca

- (1) BIKE HIKE use Scalzi Park 3/28 - Stamford Junior Women's Club - to help handicapped.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to grant permission to the Stamford Junior Women's Club to have their Bike Hike on March 28th. It is a worthwhile cause and is something that benefits the city.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY VOICE VOTE.

- (2) REQUEST BY RIPPOWAM HIGH SCHOOL STAGE CO. TO HANG BANNER 3/28 thru 4/4/82

MR. DeLUCA: It's a worthwhile cause put on by the students who are performing.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

- (1) ACCEPTANCE OF COACHLAMP LANE as a City Street

DID NOT COME UP BEFORE ADJOURNMENT.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE: Point of Order. Item #2 under Planning and Zoning, while this item is being held there is a statement that has been a consensus of Planning and Zoning that it should be read into the record this evening upon discussions this afternoon with corporation counsel. It will only take a moment to read if Mr. Wiederlight would withdraw his motion at this time.

(2) REFERRAL CONCERNING THE ZONING BOARD'S DECISION ON APPLICATION #81-020 TO AMEND HEIGHT AND BULK REQUIREMENTS FOR THE M-L and M-G INDUSTRIAL ZONES.

The Applicant is the ZONING BOARD, who, on Oct. 19, 1982 held a public hearing on their application; and who, on January 18, 1982 APPROVED their application as modified, to be effective February 2, 1982.

On Feb. 1, 1982 the Zoning Board received 39-page petition referring the Zoning Board's action to the Board of Representatives, pursuant to Charter Section 553.2.

On February 11, 1982, at 2:37 P.M., the Board of Representatives received said REFERRAL, petition, various papers. On February 17, 1982, received "un-approved Zoning Board Minutes". Transcript of Hearing has been promised for March 1st from Zoning Board.

HELD

MR. DONAHUE: For the record, Madam President, I would read this statement. After informal review with the Corporation Counsel's office, we have been advised that our committee should not act on this matter this evening. Although there appears to be a degree of merit to the challenge which has been raised, the Corporation Counsel's office wants sufficient time to thoroughly analyze and evaluate the information submitted with regard to the subject referral, and the validity of the petition thereof. If the challenge to the petition is found to be meritorious and valid, the result could be an ineffective petition which could result in the matter being improperly before the Board of Representatives. So at this time the committee would recommend that we hold this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's no vote necessary on that, Mr. Donahue.

MR. BLAIS: I would like to make a Motion to adjourn.

VOTE ON ADJOURNMENT: No Votes; Summerville, Stork, Dudley, Zelinski, Conti, Boccuzzi

ADJOURNMENT: 2:00 A.M.

APPROVED:

Jeanne Lois Santy  
Jeanne Lois Santy, President  
17th Board of Representatives

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

JLS:HM:TG