

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, JULY 12, 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, JULY 12, 1982, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

INVOCATION: The Rev. Sweppie Mal-Bon, United Methodist Church of Darien; Lay District Speaker of New York East Conference, 19 Vista Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Jeanne-Lois Santy,

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: SATISFACTORY.

(Note: The original 8 members absent are shown as absent on each voting tally sheet. Members who left during the course of the evening are recorded as NV.)

ROLL CALL: Clerk Annie M. Summerville

32 PRESENT; 8 Absent (Flounders, Owens, Esposito, A. Conti, Hogan, Franchina, Goldstein, DeLuca (mostly ill; one funeral, one vacation).)

MAYOR LOUIS A. CLAPES' ANNUAL MESSAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1981-1982

MAYOR CLAPES: First meeting in July you must listen to the Mayor's annual report, and they do get rather lengthy. This year we tried to keep it to a minimum. Ladies and gentlemen of the Board of Representatives and ladies and gentlemen of the public, although it's a Charter requirement that the Mayor present the annual budget message each July to your Board, much of what I have to report you are already aware of and have participated in its shaping.

This year was the Year of Reassessment. At no other time in the history of Stamford have property values risen so dramatically than the last ten years. The taxing impact on this change, because it took effect immediately in one year, has hit some taxpayers like a ton of bricks. They will be faced with an enormous increase while still others look forward to reduced taxes. Cutting the budget as your Board diligently did, could only really alleviate a relatively small percentage in the most extreme cases of the increase. Weighing the pros and cons of coming out slightly in favor of the pros, I asked you to consider a phase-in of the new taxes. Your decision was not to phase-in, but to face up to the full impact immediately. Needless to say, I was disappointed, even though I could appreciate the various factors you had to weigh.

This was also a year of the shopping center, which delighted the media, both with the headlines of delayed openings, as well as being a continuous source of advertising revenue for them. We really have a lot going for us in Stamford, and sometimes we spend just too much time finding fault and not enough time appreciating what we really have.

MAYOR LOUIS A CLAPES' ANNUAL MESSAGE (Continued):

Now I will, as briefly as possible, try to cover some of the major events that took place during the past year.

Public Works continues to be a department in transition. Commissioner Spaulding's effort to introduce professional management to meet the needs of today's standards are continuing to bear fruit. Public Works will return unspent money to the city in excess of half a million dollars, a tribute to their tight management and efficient operation. Your Board is also aware that Public Works did not make a single request for an additional appropriation for the entire year. Factors leading to the surplus in this department included elimination of garbage haul-away and successful sludge burning. The hiring of a Superintendent of Sanitation was in great measure responsible for these major savings. The hiring of a Utilities Specialist has already resulted in savings, and promises to result in further cost savings that could very well amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The Highway Bureau which has now 50% fewer people than 10 years ago has been organized. An important element to provide flexibility to this reduced force is training. Unfortunately, funds for training were completely eliminated in the 1982-83 budget. The Highway Bureau during this past severe winter, was called out for approximately 16 snowstorms. The new salt dome which caused great controversy provided significant saving in salt tonnage as well as reduced liability from previous use of lumpy salt being thrown into the road surface. The Engineering Bureau is also being re-organized in the interest of greater efficiency to the public. Increased fees for street openings and septic permits will bring to the City additional revenues and help relieve the tax bureau burden of the home owner. The Energy Director, under the jurisdiction of the Engineering Bureau, has instituted an awareness program which will save the City approximately \$200,000 in energy costs.

The Law Department was particularly busy during this second-half of the past year with matters concerning our downtown re-development. Included in this category were the Veterans Park, the Railroad Station Project, Street Improvement and Drafting of the Coliseum Authority Legislation. There is also great concern with tightening up bidding procedures to reduce the City's legal exposure as a result of long-standing, accepted bidding practices.

Finance in the Fiscal 1981-82 marked a sixth consecutive year of surpluses. The cause of this surplus is due to additional revenue, mainly interest income, which of course is difficult to predict from one year to another. About a half of a million dollars is due to un-earmarked capital expenditures which the Board of Finance did not transfer to specific projects as requested. Our Triple-A rating continues to attest to our fiscally responsible and sound condition. Because of the unusually high tax rate, prudence demanded that we not issue long-term bonds to fund capital projects. We decided to fund these projects instead through bond anticipation notes, issued in April 1982, for over eleven million dollars at an average rate of 8.85%. These notes may either be rolled over at maturity; or if long term conditions improve, we may opt for a longer funding term. In line with our constant search for new sources of revenue, I requested the Board to approve the establishment of a Coliseum Authority. This would not only bring in a minimum of \$400,000 in Fiscal 1982-83 and considerable more in the future, but would act as a real source of support for our cultural community. Needless to say, I am gratified at your action in improving it.

MAYOR LOUIS A. CLAPES' ANNUAL MESSAGE (Continued):

We will continue to seek new revenues to relieve the local tax burden. I have appointed an alternate revenue tax force to assist me in the subject, and I hope you will support our efforts to increasing revenues with the same enthusiasm that you supported reduced spending. They are both necessary to keep the taxes down and still provide the needed services. We are attempting to recover lost revenue due to private alarm systems and road improvements by tightening up our procedure so that this type of problem cannot recur.

The establishment of an Internal Audit Office during the past year should help us avoid such problems in the future by identifying areas needing improved controls and suggesting more cost-effective measures. We have also put into place an accounting system for the city's physical assets which will be kept up to date to safeguard against the loss of city property.

Another accomplishment over the past year has been the establishment of a new, more cost-effective system of risk management and self-insurance. This new system stands to save us about \$200,000 in premiums and at the same time, broaden and improve our coverage. Coordination with the Board of Education was an important aspect of this new system.

Reassessment of property values was completed in October, 1981, after a ten-year period. The effects of inflation over this ten-year period impacted drastically on property values. So much so that even the local tax levy for the coming year resulted in only a 3% real increase. The shift in property values will cause some taxpayers far greater increases. The reduction of taxes for automobile and personal properties will tend to somewhat relieve the most drastic increases which will still be a bitter pill to swallow.

The Grants Office has been busy this year due to the cuts, shifts and uncertainties of federal and state grants. It was and still is a major effort keeping current with the constantly changing status of the funds and trying to alleviate the most negative impact resulting from the cuts. State and federal revenue accounts were at 18% of the combined City and Board of Education operating budget. A major goal at the Grants Office is to coordinate, inform the City's departments and agencies affected by these funds. A series of meetings designed for this purpose has resulted in an ongoing task force that promises to keep the City on top of this constantly changing situation.

The Personnel Department announced openings of 118 positions during the past year. The Fleet Accident Review Committee continued to operate effectively in working with department heads to reduce the number of vehicle accidents. In line with this effort, Driver and In-Service Training was implemented and some of the techniques used have been made part of the examination process for key driving positions. Affirmative action has resulted in the recruitment of a far greater percentage of minorities than the percentage of these minorities now in the Stamford area. This successful effort will continue to bring more upward mobility of jobs. Also, during the past year, the City changed its medical coverage to the Travelers Insurance Company after many years with the New York Blue Cross.

MAYOR LOUIS A. CLAPES' ANNUAL MESSAGE (Continued):

The Personnel Department has been the focus of several studies and investigations during the year, each bearing on a different aspect of their operation. It is too soon to say at this point in time what the final recommendations and outcomes of these activities will be.

Police Department - My appointment of John Considine as Chief of Police, after a lengthy search, was carried out, was greeted by you and many others as happy news. Much of the Chief's great credit was his conduct during this stressful period of time, so intensely magnified by the press. The Police Department under Chief Considine is thriving. The shift schedule has been re-organized which resulted in a significant saving to the city. The use of smaller vehicles was also brought about, and has also brought about cost savings. The Police Commissioner formally adopted a set of new rules and regulations to serve as guidelines for acceptable police conduct. This has not been done since 1956. Community relations has become an important priority of the Department as evidenced by the re-establishment of a unit designed just for that purpose. The department, fully adjusted to its newly expanded and renovated facility, is evaluating the activity in the Town Center to be sure it can accurately provide for the needs there.

Fire Department - Fire reductions have forced the Department to operate with ten vacancies with the unfortunate possibility that service may have to be reduced. The Department is greatly concerned with the reduction and the impact of these reductions so that it does not jeopardize public safety.

Department of Traffic and Parking - Much of the credit for smooth traffic flow to and from the new Stamford Town Center is due to the foresight and planning by the Traffic Director. They are also consulting with downtown merchants to improve parking availability to service these stores. The projected construction of the Transportation Center at the Railroad Station is another major focus of the Department and will continue to be in the coming year. The overall goal of the Traffic Department is to keep traffic moving smoothly. This depends in part on the design of a computer signal system and its subsequent construction. Funds are now pending before your Board for this project, and I urge you strongly to support this critical need.

The Health Department gave nearly 1,200 flu shots, ran a Glaucoma Screening Program, and in general provided important services to our elderly population. This was recently climaxed by another successful SHAPE program, Health Fair, held on June 16th. The decreasing number of school population together with the increase of the number of elderly has required careful shifting of nursing personnel to meet these changing needs. Our Health Department's activities include measles immunization, the WIC Program, housing code enforcement, venereal disease control, and the environmental health program.

Housing and Community Development - Community Development's major thrust has been towards assisting neighborhood rehabilitation and to try to bring about new housing. Fully two-thirds of our federal grant is devoted to programs to further these goals. Targeted neighborhoods are located on the West Side and the South End. Private sector cooperation from the banks and corporations have also become involved and committed to help provide housing. Stamford's problem in constructing private housing is part of a national problem all across our country. It is a serious problem and Community Development has employed a new housing development specialist for the purpose of rushing

MAYOR LOUIS A. CLAPES' ANNUAL MESSAGE (Continued):

some progress in this area. Community Development is also actively involved in a business assistance program designed to establish a small business resource center. This effort should assist our employment base and keep our small business space healthy. This, together with the recently formed Downtown Council, will do a lot to take advantage of the Urban Renewal. The Urban Renewal Commission anticipates that they can still complete Blocks 8 and 9 within their allotted funds other than that needed to construct a 300 car service parking lot in Block 9.

The opening of the Town Center Mall was the highlight and accomplishment of the year. The linkage of Saks to Veterans Park will integrate the new downtown mall with the existing downtown merchants and cannot have been provided without the cooperation of your Board.

Parks and Recreation - The completion of the West Beach Pavillion was the highlight of the year. Also continued this year were downtown plantings in conjunction with the Garden Club in re-planting of the Kiwanis Park. There is a full program of year-round recreational activities located in the many areas of our City as you all know. These programs support the youth, serve the youth, the elderly, the retarded and the handicapped. Athletic programs are especially popular with over 10,000 people participating in softball and baseball alone.

The Welfare Department after a lengthy search hired a new Welfare Director, Paul J. DeFino was appointed in March. Changes are now underway for a re-organization to improve services to the current 128 patients at the Smith House Nursing Care Facility and the current 49 residents at the Smith House Residence. Also underway are the plans of converting Willard School into 48 congregate housing units. The Welfare Department's expenditures increased for the second consecutive year with about half of that increase as a result of the State and Federal policy changes and the other half due to the state of the economy.

To conclude this report, I would say that we have been moving forward to solve our problems in an efficient and professional way. We still have a long way to go in the area of dealing with our solid waste, coping with the problems of rapid growth, and a search of new sources of revenue and new methods of productivity to attack the problems of inflation and the burden of tax increases. We can't hope to solve these problems unless we work together for the benefit of the entire community and look at the long range as well as the immediate future. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

PAGES: Miss Krista Stork, 3rd Grade, Newfield School (daughter of Rep. Stork)  
Miss Gina Amy Kliger, 4th Grade, Bi-Cultural Day School

MOMENT OF SILENCE:

For the late ATTILIO DeLUCA, brother of Rep. Gabe DeLuca, who passed away suddenly - submitted by Rep. Gaipa.

RECESS

Requested by Rep. John J. Boccuzzi. Lasted from 9:00 to 10:00 P.M.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne Lois Santy

Motion made to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report. Seconded. Approved Unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, June 28, 1982, having been called for 7:00 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order at 7:10 P.M. Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy declared a QUORUM present and called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman	Paul Dziezyc
Barbara McInerney, Republican Leader	Audrey Maihock
John J. Boccuzzi, Democratic Leader	John Roos
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Asst. Rep. Ldr.	Donald Donahue
Mary Jane Signore	Sandra Goldstein
Marie Hawe	Gerald Rybnick
Philip Stork (7:40 P.M.)	James Dudley
Bobbie Owens (7:35 P.M.)	John Zelinski
Lathon Wider, Sr.	Handy Dixon
Walter Gaipa	James Bonner
John J. Hogan, Jr.	Advocate (Costello)

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the names of John Wiltrakis, George Cohen, Kim Williams, Georgina White, E. Beatty Raymond, Meredith Leitch, and Patrick Tatano. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE FOR NEXT MONTH were Richard A. Hermann, Patricia McCabe Wilson, Michael P. Minotti, and Francis M. Ferguson.

(2) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE ITEM was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being request for re-paving of Derwen St., Rutz St., Glen Ave. and DeLeo Dr. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were five items submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding awaiting text for proposed ordinances. Removed from the agenda was an item referring to condominium owners' compensation in lieu of garbage collection as that item appears on L&R.; same thing applied to an item related to the

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (Continued):

(2) PUBLIC WORKS (continued)

Annual Pick-up of Household & Yard Debris, which is to be in L&R Committee only.

(3) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the 27 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(4) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the last four items on the Tentative Agenda, all being requests to hang banners, hold a parade, erect a gospel tent, etc. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was Rep. Stork's problem with the Scalzi Park Softball fields after a heavy rainfall, but was put on the committee meeting notice for discussion. ORDERED removed from the agenda was the matter of poor lighting at Scalzi tennis courts. Ordered removed, to be resubmitted in January, 1983 by Rep. DeLuca and/or the tennis players was the matter of seasonal permits for tennis players. One item was ordered to be referred to the Board of Education, being request for a carnival to be held at Westhill High School to raise funds for Stamford Boys' Club.

(5) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were six items: (a) proposed new noise ordinance; (b) satellite transmission facilities; (c) burglar and fire alarm connections; (d) control of pigeons; (e) rock-crushing plant on Camp Avenue; (f) "Lifeline". ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were seven items: (i) public facilities for the handicapped; (ii) permits for hairdressing and cosmetology establishments; (iii) emergency medical services to institute advanced life support in City; (iv) fire alarm system in the Municipal Office Building; (v) drug paraphernalia's availability to minors in City; (vi) rooming houses that are not protected with fire escapes and fire alarms; (vii) the matter of The Pleasure Nook (added to the Tentative Steering Agenda at the meeting).

(6) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were six items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda: (a) Code of Ordinances amendment to Sec. 6-17(3), a technical change; (b) Amending Ord. #474 re leashing of dogs; (c) sanitary sewer easement/conveyance between Buccieri and City; (d) Amending Ord. #449 Tax Relief for the Elderly; (e) tax credit for refuse collection to owners or residential units in multiple unit residential complexes; (f) amending Ord. #429 over-night parking on trucks on residential streets. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were three items: (i) resubmission of proposed traffic and parking regulations; (ii) amendment of Section 8-18 Annual Pick-up of Household and Yard Debris; (iii) Restriction and control of availability of undesirable, pornographic material to minor children. ORDERED TRANSFERRED TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (with L&R as secondary committee) were the last five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being those proposed ordinance submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding, and are awaiting text to be provided.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (Continued):

(7) PERSONNEL ITEMS

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

(8) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the Acceptance as City Streets of Huckleberry Hollow, Frost Pond Road, and Aspen Lane; also Planning Board Referral MP-254 Thomas Lyman, Jr.; and 2 resolutions relating to the abandonment of a road section, and acceptance of transfer from URC to the City (which resolutions appeared under Public Housing Committee originally on Tentative Agenda). Held until other Boards implement the procedure for the sale of City-owned property.

(9) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of unenforced parking restrictions.

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were the items relating to personnel policies of SCDP and auditing policy and the Board of Finance. The other two items were transferred to Planning and Zoning, being resolutions pertaining to abandonment and transfer of properties.

(11) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the resolution re sale of land in S.E. Quadrant.

(12) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

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

(13) CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the resolution to initiate a Charter Revision Commission.

(14) HOUSE COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA were the two items relating to the computerized voting equipment problems.

(15) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first four items on the Tentative Agenda, and HELD was Rep. McInerney's request for support of State Dept.'s position working for cease-fire in international hostilities (text to be provided).

(16) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA was Rep. Tarzia's 6/23/82 letter regarding maligning statement made by NAACP re fiscal boards on budget deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

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

HMM:MS

---

APPOINTMENTS - Co-Chairpersons Handy Dixon and Mary Jane Signore

MRS. SIGNORE: The Appointments Committee met Thursday, July 8, in the Democratic Caucus Room. In attendance were Mr. Dixon, Mrs. Perillo, Mr. Conti, Ms. Summerville, Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. DeLuca and Mrs. Signore.

I would like to Move on the Consent Agenda, under Appointments, item #2, George Cohen, Stamford Golf Authority; item #4, Dr. Georgina White for Parks Commission; item #5, Mrs. Beatty Raymond, Transit District.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mrs. Signore, it has been requested to take that off Consent.

MRS. SIGNORE: Are you talking about Mrs. Raymond, item #5?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #6, Mr. Meredith Leitch for the Sewer Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Signore, there has been a Motion to take that off the Consent.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #7, Mr. Patrick Tatano for Environmental Protection Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore. Now on the Consent, we'll have item 2, item 4, and item 7.

MRS. SIGNORE: 2, 4, and 7; that's right, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Continue with your Report.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item 1 and item 3, that's Mr. Wiltrakis and Mr. Williams were Held in Committee. Neither one could attend the Appointments Committee meeting.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

		<u>Term Expires</u>
(1) <u>JOHN WILTRAKIS</u> (R)	Re-Appointment	December 1, 1984
8 Westcott Road		
Held in Committee 6/7/82		

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

STAMFORD GOLF AUTHORITY

(2) <u>GEORGE COHEN</u> (R)	Replacing Leo Belsito	January 1, 1985
293 Club Road	whose term expired	
Returned to Committee		
6/7/82		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA; with Abstentions from A. & M Perillo, B. Conti, Guroian; and M. Wiederlight Not Voting.

HEALTH COMMISSION

(3) <u>MR. KIM WILLIAMS</u> (R)	Re-Appointment	December 1, 1984
310 Roxbury Road		
Held in Committee 6/7/82		

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)PARKS COMMISSION

- (4) DR. GEORGINA WHITE (R) Replacing J. Calka December 1, 1984  
66 Auldwood Road  
Held in Committee  
6/7/82

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA: with B. McInerney abstaining, and  
W.D. White Not Voting.

TRANSIT DISTRICT

- (5) MS. E. BEATTY RAYMOND (R) Re-Appointment December 1, 1985  
74 Eden Road  
Held in Committee 6/7/82

MRS. SIGNORE: Mrs. Beatty Raymond is a re-appointment to the Transit District. She has lived in Stamford for a number of years and is actively involved professionally in transit in the City of Bridgeport. The Committee was impressed with her knowledge of the Transit District and her plans and aspirations for the functioning and greater involvement of the Transit District in the City of Stamford. She also mentioned that the Transit District is often thought of as just being concerned with traffic within the City. She felt that a lot of people felt that the Transit District was just concerned with vehicular traffic within the City and she talked about its involvement with the Bus system, the Railroad system and the greater traffic in general. The Committee voted in favor of Mrs. Raymond with 2 abstentions.

MRS. SANTY: May I have the Committee vote, Mrs. Signore?

MRS. SIGNORE: The Committee voted 5 yes and 2 abstentions.

MRS. SANTY: Your Moving for her approval?

MRS. SIGNORE: Yes, I am.

MRS. SANTY: Is there a Second to Mrs. Raymond? **SECONDED.**

MR. BLUM: One of her duties on the Transit District is the routing of busses. Now, the routes of the busses were extended into North Stamford and there were some more busses that were coming in and out through the Railroad Station. But one of the biggest complaints that I received from some of the elderly people who do get on the busses, is some of the connections and the time span. You miss the bus every so often because by the time your bus comes from wherever it does to the square, you have lost, or that other bus you were supposed to get, has gone already. I ask through you to Mrs. Signore, were some of the questions asked of Mrs. Raymond in her duties regarding the routing of busses so as people can make the connections?

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI: The Transit Authority of the City of Stamford has no control over the busses. We do not own the bus company as Bridgeport and some of the other towns that have a Transit Authority that run the bus lines themselves. We do not run the bus lines.

MR. BLUM: I have to make a correction. They have some control in regards to making requests to the Transit District insofar as the routing is concerned. That's part of their duties.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would suggest that you contact the Transit District with your questions, but right now we're going to move on the appointment of Mrs. Raymond to the Transit District.

APPROVED with 22 Yes; 3 No; 2 Abstentions; 5 N.V.

SEWER COMMISSION

(6) MR. MEREDITH LEITCH(D) Re-Appointment December 1, 1983  
110 Skymeadow Drive  
Held in Committee 6/7/82

MRS. SIGNORE: The Committee was impressed with his knowledge of the Sewer Commission, his enthusiams for the projects that are currently being undertaken by the Sewer Commission, and the Committee moved for his adoption, 7 in favor and none opposed. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask the Committee Chairman, what Mr. Leitch's record of attendance is on the Sewer Committee meetings?

MRS. SIGNORE: That was not asked, Mrs. Conti. I don't know.

MRS. McINERNEY: The Committee didn't inquire as to his attendance on the Committee meetings? Is that a question that is normally asked of all the re-appointed people?

MRS. SIGNORE: No, it is not, unless someone alerts us to the fact that there may be problem with attendance, then we do ask.

MRS. McINERNEY: There was great discussion in our Caucus earlier this evening, and it was brought to the attention of the members of the Republican Caucus that a member of the Board of Representatives had attended several meetings of the Sewer Committée and the absence of Mr. Leitch was visible at that time; and I feel that based on the items that were brought before the Caucus, I would like to make a Motion to hold this item until we can ascertain a record of attendance for Mr. Leitch. SECONDED.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm not sure if we're not doing what we normally do and that is, obtain this information. If it's a requirement that there's "X" amount of meetings that different people should attend, then I would think that some of this should be spelled out in advance, and for us to hold this for the sake of asking questions about something that we have failed to ask other people; are we being fair? I would like to know why would this individual be singled out for this kind of questioning? If it is because a particular person didn't see them at a given time, I'm not sure if we're being totally fair to take that kind of a position. I would like Mrs. McInerney to explain further her intent.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Livingston, it was mentioned that one of our members had attended six meetings of the Sewer Committee and the absence was for all six of those meetings; and it seems a sizeable number to have missed, and we were concerned as to his attendance. We realized that the man was enthusiastic to the Committee, but we thought that that was a sizeable number of meetings to miss.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'm speaking only as a committee person who served on the Department's Committee two terms. I would think it would be incumbent upon the Mayor to not re-appoint anybody with the questions that you have. When it gets down to the Appointment Committee, I don't think it's our job to go out and search as to the attendance of a person that's before us. It's the qualification of a person that we're dealing with, and I would think that the Mayor would not re-appoint someone if that was the type of a question that a person on this Board would ask.

MR. ZELINSKI: First of all, I would hope that this would not be Returned to Committee. I am concerned that this particular individual, for whatever reasons they may be, seems to have been singled out for a reason because of some attendance. We don't know the reasons for it as far as illness or out-of-town on business, and it just leaves a question which I don't think is fair to the individual; and I think if we hold this up, it's going to be a reflection on an individual. Further, I would strongly suggest to the Co-Chairpersons of the Appointments Committee that this question be asked starting next month of all the candidates who are coming for appointment for boards and commissions because it is incumbent upon we members of the Board here that cannot attend the Appointments Committee meeting and would like to know the attendance as well as the enthusiasm and why they want to serve. I think it's an important question, but I don't think tonight we should start with this individual; and I would sincerely hope that we would not keep this in Committee.

(End of tape; some dialogue lost)

MR. BLUM: Through you to Mr. Livingston, I do feel that we do have in voting, these commissioners, they have some responsibility to the public to at least attend a certain amount of meetings.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I don't think that this question singles out any one particular person although it has come up concerning this particular appointment. Since this question has come up concerning attendance, it seems to me that returning him to Committee and answering the question would certainly clear his name; and therefore we should do that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you to either Mrs. McInerney or the person who attended six meetings, how many meetings did Mr. Leitch attend? I assume he had a 3-year term and he has worked 1 year longer than he's supposed to. He lost 6 meetings in four years; I assume they met 1 or 2 times a month. So if he missed 6 in four years, that's pretty good attendance. To single him out because he missed 6 all the time that he has been a member of that Sewer Commission, it seems to me that that's no reason for sending him back to Committee. If he wasn't doing his job, or he wasn't a valuable member of the Committee, we shouldn't appoint him. But he is a valuable member of that Committee; and I believe that for the amount of time that he's been on the Sewer Commission; if six Committee meetings is all he missed, I don't think that's too bad a ratio.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: I think I'll respond to the previous statements that were made first-hand; that is, we don't know how many meetings he missed. As far as we know, he may have missed at least six; we don't know how many. So that's not a consideration; assuming that he missed more than 6 meetings, then that would be a consideration. However, I would like to also endorse what Representative Blum said about the fact that the Appointments Committee in the future should ask the very first question about their attendance at meetings. I don't think, since this is a re-appointment, that delaying it one month means anything to the person because he's going to be serving on it anyway. It will delay nothing; however, I will qualify everything I've said by saying I accept Rep. Perillo's statement about her knowledge of his participation in the Sewer Commission. Based on what she said, I would vote not to put it back in Committee but consider his name now.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have a few questions directed through you to Representative McInerney. First question simply being, who attended the six meetings in a row or six meetings of the Sewer Commission?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wiederlight, that question does not have to be answered unless the person wants to mention that.

MRS. McINERNEY: If the person wanted to identify themselves, I think they have ample opportunity to do so now.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to state for the record that in the 16th Board of Representatives, I was the Chairman of the now-defunct Sewer Committee of the Board of Representatives, and for the record there were not too many people attending the Sewer Commission meetings because of, let's say, a lack of interest. At every meeting that I attended of the Sewer Commission, because I was the Chairman of the Sewer Committee, Mr. Leitch was there. Apparently, this is heresy evidence since it is not substantiated that Mr. Leitch missed six meetings. No one is willing to come forth and say 'I was at a meeting on such-and-such-a-date and such-and-such-a-date and Mr. Leitch was not there'. I, therefore, submit to you that in any court of law, heresy evidence is not admissible; although this is not a court of law, I think we should respect that principle, and I think we should not return his name to Committee. We should appoint him tonight since he has served with honor and dignity and intelligence on the Sewer Commission in the past.

MR. DIXON: I would agree with Ms. Summerville, first of all, in stating that it is the Mayor's first...I mean, the responsibility first lies with the Mayor to ascertain whether or not a person has a good attendance record. He does make the appointment; we either deny or confirm. We cover a very wide range in terms of time and questions; we don't have any special list of questions that we ask. The questions that we do ask are all relative to the position that the person has been appointed to. We spend anywhere from 30 minutes to 45 minutes and sometimes an hour with an individual. I think it is incumbent on any member of the Board of Representatives to notify the members of the Appointments Committee or request of the Appointments Committee to ask certain questions if they have knowledge in any given area that they think we perhaps might have overlooked. I don't think they should wait till the matter gets before the Board and then raise it. I don't think it would be a wise thing to do, to hold this in Committee. It would serve no purpose at all.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (Continued)

We would only come back to you, perhaps next week, and say well, yes, he missed six meetings or he didn't miss any. I don't think that has anything to do with the fact that he should be re-appointed tonight, and I think we should move on to that line of business.

MR. PERILLO: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move the question whether to return Mr. Leitch to Committee.

MR. LEITCH is not RETURNED TO COMMITTEE. 13 Yes; 19 No; 8 Non-Votes.

We are now going to move on the confirmation of Mr. Leitch to the Sewer Commission.

APPROVED: 26 Yes; 3 No; 3 Abstentions; 8 Non-Votes.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARDTerm Expires

(7) <u>MR. PATRICK TATANO (R)</u>	Replacing Anne Boden	December 1, 1984
71 Van Buskirk Ave.	whose term expired	

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. SIGNORE MOVED THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES TO BRING UP A NAME FOR PERSONNEL COMMISSION WAS DEFEATED. 10 yes, 17 no, 1 abstention and 4 not voting.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Alfred Perillo and Burtis Flounders

(1) REQUEST FOR RE-PAVING OF DERWEN STREET, RUTZ ST., GLEN AVE., DeLEO DRIVE.  
Submitted by 15th Dist. Rep. Paul Dziezyc. Situation critical for these residents.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. PERILLO: Although Public Works Committee did not meet on what's on the Agenda for them tonight, I would like to make a couple of comments to that issue. To begin with, as Mr. Paul Dziezyc requests a letter of transmittal, "he has been after this project for some 3 years." I didn't believe Public Works could have ever resolved it in less than two weeks. Secondly, the project has been around for some 8 years, not 3 years, because I've been around that long myself. We've had changes in administrations, changes in Public Works Commissioners; and anytime that this happens, the issue gets buried deeper. On such streets that Mr. Dziezyc is asking for re-paving, they have a severe drainage problem; and to re-pave before repairing is a total loss. Unless monies are available to correct the drainage condition on these streets, Public Works Committee can't do anything more with this item. Therefore, I move this item out of Public Works Committee.

MR. DZIEZYC: These streets have not been paved, at least some of them, for twenty years. There are many streets that have been paved two or three times. They've been patching and they've been spending more money on those roads patching the potholes. There are only drainage problems at one end where it's soft. If they paved the whole thing, they would be saving the City money and they would be relieving the problems in my District.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: I can attest to the fact that these streets are in deplorable condition since I go there several times a week. I think since that drainage problem has not been corrected all these years, we have no assurance that it's going to be corrected in the near future. As Mr. Dziezyc stated, the drainage problem does not exist everywhere in this area, only in a small portion of this area. I don't see why the more than a large majority of those people have to suffer year after year; the cracks, the holes, the potholes, the ruts, and it's appropriately called Rutz Street, year after year, waiting on a project which never seems to materialize. I think that at least they are entitled, the ones that do not have a drainage problem, to better driving conditions than those existing on those streets. Those streets are probably amongst the worst, maybe they are the worst, conditions in the whole City; and I would urge the Public Works Commission to see that these streets are paved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Perillo, did your Committee make a recommendation on this item?

MR. PERILLO: I just did some research on my own. The Committee didn't meet at all on this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: In essence, this item is still in Committee?

MR. PERILLO: I Move to take it Out of Committee. There's nothing that could be done at this point unless there's monies available to correct the conditions before re-paving. If we're going to re-pave, sure we've patched potholes, and what's happened? They pop out again. So what do we do?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Perillo, would you be willing, because of the comments here tonight, to keep it in Committee and then your Committee meet with the people concerned and then maybe come with a recommendation at our next Board meeting. Would you do that?

MR. PERILLO: Let's go the other route. We'll ask them at this point for \$435,000 to correct that road's condition. We've stayed here till 6:30 in the morning picking up nickels and dimes, now you're talking about half a million bucks, where are we going to get it?

MR. BLAIS: What Motion are we speaking to?

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's no Motion; we're just speaking to Mr. Perillo's report. He did not make a Motion to remove it from Committee. It wasn't seconded if he made a Motion. There's no Motion on the floor, Mr. Blais. We're directing the Public Works Committee report that did not meet, so we're just airing our views; that's all we're doing.

MR. BLAIS: In accordance with the Roberts Rules, in view of the Agenda ahead of us, I think that we should move on with the Agenda.

MR. TARZIA: I will limit my comments. I would just like to add in all due respect to Mr. Perillo, I am quite familiar with those streets. Although they are not in my district, almost on a daily basis I go by there. I do have several friends that live on those streets, and the comments I'd like to make are that they are in very bad shape. In the winter time, it becomes almost a safety hazard for those people. I think that the least the City can do is try to rectify it. I understand we cannot afford close to half a

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (Continued)

million dollars, but to repave those streets after so many years maybe would be the least that we can do at this time.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I can understand everybody's comments. We can keep it in Committee. We can bring Mr. Spaulding in, and I'll use all my influence on him to get it paved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: With those words of wisdom, I suggest we go on to Fiscal Committee.

MR. PERILLO: If I may make one more comment, I have a letter of transmittal from the Commissioner of Public Works. If the Board feels that they wish to pass a Resolution requesting Public Works to pave those four streets, then I suggest out of fairness to all taxpayers and representatives of all districts, that a complete list of streets that you would like to see re-paved throughout the city be generated by the Board and submitted to this office. They should be listed by priority and then we will proceed as long as this year's funding lasts.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Perillo, that is in your Committee. I expect at next month's Board meeting you'll come out bearing in mind this letter.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, July 7. Present were Committee members Betty Conti, Burt Flounders, Joe Franchina, Sandy Goldstein, John Hogan, Co-Chairperson Paul Esposito and myself. I would like to place the following items on the Consent Agenda: Item #1,

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #1 on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #2.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #2 on Consent. Sorry, Mrs. Hawe, item #2 is off Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #3.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #3 is off Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #5.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #5 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #6.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #6 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #10.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #10 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #13.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #13 is on Consent.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: Item #14.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #14 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #15.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #15 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #16.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #16 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #19.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 19 is off Consent, Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. HAWE: Item #21.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 21 is on Consent. Item 21 is off Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #22.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 22 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #23.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 23 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #25.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 25 is on Consent.

MR. BONNER: Which of these items are for expenses that have been already incurred such as the 1982 budget and which are for the new budget, 1983?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, will you give that in your report as you go down by line item?

MRS. HAWE: There's only two that are in the new budget.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you give them when you come to those items, please?

- (1) \$ 7,875.00 - BELLTOWN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 470.4330 - to fund salary increases for paid members in line with City firefighters' contract for period 7/1/81-6/30/82. Board of Finance approved 5/25/82. Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request.

APPROVED ON CONSENT - Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- Recreation*
- (2) \$ 539.40 - ~~BOARD OF EDUCATION~~ - Code 650.2510 MAINTENANCE OF VEHICLES - Additional Appropriation to be reimbursed to department which City has received from Travelers Insurance Co. for repairs to vehicle involved in accident. Board of Finance approved 5/25/82. Per Mayor Clapes' request.

MRS. HAWE: The check has already been received from the Travelers Insurance Company by the Law Department and deposited to the General Fund, in order to get it out of the General Fund to repair these vehicles, we have to appropriate anew. We have a copy of the check.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Is the check for the exact amount we're appropriating?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, the check was for \$539.40. Fiscal Committee vote was 6 in favor and not opposed and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

APPROVED: 29 Yes; -0- No; -0- Abstentions and 3 Non-Votes.

- (3) \$ 706.00 - ZONING BOARD - Code 107.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation required for renewal of labor contract with Zoning Analyst, effective 4/20/82, at annual salary of \$27,000. (up from \$23,540.00) Board of Finance approved 5/25/82. Per Mayor Clapes' request.

MRS. HAWE: This is for a renewal of the contract with the Zoning Analyst. The Zoning Analyst's contract expired on April 20, 1982. The Zoning Board has agreed to renew her contract for another year at the annual salary of \$27,000. Her current annual salary is \$23,540. This appropriation is to cover the amount of time from April until the end of the fiscal year. If we approve this, we will then see an appropriation for this fiscal year next month for the current fiscal year. I might say that when she was hired, her salary was set at \$22,000 which Mr. Levine informed us that at that time that was too low a salary because she far exceeded the minimum qualifications. Also, if she had been earning originally what she should have been earning at that time due to her experience, her salary would have exceeded the Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning who was her superior. The Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning now makes, I believe, \$35,000.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Am I to understand right now, in the new budget, her salary is not in the new budget yet?

MRS. HAWE: Her salary is but not the increase for her new contract. Her current salary is but not the increase.

MR. BOCCUZZI: In other words, her current salary is what?

MRS. HAWE: Her current salary is \$23,540 and her new salary would be \$27,000. If we appropriate this \$706.00 tonight, next month we'll see an appropriation for about \$2,000, a little over \$2,000, to pay her for this fiscal year. This appropriation is just for the period from April, May and June for the last fiscal year. It has to be done in two parts because it covers two fiscal years since her contract is up in April.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE: In the past two years, as Chairman of Planning & Zoning Committee, we've had many occasions to ask the Zoning Board for information and for help in many of the items that have come before us. The Zoning Analyst in question has been a tremendous asset to this Board, and I would remind the Board that that is not something that she has to do. She does it because of her knowledge and her concern for zoning in Stamford. She has been an asset in the comprehensive re-zoning of the City which is currently underway, as we all know it. The person in question, as far as productivity is concerned, never works a 40 hour week. She probably works 60 hours or more per week on an average to try to get all the work that must be done in a short period of time accomplished. She is knowledgeable, she is talented, she is deserving of more than what the City has currently allotted to pay her. I think this should be approved; I believe that when looking at employees who do produce very well for the city and show a definite concern for this City, we shouldn't ask them to work for less than is appropriate. This is the question here. The time that she has spent, as far as the Committee is concerned, has been well worth it to this Board and to the Zoning Board. So I would urge that we accept this this evening.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion to Move the Question has passed; 22 yes, 9 no, 1 not-voting

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to vote.

MOTION DEFEATED: 19 Yes; 9 No; 2 Abstentions; 2 Non-Votes.

- (4) \$ 25,000.00 - DATA PROCESSING DEPARTMENT - Code 245.5160 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTER SERVICES - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request. Board of Finance approved 5/25/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) \$ 78,000.00 - EMPLOYEE TAXES AND INSURANCE - Code 290.1320 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request. Approved by Board of Finance 5/25/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH SUMMERVILLE ABSTAINING.

- (6) \$247,252.00 - DEBT SERVICE - Code 900.8210 CITY-BONDS-INTEREST - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Louis A. Clapes. Board of Finance approved 5/25/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (7) \$ 2,500.00 - NON-CITY SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES - INFO-LINE OF SOUTH-WESTERN CONNECTICUT - Code 540.4406 Infoline of South-Western Connecticut - Additional Appropriation requested.

For 1982/83 fiscal year-to be charged to 1981/82 Operating Budget.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 3 in favor and 3 opposed, which is a negative recommendation, but for clarity, I will make a Motion to approve it. Infoline is an information referral service serving Greenwich through Stratford. They also do crisis intervention and serve as the 24-hour availability line for other agencies. Federal funds have been cut back and their after-hours round-the-clock service is in jeopardy. They have received additional support from United Way and they have been trying to get the various towns to contribute. Norwalk and Westport have done so thus far.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to speak favorably for this appropriation. I think it is a worthwhile appropriation. I think that if we're going to appropriate any sums of money to help the citizens in our community, this would be a worthwhile one and I am in favor of it.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you to the Co-Chairperson of Fiscal, Rep. Hawe, can you tell me how many cities or towns are being serviced by this particular Infoline, please?

MRS. HAWE: 14.

MR. ZELINSKI: Of the 14 cities and towns that are being serviced by this Infoline, how many have contributed any financial remuneration?

MRS. HAWE: 2 have so far, Norwalk and Westport, but I think they are in the process of trying to get it from the other towns. I don't think that that necessarily means that the other 12 have turned them down, but that's all that have come through so far, Norwalk and Westport.

MR. ZELINSKI: How long has this Infoline been in existence, Rep. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: Several years, at least. I don't know exactly, but it has been around.

MR. ZELINSKI: But up to this point, the only two towns are Westport and Norwalk that have contributed funds that you know of?

MRS. HAWE: No, up to now they got a lot of their money from the Federal Government; and with the cutbacks now, they got additional support from United Way and now they are making a push to get funds from the various towns to supplement the Federal funds which have been cut back.

MR. ZELINSKI: Is this a member of the United Way also?

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Oh, so they get funds still from United Way. Thank you.

MR. DUDLEY: I would just like to speak in favor of this. I've had an occasion to visit the facility, one of the facilities, which is located in Norwalk. I think they provide a valuable service; they provide many services and for someone who does not know where to turn to, all they would have to do is call the phone number or go down to the Infoline and they would put them in the proper area. In some cases where people are in distress, they don't know where to turn to; they can put them in touch with the proper agencies, and I think this is a very valuable service. I think we should appropriate this money.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Which budget does this come out of? '81-82 or '82-83?

MRS. HAWE: This comes out of the '81-82.

MRS. GERSHMAN: May I ask why the Committee voted against it?

MRS. HAWE: I can speak for myself because I voted against it and then perhaps the other members would like to speak. I felt that in this time of budgetary constraints that this is something new that we haven't funded before and we should not take on anything new at this time worthwhile though the agency might be. I didn't think we should set a precedent because surely then we would be asked to contribute in the future, and it's very hard to cut funding from something that you've already given money to. That was my reasoning; perhaps some of the other members of the Committee, the other two, would like to speak too.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mrs. Hawe, just a point of information. \$45,000 for 14 towns, is that correct? To date, we have \$16,000 in After-Hours funds from the Connecticut Department of Mental Health. Do we assume that we deduct \$16,000 from \$45,000 and that's what they're looking for?

MRS. HAWE: They're looking for \$2,500 from us.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If the service costs \$45,000, and they're getting \$16,000 from Connecticut Department of Mental Health, so they're looking for the difference.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, they're looking for the difference for their After-Hours service.

MR. BOCCUZZI: From 14 towns.

MRS. HAWE: That's correct. But let me just point this out...their total budget is \$210,000.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI: What I'm trying to find out is \$25,000 the assessment from every town that they service?

MRS. HAWE: Oh, you mean, is it an equal assessment for all the towns? I really don't know that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: We feel justified in asking the City of Stamford for \$25,000 but it doesn't say what they're asking Norwalk, Darien, New Canaan or anybody else. Sorry, \$2,500. What I'm trying to find out, when we have a service in Stamford that these other cities use, nobody helps us foot the bill. Now they're assessing us for \$2,500; if you multiply that by 24, it comes out to more than \$45,000, more than the difference of \$29,000 because they're already getting \$16,000.

MRS. HAWE: I don't know whether they're asking each of the 14 towns for the same amount or asking us for more because we're a bigger town. I don't know the answer to that.

MRS. CONTI: I too will answer the question that was raised on the floor as to why there were voted against it in Committee. I agree with Mrs. Hawe's reasoning. I too voted against it. In this time of federal and state constraints and cutbacks in funding from other sources, we are going to have a number of requests like this; and if we set the precedent of passing this, we will have all sorts of other social service requests from other groups whose funding has been cut back. I'm not saying that these people do not do a commendable service. However, we just cannot load this onto the local taxpayers and I voted No.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we are going to proceed to a Vote. We are voting on the Motion to approve \$2,500.00 Non-City Social Service Agencies, Infoline of Southwestern Connecticut, bearing in mind that Fiscal came out with an unfavorable vote, 3-3, but the Motion is to approve.

APPROPRIATION DEFEATED: 19 No; 6 Yes; 4 Abstentions; 3 Non-Votes.  
(Blais changed to Yes)

(Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE)

- (8) \$ 10,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING TO PROJECT IN SAID BUDGET, KNOWN AS "REPLACEMENT AND NEW VEHICLES #280.0626" to replace van destroyed by fire, to be financed by TAXATION, per Mayor Clapes' request. Approved by Board of Finance 5/25/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: This is to replace a parking revenue collecting vehicle which was destroyed by fire. The car was 8 years old and the replacement was requested in the Department's budget this year; however, it was cut by the Board of Finance. Now, however, since the fire, there is no van and the Department's ability to make collections from the parking meters is greatly hampered. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed, and I so Move. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The Transportation Committee did take a vote. Both Mrs. Goldstein and I were at this meeting of the Fiscal Committee and we did take a vote. We were favorable.

MR. STORK: I must ask, what happened to insurance money for the vehicle?

MRS. HAWE: We're self-insured.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman, to Mrs. Hawe, was the fire before the Board of Finance' decision or after?

MRS. HAWE: It was after.

MR. BLUM: My question was answered in regard to insurance.

MR. ZELINSKI: That was one of my questions pertaining to the insurance. Will this new vehicle also be self-insured?

MRS. HAWE: It will unless someone else hits it, then we would get money from them. But the City is self-insured for these things.

MR. ZELINSKI: I guess I'm a little confused at this point because I know we have created that Department of Risk Management pertaining to all forms of insurance, and I'm just surprised that some of the City's vehicles such as this are self-insured. Then when something does happen, it seems that the taxpayers have to foot the bill. Certainly, we have no choice, I guess. If there's no vehicle that this thing was replacing...What was this vehicle used for?

MRS. HAWE: To pick up the money from the parking meters.

MR. ZELINSKI: \$10,000 for a van to pick up money from parking meters? That seems like a lot of money to pick up nickels and dimes. Couldn't they use a smaller vehicle like a...It just brings out a point. Why does the Traffic Department have to spend that kind of money on a vehicle to pick up money for that when I would think any type of a vehicle, even possibly a used vehicle, rather than having to spend \$10,000 for that, unless it's going to be used for something other than that. Could Rep. Hawe clarify that, please?

MRS. HAWE: I just would say that when you're picking up several thousand dollars from parking meters and driving around with it in the back of a car, you can't do it on a motorcycle. Can I speak to the question about the insurance?

DEFEATED with 15 Yes; 14 No; 1 Abstention; 2 Non-Votes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (9) \$300,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING THERETO A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #280.0239 COMPUTER SIGNAL SYSTEM; to be financed by TRANSFER of \$300,000 from Account known as #280.0658 STATE-ASSISTED PROJECT. Per Mayor's request. Approved by Board of Finance 5/25/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: The money has already been bonded and the money is in that account. A feasibility study has been completed on this project to date. This money is only for the design of the project, not for the construction. The projected construction cost is \$4.8 million which at the time that that is requested, we decide on whether to spend that or not. Mr. Ford has said that he believes that there may be a possibility of State funds available for construction. He said that the State is considering a payment in lieu of a program which would mean that large developers and large generators of traffic in a municipality would have to pay a certain amount of money into a State fund and that money would be then disbursed back to the municipality to help with traffic related problems. This is a possibility in the future which we would consider at the time the construction costs come up for appropriation. The design phase of this would take one year, and the first phase of construction an additional year. I sent a map to each one of you showing the different phases of construction. There are 3 phases, and that map points out which lights would be completed in each phase.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Since there has been a great deal of discussion prior to the meeting and there are quite a few questions that I think should be answered, rather than jeopardize the amount, I would like to Move the \$300,000.00 back into Committee.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion to move the question has been defeated. 19 yes, 10 no, 3 not-voting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you to Rep. Hawe, you had mentioned that this money had been approved...

MRS. HAWE: Point of Order. Isn't the Motion to return it to Committee? Moving the question was defeated.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now discussing returning it to committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would hope that this is not returned to ommittee. I think this is an important matter. I think that people feel very strongly about this, and I think that holding it up one month is not going to make a difference. It either should be voted up or down tonight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I think we should send this matter back to Committee because obviously we're really voting not just only on a \$300,000 transfer, but we're also going to be voting on whether or not, in essence, we feel we should appropriate the four million or so to put this program into effect, inasmuch as it makes little sense to appropriate \$300,000 and then not to appropriate the four million dollars, which we're going to need. I think

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (Continuing)

further study by all the members of the Board is necessary. The map that we got on our desk tonight surely does not tell us the full story, does not give us all the implications and what have you. Therefore, we should make a sound judgement when we vote. I don't think I am personally equipped at this time with all the facts and all the knowledge to vote intelligently on this matter. As much as I say we're not just voting on the \$300,000, we're voting on the entire project in essence. Therefore, it should go back to Committee; it was a wise motion to make to send it back to Committee.

MRS. MAIHOCK: This appropriation is very urgently needed to facilitate important traffic improvements in our city. It should not be put back in Committee.

MR. DONAHUE: While I support this transfer, I think there are some questions that have been raised that should be answered; and I believe that while on one hand we are talking about a potential of spending 4-4½ million dollars over a period of time and a potential, strong as I understand it, strong potential, for Federal and State assistance during that period of time; on the other hand, I think we should also remember that \$143,000 has already been committed to this program and spent over a period of time. I know in the course of a 2-year period, that everytime we talked about computer signalization and the eventual completion of the same, we were told that they would ask for a sum of money, they would ask for another sum of money, and they wouldn't ask for the money for the study for the computer until it was absolutely necessary. We've reached that time. Because of the issues that have been raised and because of the confusion that people seem to be laboring under, I think it should be sent back to Committee.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a point of information through you to Mrs. Hawe. This was in a State-assisted project. This account has now been closed out?

MRS. HAWE: No, the money is in that account. Last fiscal year, the money was appropriated to this State-assisted account, the \$300,000 for this purpose, for computer signalization. However, also under the revenue column was projected \$300,000 to be gotten from the State, well, actually from the Federal government through the State; however, now those funds are no longer available so this money is being transferred from that account since it's no longer a project that money from the State is going to be gotten for it. It's going to be transferred into this other account. The money has been bonded already. The money is there in the account.

MRS. GERSHMAN: In other words, this is for the same project, it was our contribution to this project. Is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: No, it wasn't matching funds; it was money that was coming from the Federal government. At the time a year ago May when we approved it in the budget, we were under the impression because on the revenue side of the ledger, it said \$300,000 is coming back to us; however, that is no longer true. For that reason the money is being transferred from that project which is called State Assisted Project which was for this very thing, the computerization. We're transferring into this other account.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN: That was money that we had appropriated, right?

MRS. HAWE: Correct. We had appropriated it with the understanding that we would be getting it back though. This wasn't our share of it or anything like that.

MRS. GUROIAN: Several references have been made to the fact that several questions have been raised. I haven't heard one question raised yet. The Motion to put it back into Committee came before any questions were raised, so I would like to first hear what the questions are that were raised before I vote to send it back into Committee. As it stands now, I don't know what the questions are that have been raised. Everybody else seems to know but I don't know.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Basically, Madam President, to Mrs. Guroian through you, as I said, my reason for putting it back into Committee is because, in essence, we're going to be voting for a \$4.5 million appropriation, not just a \$300,000 appropriation. I don't have all the facts, I have no facts on the \$4.5 million, personally. I don't know what it entails. Are we going to hire more people?

MRS. GUROIAN: It seems to me you should be asking the questions on the main Motion before you decide that the questions can't be answered. I don't know if the Chairman can answer those questions or not, do you?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to vote on whether to return Item #9 back to the Fiscal Committee.

RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: 19 Yes; 11 No; -0- Abstentions; 2 Non-Votes.

MRS. McINERNEY: As a Point of Information, I would like to suggest to the Chairperson of Fiscal, that any information that Fiscal received in reference to this \$300,000 or the possibility of the commitment of \$4.8 million, if she would make copies again of all of those items and have them available to all the members of this Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would also recommend Board members to go to Fiscal and maybe you can find out this information.

MRS. GUROIAN: I would also like to make certain that it is a transfer and those require 21 votes according to transfer; or if it is not a transfer, what number of votes would it require?

PRESIDENT SANTY: As it is now, 21 are required either way because there are only 31 members present. But maybe at next month's meeting, I will ask for that ruling.

- (10) \$ 29,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY - Code 520.1201 OVERTIME - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes. Approved by Board of Finance 5/25/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (11) \$ 12,815.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - GROUP 41.1110 SALARIES - 1982/83 Budget  
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes' 6/1/82.  
Board of Finance approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to Personnel Committee

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed and I so Move. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Personnel Committee, may I have their report?

MR. STORK: Madam President, Personnel concurred 4 to 0.

MRS. HAWE: This is one of the items that will be coming out of the 1982/83 budget, the one we're in right now. This is for a Clerk Typist II to process the burglar and fire alarm fees that we have been discussing here on the Board that haven't been billed in the past. Achieving the \$100,000 budget estimate for these revenues is dependent on obtaining this position.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Was this cut out of the budget, or is this something new?

MRS. HAWE: No, it wasn't cut out.

MR. BLUM: Is this a new position?

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MR. BLUM: And it's going against the 1982/83 budget. And the Mayor just said let's have a freeze. Thank you.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion to Move the question has been defeated. We will now continue with debate.

MRS. McINERNEY: I agree with what Mr. Blum has indicated, that it has been publicly indicated that we are possibly faced with a deficit in this year's operating budget; and I feel that if a freeze was extended to all department heads, that this Board would be best served to honor the request of the Mayor and put a freeze on all new people coming into the City employment. I note that on the letter attached requesting this information that this particular item was given to the Board of Finance in 1976, I'm sorry, the Commissioner of Finance, the Finance Department, and that it was that Department that has been remiss in sending out the bills necessary to collect the funding. I feel that the people who met and decided that a new person should be hired made that decision without regard to the fact that we might be operating under a deficit next year; and I think with all of the items that we presently have before us, it would be incumbent for the Finance Department to find somebody within that group that could do this job and avoid hiring this new person at \$12,000 plus whatever the benefits might be yearly.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, recently I read in the paper the Police Department returned \$70,000 to the city or they are returning it. from I think the gasoline account where they saved. Couldn't they get a transfer from this for this position?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, if that was the case, they could; however, I don't know this because we don't handle transfers. What could possibly have happened is that they might have had a savings in the gasoline account but they might have transferred that into other accounts. I don't know because we don't see any transfers. Plus this is setting up a new position.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN: I think that if you read further in Mrs. Cosentini's letter, you will see that this is while perhaps a new position, it is really two part-time positions; and it is being handled by a transfer from an already in-place employee from the Traffic Department. Therefore, while it might be a new position, it is not a new person. We are maintaining someone on the rolls who is already there. We are maintaining a job. Not only that, but the revenue brought in, this was brought out, will be substantial and she is going to do other jobs other than just this. Ms. Gloria Price is the person's name. I think this is something we should support,

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: We have to approve this appropriation inasmuch as, number one, there are many many thousands of dollars that have gone uncollected over at least the past five years through the Finance Commissioner's Office for the fees that are due the City for burglar alarm and fire alarm hook-ups. This is a fact. It's water under the bridge, if you will, about the fact that it has not been collected. We are now in a position to go back and make these collections; that's number one. Number two, there is currently on the Agenda a burglar alarm and a fire alarm ordinance whereby people will be assessed the costs of false alarms. In addition, a new fee schedule will be put out for hook-ups. This person will be charged with the responsibility of sending out these bills and cost fees. It is almost on open-end to how much money we're going to be able to bring in to the City's treasury, if you will, with this appropriation. You're going to have take one step back and appropriate \$12,815 to get a six-figure return on your investment, and I think it's a well-spent investment.

MR. BOCCUZZI: The way I read this letter, this girl is being transferred from the Traffic Department to the Police Department, is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, it is.

MR. BOCCUZZI: In other words, her salary is over the Traffic Department yet?

MRS. HAWE: You're referring to this letter which really isn't very clear. One thing that does appear from this letter that, what I think happened, I think there was a vacancy at the time that the Board of Finance was looking at the budget; and they cut the vacancy.

MR. DONAHUE: When Jim Ford came in during his budget presentation, he felt he could reorganize his Department and that there was room to take, I believe, it was either a \$10,000 or \$15,000 cut in his administrative account. If that was done, he would make two Clerk Typists one Secretary instead so that, I believe, we took that cut and he has reorganized his Department. So that's where the money has gone; the money is no longer in his account for next year. We've already taken it out.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Actually, what we're doing is just transferring an expense from one department to another then. If Mr. Ford gave us permission to take away an account, a certain amount of money, then he takes the same girl and transfers her to the Police Department, we have to put her salary in the Police Department, we didn't save any money by cutting his Department. Taxpayers are still going to have to pay. As far as we hear these remarks, it's water under the bridge, Mr. Wiederlight, I agree. But we have departments who are charged to do certain things in this City. The Finance

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

Department is charged to make sure that these bills are sent out and we collect them. If we go back so many years, 1976, when it was transferred into that Commissioner of Finance's Department, and it says, unfortunately, no billing has been done since then. I can't see how this City is operating with all these departments where we're charged by Charter to do certain things for the City. No wonder why the taxpayers are being hit with big bills. We got outstanding bills out there and no one in the Department is doing anything about collecting them. And the only way they want to collect them is if we add to the payroll. We got to spend money to get money that we should get without spending money if the departments did their work. I don't think that we should put more people on the payroll; I think the Finance Department is charged with this, they should get it done.

MR. GAIPA: First, I would like to answer Mrs. Perillo's question, the \$70,000 that was saved on the Gasoline Account was used to keep 10 additional patrolmen on duty. On the other hand, I would like to direct a question to Mrs. Hawe through the Chair, did anybody appear at Fiscal from the Police Department on this appropriation?

MRS. HAWE: No, no one appeared at Fiscal on this, but the Committee felt that it was something that we wanted to bring out to the Floor because we felt that it was worth the expense to get this \$100,000 projected back this year so we voted 5-1 to approve it.

MRS. CONTI: I was one in Fiscal that did not agree to that. I do agree with Mr. Boccuzzi's remark that everytime this Board points out a deficiency that the Charter is not being complied with, that certain jobs are not being done, we're automatically with a request for an appropriation for somebody to do the job and it's getting very disconcerting. I would like to read from the Minutes of the Finance Board: "Bills outstanding are estimated at \$100,000. Annual Collections..."

PRESIDENT SANTY: What is the date of the Minutes you are reading from?

MRS. CONTI: This is the Board of Finance, June 3, 1982. Annual Collections is estimated at \$22,500 at current rate, and \$52,000 at the proposed rate. The annual cost of the Clerk Typist salary plus fringes at 30% would be \$16,700 prior to the MEA settlement. Although the appropriation before us is for \$12,815, what we're actually appropriating is closer to \$17,000 - \$18,000 with fringe benefits. The way it is presented to us, because it was taken from one department, we must consider it a new position; and either we're going to enforce a freeze on new positions or we are not. I think it's incumbent upon this Board, knowing the mood of the taxpayers, to cut out all new positions.

MR. BONNER: When we have a failure in billing, it's very easy to assume we need more help. I would like to assume that the correction can be made with the group that we have and be confident that it can and not increase the number of people but have the group that's now responsible do the job which they know they should be doing. I would not be in favor of this.

MR. ROOS: As I understand it, we have roughly 200 of these drops. It seems to me that it shouldn't require a full-time person to service these, bill them, and collect, and keep track of them. When we talk about six figures and with the number drops they have there, we'd be up into possibly maybe

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

a thousand dollars per signal. I feel this is a job that should have been done; it should never have been dropped. The Police Department or the Fire Department were in charge of this thing, and why they ever discontinued it, I don't know. It seems to me that somebody should pick up these loose ends, and get this on the road; and I don't think we need extra people to do it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are voting on the approval of \$12,815 Police Department - Salaries.

MOTION DEFEATED: 19 No; 9 Yes; 1 Abstention; 3 Non-Votes.

MRS. McINERNEY: On the letter which was the back-up material to this item, there is a little notation that Commissioner Marra, realizing the potential financial gain to the city, strongly supports the hiring and retention of a Clerk Typist II and has promised to deficit spend if necessary, in order to maintain this position. I would like to suggest to you, Madam President, that you indicate to Mr. Marra that this Board would not look favorably on deficit spending by any City official at this time.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Along with what Mrs. McInerney said, I think we should not forget that although we have not appropriated this \$12,815 to hire somebody to collect this money, this money is still out there. It is still incumbent upon the Finance Commissioner to collect these monies with whatever means he has available at this time. Although we didn't give him the person, he still has to get the money. I think that some follow-up should be made by this Board in some manner to find out what he's going to do to get this money.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wiederlight, you can always submit that item to Steering if you'd like, but I will forward a letter to him in the morning.

(12) \$ 20,000.00 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 105.7554 PLANNING DEPT. COASTAL ENERGY IMPACT (CEI) - (GRANT) Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 6/1/82. Board of Finance approved 6/10/82.  
Above also referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 4 in favor and 2 opposed and I so Move. SECONDED.

MR. DONAHUE: I would yield to Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: Planning and Zoning concurred 4 to 0.

MRS. HAWE: This is the approval of the Grant money for the planning study of the Helco site in the South End. At our November, 1981 meeting, we approved a resolution authorizing a contract for the required consultant services. However, we have never approved the \$20,000 which we are getting from the State grant.

MR. WIDER: I would like to ask my fellow Board members to vote in favor of this. We now have a little information that Helco is doing a great deal of planning for itself in the South End. We need the City to do some planning to see what they can be on top of and prevent from happening. We do not want another Harbor Plaza. Unless we do something in advance, it'll be over us and we'll be looking at another Harbor Plaza in the South End. The citizens down there do not want it, so I ask your support.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we can Move to a vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on the approval of \$20,000 Planning Board, Coastal Energy Impact.

APPROPRIATION APPROVED: 26 Yes; 4 No; -0- Abstentions; 2 Non-Votes.

- (13) \$ 45,286.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE - Code 761. various accounts -  
Additional Appropriation to be allocated to the various  
Title XX Accounts listed in back-up material, per  
Mayor's request 6/1/82. Board of Finance approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (14) \$ 2,580.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655.4160 - MEN'S INDUSTRIAL  
SOFTBALL - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor  
Clapes 5/17/82. Approved by Board of Finance 6/10/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (15) \$ 3,800.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655.4170 - WOMEN'S SOFTBALL.  
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 5/17.  
Board of Finance approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (16) \$ 8,050.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655.4150 SELF-SUSTAINING  
PROGRAMS - MEN'S OPEN SOFTBALL. Additional Appropriation  
requested by Mayor Clapes 5/17/82. Board of Finance  
approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (17) \$ 185,454.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Additional Appropriation requested  
by B.R. Reed, Asst. Supt/Business, dated 5/28/82, to  
cover premiums for Teachers' Health & Hospitalization  
Insurance resulting from Premium Increases. Board of  
Finance approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: Items 17 and 18, if I can discuss these together, are appropriations for the Board of Education.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, you can discuss them but the Motions will be separate.

MRS. HAWE: When the Board of Ed came in last week to our meeting, they indicated to us that they were not sure at that point exactly how much

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

money they would need for these two items. It seems that the Payroll Department, their computer was not able to tell them at that point, exactly how much had been paid out at that last paycheck to the teachers. They were having to do this manually. It was a problem in the payroll department. However, they said they would get back to me; they did today. It appears when the final figures were in, it turns out they do not need either of these monies. Even though we had no committee vote on this because we were Holding this until tonight in order to vote on it when I got the information, and tonight at our Committee meeting, there was not a quorum present. So I have no official Committee report, but may I make a Motion to defeat this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Committee report from EW&G?

MR. GAIPA: Yes, we voted 3 - 0 to Hold it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a Motion to Hold, but we'll go with Mrs. Hawe. You're going to make a Motion to defeat this, to deny this appropriation?

I want to make a special note that Mr. Donahue has left the Meeting and will be absent during these two votes.

There is no Committee report.

MRS. HAWE: Actually, the committee report was to Hold but we were only Holding it until tonight when we could find out. We don't need this money, what's the easiest way just to get...

MR. BOCCUZZI: Since both Committees voted to Hold, and the information now is that they don't need it, I assume someone or they can both make a Motion to Hold and someone can make another Motion to bring it Out of Committee; we get it on the Floor, and we defeat it. I think that process would be the way to do it because they're both saying Hold. I will make a Motion to take it Out of Committee and then I will make a Motion to defeat both appropriations, and then we'll get rid of it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Discussion on Holding the item? No discussion.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I would make a Motion to take both items Out of Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you take one at a time.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I make a Motion that we bring Item #17, \$ 185,454.00 Out of Committee.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Just curious how all of a sudden they don't need the money. Here they're coming in asking for \$185,454.00 and now they don't need the money.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Don't look a gift horse in the mouth.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I think it's an important question.

MRS. HAWE: Can I answer that because I really don't want people to think that the Board of Education went to all this trouble to request this and then at the last minute 'ha,ha they have the money! At the beginning of January, the Board of Education knew that there was going to be a problem

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

with these two accounts. Especially with the Health and Hospitalization Insurance. At that point, they initiated a budget freeze in an effort to have money available in their account without having to ask for an additional appropriation. However, as I explained before, the last payroll, in fact the last two payrolls, that were paid to the employees of the Board of Education, the Board of Ed was not able to ascertain exactly how much had been paid so they were not able to tell how much they had left in their various salary accounts and would be able to use for this. That was the fault of the Payroll Department and the computer there, that it was not able to give them this information, and so this past week, they were manually figuring out how much, going back over the records, had been paid so they could come up with a figure as to how much they would need for these. As it turned out, due to an unexpected drop in the payroll and also a savings in gasoline, they were able to cover these costs and they do not need them at this point.

MR. BLUM: Let's make it short. I'm glad, Mrs. Hawe, that you really believe the Board of Education. But I was there that evening and I did question them. To use the payroll as the fault, are we to believe that the last payroll they did not know that they had a total of close to a half a million dollars, and all of a sudden the last minute, you got a report to the fact that they don't need the money. It sort of makes us feel, how did they really figure their budget? I think in the long run when the Board of Education and some of the people that I hope will be running for the new Board of Education, that one of the things that has to be brought out, there has to be a little good relations, or we have to have a clearer picture of the finances of the Board of Education.

MR. BOCCUZZI: We are discussing an appropriation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are discussing bringing this Out of Committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: We're not discussing the Board of Ed or anyone else. We went through that at budget time. I think it's a waste of time now to start saying now that the Board of Ed should have done this, should have done that. I feel good that they come up with the money, that they found it, and we don't have to appropriate another \$400,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're beyond the point of privilege at this point. We are discussing bringing this Out of Committee.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue has now left the Meeting. There are 30 members present.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now use a machine vote. The Motion is to take this Out of Committee.

Mrs. McInerney has also left the meeting; we're now down to 29 members. They will be recorded as absent during these votes.

MOTION TO TAKE OUT OF COMMITTEE PASSED: 28 Yes; 1 Abstention; 3 Non-Votes.

It is now Out of Committee. Any discussion on #17?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move that we delete the total amount of Item #17 \$185,454.00 from the Board of Ed. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now moving to the machine for a vote to delete the entire amount of #17.

MOTION UPHELD with 26 Yes; -0- No; 2 Abstentions and 4 Non-Votes.

- (18) \$277,445.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Additional Appropriation requested to cover unanticipated Special Education costs related to Public Law 81-432, per 5/26/82 letter from B.R. Reed, Asst. Supt/business.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: We voted 6-0 to Hold this item.

MR. GAIPA: E, W, & G voted 3 - 0 to Hold it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made by Fiscal and concurred with EW&G to Hold Item #18 in committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move to bring Item #18 to the Floor of the Board. I am making a Motion to delete the entire amount.

MRS. GUROIAN: Point of Order. The Motion was made to take a specific item Out of Committee onto the Floor. Without voting on that Motion, another Motion was substituted to delete that. This appropriation was put on the Floor by vote of this Committee even though Fiscal Committee did not propose that. It was put on the Floor. This Motion was put on the Floor, not the Motion that he proposed afterwards.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Guroian, you are Parliamentarian. May I have your Ruling, official Ruling as a Parliamentarian, on this past vote?

MRS. GUROIAN: When a Motion is brought Out of Committee and put on the Floor, then there is a Motion on the Floor. You vote on that Motion before you substitute another Motion for it.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I didn't bring out a Motion. I brought Out an item. When it reached the Floor, I voted to delete that item. I can't see what the problem is.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I agree. Mr. Boccuzzi could have made a Motion to delete \$50,000 of this amount, but he made a Motion to delete the entire amount and I rule that it was a proper order. We are now on item #18 and the Motion is take #18 out of Committee.

MR. LIVINGSTON: If I understand you correctly, you're over-ruling the Parliamentarian?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't know if she made an official Ruling. Did you make an official ruling, Mrs. Guroian?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROLIAN: The Parliamentarian's point of view is the Parliamentarian's point of view. The Chairman can judge it as she deems fit. If you don't agree with the Chairman's ruling, then you ask for a vote, challenge the Chairman's ruling.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum is standing and I recognize you, Mr. Blum.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Wait a minute, I'm not finished, Madam President.

MR. BLUM: I asked for the Floor before you and I wasn't recognized. All of a sudden you jumped in.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Madam President, his remarks are totally uncalled for.

MR. BLUM: Too bad.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and gentlemen, we have another two hours of work on this Agenda. Mr. Livingston is down next to speak. Mr. Livingston, you have the Floor.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Never mind, Madam President, I choose not to have it.

MRS. HAWE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question is whether to take this item Out of Committee. SECONDED. All in favor of taking this Out of Committee say, aye. Opposed? We are now taking item 18 Out of Committee. We are speaking to that Motion.

MR. DZIEZYC: Point of Information, Madam President. What did we just do and what is the Motion on the Floor, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We just took Item #18 Out of Committee.

MR. DZIEZYC: Which is what? To appropriate X number of dollars. That's what we have to vote on. We can't vote on a substitute Motion to delete it, right?

I make a Motion we approve Item #18.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on that Motion.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I was going to start off my little speech by saying I'm confused but that would be an exponent of the obvious. I am really concerned about a department that sends in a request for \$277,000 in change and a previous appropriation, both of which totalling about almost half a million dollars, and then all of a sudden we get a withdrawal of the appropriation of a half a million dollars. Now this department has supposedly got sophisticated computer equipment, it's got people who supposedly know what they're doing down there, and then all of a sudden they withdraw the appropriation. The credibility is really in question here. I thank the good Lord that we can finally get rid of this \$462,000 and we don't have to spend it, but I really wonder why we were even given it in the first place.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're giving a total of the two figures; we're now just speaking to Item #18.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Excuse me, Madam President.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd like to make a Motion that we adjourn. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor, say AYE. Opposed? We will not adjourn.

MRS. PERILLO: Move the question, please. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made to approve #18. We're moving the question. The Motion is made in the affirmative to approve the amount.

MOTION TO APPROVE DEFEATED: 25 No; 2 Abstentions; 5 Non-Voting.

- (19) \$ 12,500.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Code 240.5150 PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 6/1/82. 1982/1983 Budget. Approved by Board of Finance 6/10/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: This is the other item that will come out of the 1982/83 Budget.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blais has left the Floor during this discussion.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none against and I so Move.

MR. GAIPA: E, W. & G vote 3 - 0 approving.

MRS. HAWE: This item is for the audit of the Personnel Department which the Board of Representatives had requested several months ago. We asked the Finance Department about the possibility of the Internal Auditors doing it, and Commissioner Marra said that because of their workload it would be impossible for them to do it. It would be very expensive for the City to do it that way, and also there would be a question of ethics for them to be investigating the Personnel Department. Arthur Young was asked for a bid; it was a very low estimate. This is a slow time of the year for accounting firms, and the Finance Commissioner said that this was an extremely low figure.

MR. STORK: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, did you and your Committee use in your deliberations the letter from Arthur Young & Co. dated May 26 in which they set forth the procedures they would perform in the audit?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, we did.

MR. STORK: I have some questions with regard to that document. On the first page of that letter, Mrs. Hawe, the second and third items, specifically, Review and Document the Existing Personnel Department Procedures Systems and Manuals, and the third item, Review, Document and Evaluate the Systems Internal Controls Existing in the Personnel Department. My question regarding those two items is: These seem to be items that are supposed to be conducted on an annual basis anyway. Are we being double-billed for the same service?

MRS. HAWE: I am afraid I can't answer that question. I have a copy of the letter, but we went into the appropriation request and the reason why they were requesting this much money but it is not the pervue of the Fiscal Committee, I don't believe, to go into exactly how they were going to be doing this audit. We didn't ask them specific questions on how it was going to be done, so I can't answer you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. STORK: Have any of Arthur Young's management letters in recent years, which report on internal control, indicate any problems in the payroll area? Would you have knowledge of that?

MRS. HAWE: I really don't.

MR. STORK: The indication seems to be based on the Ruszkowski audit, at least, that there are problems; my point being that if Arthur Young hasn't reported these problems to us, I'm a little concerned with them performing this particular audit. Therefore, since there doesn't seem to be any information readily available with regards to that, I would like to see this item held in Committee pending some receipt of this information. I think it's important.

MRS. HAWE: I think one thing that can be said for the advisability of using Arthur Young is the fact that it's the Company that does our audits, and they are familiar with the City of Stamford and that's one reason why they were able to do it at this low a price because they have background information already that they don't have to get.

MR. STORK: Please don't misunderstand me; I'm in wholehearted support of such an audit. In fact, it was our Committee's recommendation to this Board that such an audit take place. I just want to see the City get value for its money; and if Arthur Young has in the past perhaps missed some of these items that I have been talking about, I think it might be worth looking into another company performing an audit. I wonder if, perhaps, Arthur Young's performing this audit has happened too hastily.

MRS. HAWE: According to Commissioner Marra, they felt that Arthur Young would be the appropriate one to do this. They asked them for an estimate. They felt it was a very, very low estimate. If the Commissioner had felt it wasn't, they would have asked some others; and this is how they determined it. I would like to say though, that if Mr. Stork wants to pursue this, and if the Board decides to pursue this, I would suggest that it be put in the Personnel Committee to pursue these questions since the Fiscal Committee has voted on the appropriateness of the \$12,500 for this.

MR. STORK: I'm afraid I would have to speak against this. I don't like having to do that, but I'm kind of being forced to do it.

MR. BLUM: In regard to Arthur Young, if we remember, it was the Arthur Young auditors that audited the personnel problems at the Board of Education. So they have some ballpark figures in regard to whether they can do this type of audit or not. At that time, when Arthur Young was used at the Board of Education, as far as the personnel problems, I questioned the idea of Arthur Young knowing that auditing dealt with finances. Well, Arthur Young and all these big accounting firms, information that I received, do not only financial but they do auditing for personnel, management and other items that might be requested of the firm. They are well aware of items concerning personnel because this has to do with money directly. Auditing is a big field, and we should go along with Arthur Young people who are aware of personnel problems in this city.

MRS. CONTI: While I did vote favorably on this in Committee, I think Mr. Stork's point is well taken. I think we perhaps should take it Back

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

to Committee and get the annual letter as to what Arthur Young has charged and see if there is any duplication, as Mr. Stork suggests. If there is, then that should be taken into consideration with this appropriation. If they are not doing additional work over and above what they do annually, then there is some question here.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I like your discussion but there is no Motion on the Floor to Return it to Committee. You can make that Motion at any time.

MR. STORK: I Move that the appropriation of \$12,500 be returned to the Fiscal Committee pending the information that we're seeking.

MRS. GUROIAN: I have to concur with Rep. Stork and Rep. Conti. I think the pertinent information that is lacking is in what way does this procedure, that they've outlined, duplicate or augment the regular audit procedure that they go through when they audit the Personnel Department. Until we have that information, I don't think we can approve this appropriation because with the approval of the appropriation, we will be giving approval of the procedure involved. I think we have to get that information first, and I think we should honor the request of the Personnel Department which originally proposed that we go through this audit and not approve it until they are satisfied that the procedure that is being outlined, the conclusions drawn from that procedure, will answer the questions that they have raised. I also will vote to put it Back into Committee.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would support Mr. Stork's Motion to Return to Committee. Until we can resolve whether or not the procedure outlined in here, could or could not be a duplication of services rendered previously.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to vote on whether we Return it to Committee. We have 29 present and Mr. Blais is absent during the vote so there are 28 people voting.

APPROVED TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE: 17 Yes; 11 No; 4 Non- Votes.

(20) 37,775.00  
~~\$ 40,000.00~~ - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3601 CASH RELIEF -  
 Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 6/2/82.  
 Approved by Board of Finance 6/10/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal Committee recommends 6 in favor and none opposed that we reduce this amount to \$37,775.00 and I so Move. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWE: The reduction is because when the Welfare Department requested this, it was several months ago before it went through the Board of Finance, this was really an estimate; they were not aware of the exact figure that would be needed by the end of the fiscal year. The other night, they were able to give us a more exact figure. They didn't need quite as much as they had thought.

(?) Move the question.

MR. GAIPA: We passed 3 - 0.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to proceed to a machine vote.

APPROVED TO REDUCE TO \$37,775.00: 21 Yes; 2 No; -0- Abstention; 9 Non-Votes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (21) \$ 75,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES -  
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 6/3/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE  
MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so Move. SECONDED.

MR. GAIPA: E, W, and G approved 3 - 0.

MRS. HAWE: This is to pay for outside counsel for the Law Department. There are at this point, outstanding bills in the amount of \$83,093 with several more to come in so this will not even cover the outstanding bills for the fiscal year that has just passed.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: She answered my question, thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Move the Question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the Question, please say, aye. Opposed? How many nos? May I have the hands of all those in favor of Moving the Question; I ask my two Tellers to count them. We need two-thirds. We need 21 votes to Move the Question. The Question is NOT MOVED. There are only 29 people present and we need 21 votes. We'll continue with discussion.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mrs. Hawe, on the information that I have attached to the appropriation request, it indicates that they have on hand the following bills for payment in the amounts totalling \$25,881.05. Now you just indicated that they have outstanding bills of \$83,000. I see that on the same detailed information, they have estimated bills for the remainder of the fiscal year from 4 law firms; are those still estimated bills or have they been actually turned into bills on hand for payments received?

MRS. HAWE: What happened, and this happens quite often, is that when the appropriation is sent in, the figures often aren't finalized. You can see that Mr. Fraser signed this on the 2nd of June, and we spoke to him on the 7th of July. So by the 7th of July, he had more bills in hand and gave us a more detailed breakdown of exactly what monies they needed. What I gave you was the most up-to-date figures.

MRS. McINERNEY: May I ask who the new bills are from and for what amounts? Oh, wait, someone just handed me something. I'll have to read it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no speakers, we are now voting on Item #21, \$75,000 for Law Department.

MOTION DEFEATED: 18 Yes; 3 No; 2 Abstentions; 9 Non-Votes

- (22) \$176,000.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - GROUP 29 INDIRECT EXPENSE - Code  
290.1310 SOCIAL SECURITY - Additional Appropriation  
requested by Mayor Clapes 6/7/82. Board of Finance approved 6/10/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (23) Pursuant to Section 414.1 of the Stamford Charter, the Board of Finance adopted, unanimously, the following Resolution placing a ceiling on supplies, materials and equipment to be purchased without a bid procedure, etc. See Memo from Purch. Agt. Thos. Canino 6/3/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (24) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF DRAFT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN A MASTER CONTRACT WITH THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES.  
This will save at least six weeks of time for each yearly allocation to be in effect over past years. Submitted by Mayor Louis Clapes 6/17/82.  
Copy of Master Contract not provided to Board.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed and I so Move. **SECONDED.**

MRS. HAWE: This is a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign a Master Contract with the State of Connecticut Department of Human Resources. The City receives several grants through the Department of Human Resources, including the Social Service Block Grant which includes \$96,000 to municipal allotment. Some are Day Care funds and some are Bussing money. We will have one contract which will be on file and the State can append these separate grants to it without us having to sign a new contract each time. What it will do will save about six weeks time over when we've been getting these grants over past years. Our Board will still have to review allocations annually in order to pass these resolutions. The advantage of the Master Contract is that we won't have to sign a new contract each year which then must be reviewed by the State's Attorney General. This will be on file and then when the separate grants come up, it will just be appended to that. But we still have to approve them all.

MRS. CONTI: Since Fiscal did not get a copy of this Master Contract, I have no idea what provisions there are in this Contract, and I am very reluctant to vote in favor of any contract of which we haven't seen the provisions.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you, I would like to ask Mrs. Hawe a question. Did I hear you say this includes Summer Bussing? Didn't we just approve money for the Board of Recreation for Summer Bussing?

MRS. HAWE: No, we have not approved money. We approved a Resolution authorizing them to apply for the money. The Board of Finance the other night approved the grant money for Summer Bussing, but it is not on our Agenda.

MRS. PERILLO: But is this the Bussing in this also?

MRS. HAWE: No, this does not include any of the appropriations or any of the grants. This is just when each of these separate grants come up for approval, the same contract with just a change in a few of words, but the State's Attorney General has to review each one. But if the Mayor can sign a Master Contract, which is the same as we've always signed, then the separate grants can just be added, be appended, to it. In other words, it will save time because the Attorney General will not have to review each contract. He will have reviewed it and it will be on file, and then the Mayor can just send the addenda, so to speak, each time. Our Board will still have the approval for each application, for each appropriation, for all of these grants. It won't take any of those powers away from us, but it will just facilitate the paperwork part of it.

MR. ZELINSKI: Am I to understand, based on Rep. Conti's remarks, that we have not been furnished with a copy of the Master Contract?

MRS. HAWE: No, we haven't, but when we pass resolutions authorizing the Mayor to sign a contract for a grant, we never see the contract. We discuss the merits of why we're applying for the grant, whether we need it; but we don't go through the actual comb through the contract. So we saw no need to see it this time. It will be no different from contracts signed in the past. It's just

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

that...it's what they call a Master Contract that will be on file and will not have to be reviewed each time.

MR. ZELINSKI: In other words, Rep. Hawe, the Master Contract, there has been no changes in the provision of what the previous contracts were. Is that my understanding of this?

MRS. HAWE: That's correct, but when the individual parts of it come up for approval with those individual changes, those are the things that we will still approve each time, like each year when the Summer Bussing money comes up, we will still approve that. We won't be able to get the money unless our Board approves that.

MR. ZELINSKI: Then we will be getting a copy of that contract then or the provisions of that?

MRS. HAWE: Well, the resolution.

MR. ZELINSKI: I guess my only final comment was that first I was a little skeptical myself not having to vote as Rep. Conti said; but if there's no changes, then I see no problem.

MRS. CONTI: With regard to Mr. Zelinski's question, it's my understanding that we never before had such a Master Contract. This is why I'm apprehensive.

MRS. McINERNEY: I think the point that Rep. Conti makes is a good one because if we are in agreement with the Master Contract concept, then I think the detailed information should have been supplied to this Board; and noting the type of financial conditions the State of Connecticut is in presently, I don't really know that I would be willing to approve something with a 5-year stipulation without seeing the detailed information. It's not a matter of philosophical merit whether you believe or you don't believe in a program; but certainly when you're signing the contract, you must know the specifics of it. I would support Mrs. Conti and vote against this until such time as the administration has furnished a copy; and I would go further and make a Motion to Return it to Committee until they do.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I would like to speak against sending it back to committee. If I understand Mrs. Hawe correctly, what this Master Plan is is just the prologue to asking for future money. The Master Plan actually doesn't ask for any money at all for any specific grant. All it does is lay the groundwork so that when we do ask for a grant, that part of our work is already done. Am I correct in assuming that's what this is?

MRS. HAWE: This is what they call the boiler plate part of the contract. All these contracts that come down to us, there's a certain part of it that's always the same; and according to the Mayor's letter, it says the Board will have to review allocations annually in order to pass resolutions to be attached to each yearly plan. The advantage of this Master Contract is that we will not have to sign a new contract each year which must then be reviewed.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I think this Contract should be available for any representative who wishes to see this before we act on this, and I am supportive of putting it back into Committee until such time as we have resolved this issue.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ROOS: This sounds like a very expeditious idea. It should save a lot of paperwork and a lot of time. As was stated before, we don't study these requests and we haven't studied them in the past. It's just a request to apply for a grant and there certainly must be repetition in every request. If we can avoid that, I'm for it.

MR. WIDER: Is there any time frame around filing this master application?

MRS. HAWE: I don't believe so.

MR. WIDER: Then it won't hurt to Hold it in Committee until we can...

MRS. HAWE: I don't think it will.

MR. DUDLEY: I would like to Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blaise has left the Meeting. We now have 28 Members present.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We now are going to vote on returning this to Committee.

RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: 18 Yes; 10 No; 4 Non-Votes.

- (25) REQUEST AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SIGN A CONTRACT WITH STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES to receive \$6,500 to continue the sexually-transmitted disease clinics which the City's Health Department has operated for the past four years,

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA with M. Perillo Abstaining; B. McInerney voting No.

- (26) REQUEST TO APPROVE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SIGN A GRANT CONTRACT WITH STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, TO RECEIVE FUNDS TO AID IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF WEST SIDE PARKS. State to provide 40%, or \$26,250, of a proposed \$65,625 project. This is for Lione Park and Jackie Robinson Park.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed and I so Move. SECONDED.

MR. GAIPA: E, W, and G approved that; 3 - 0.

MRS. HAWE: This resolution would enable the Mayor to sign a grant contract for the City to receive \$26,250 to aid in the improvement of Jackie Robinson and Lione Park. The proposed improvements at Lione Park are designed to protect facilities and night-users, rehabilitate active play area, and improve the general park appearance. Proposed improvements at Jackie Robinson's Park are designed to improve the general appearance; the concept is to better define the park as separate from nearby street traffic and to take advantage of its significant view of downtown Stamford. This is 40% of a proposed \$65,625 project. The remaining monies, which are the City's share, are already in various capital project budgets in different departments throughout the city. This is to receive the \$26,250 from the State.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to ask Mrs. Hawe, what are some of the improvements, what are they going to do, they're not going to put up a barbed wire fence, are they? What are they going to do?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: We did have the Grants Office discuss somewhat of what they were doing. I know someone had asked whether they were going to pave it over. She said no. Some of this was for improved signs for some of the parks, and some planting, things like that. As to actual detail, I can't read it out to you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam Chairman, it is very clear that Mrs. Hawe did not answer my question. I don't know if any Representatives here can answer, but can I have an answer, please?

MS. RINALDI: With respect to Lione Park, there is a very bad drainage problem there and I think some of the money is going to be used for that.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'm specifically interested in the visible Jackie Robinson park going up West Main Hill.

MRS. CONTI: According to the letter of transmittal, proposed improvements at Jackie Robinson Park are designed to improve the general appearance as Phase I of an overall master plan. The concept is to better define the park as separate from nearby street traffic and to take advantage of its significant view to downtown Stamford. That's about all.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Maybe I can make my question a little simpler. I said barbed wire fence, are we going to put trees, are we going to make a ball diamond like it is; you said visible to the street, I don't understand what's going to happen there.

MRS. CONTI: It says to improve the general appearance.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: What is that?

MRS. CONTI: I don't know, but that's the information we've received.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, may I ask Mrs. Hawe, if the representatives from this district that will be affected by the improvements, have been consulted at all by the Grants Department on what kind of things were needed in that area to improve it and make it a more desirable park and recreational area?

MRS. HAWE: I think perhaps the representatives from those districts can answer that.

MR. DUDLEY: I have a problem with this. It seems to me that nobody here can really answer what this money is going to be used for; and until we decide what this money is actually going to be used for, we have heard drainage problems, we've heard signs, we've heard plantings, nobody appears to have the answer. Until somebody has the answer, I cannot vote in favor of that.

MRS. PERILLO: I was not consulted but Gabe DeLuca and I have been working with the Parks Department on Lione Park and that was not from the Community Development money, and they told me and assured me for the past two years that the tennis court was going to be put back up. The net has been lying there and not up where it cannot be used. As far as Community Development, they mentioned nothing about community development going in and putting anything there. Community Development did not contact me on any improvements in the Lione Park so that's a lot of money for no information.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The improvements that are going to be going forth in this park are about as specific as many of the other requests that have come through this Board tonight. They are all estimates and guesstimates. Rep. Summerville is correct as is Rep. Dudley. What's going to be done? I have no idea what's going to be done. Nobody else knows what's going to be done to the park. I think it ought to be a point in fact that things that are brought before this Board should be specific and enumerated; and until such time as they are, we should reject everything that comes before the Board on that matter. That's the first thing. Secondly, I agree that the representatives of the district should be consulted but I also want it to be on record that I am just as concerned with Lione Park and Jackie Robinson Park, whether it be in my district or in anybody else's district. I want to see it beautiful; I want to see it useful. I think that I would like to make a Motion that this be Returned to Committee till we can get specific information on what's going to be done. SECONDED.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: 22 Yes; 5 No; -0- Abstentions; 5 Non-Votes.

- (27) \$ 13,300.00 - Request for additional appropriation from Grants Director Sandra L. Gilbane 6/24/82 to be funded from CAPITAL NON-RECURRING FUND to repay Federal Government, due to changed circumstances enumerated in Mayor Clapes' letter 3/25/82. Board of Finance approved this item previously; and it was withdrawn at Board of Representatives level.

(Ms. Hawe said funding by TAXATION not Capital Non-Recurring)

MRS. HAWE: In 1978, a \$13,300 grant was received by the Federal Government to go toward the purchase of a Tot-Lot on Division Street. This project is no longer feasible so the City must reimburse the Federal Government for this amount. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed and I so Move. SECONDED.

MR. BONNER: What other alternative is there if we have to pay the Government back?

MRS. HAWE: There really is no alternative to this, unfortunately.

MR. WIDER: Since they say the area wasn't feasible for a tot park, is there any effort being put forth to create another tot park, some other place?

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

MR. WIDER: I'm wondering why they eliminated the tot park.

MRS. HAWE: There is quite a long history to this; and if it's alright with the President, I'd like to read from a letter sent by the Mayor and it really sets out the whole history of this thing. It goes back quite a few years, and maybe that will help clarify it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rybnick has left, Mrs. Rinaldi has left, we're down to 25 people present.

MRS. HAWE: It's a letter of March 25, from the Mayor and it sets down the whole history of the Connecticut Newspapers and the Tot Lot and all that, and it really is very self-explanatory, if you would like me to read it. If not, they can refer to their own copy.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIDER: No, thank you, Mrs. Hawe, but the most important thing to me is, are we going to deprive those kids of a tot playground? That's my question. The Mayor's letter was explicit but it had no explanation as to what he was going to do for those kids from whom he has taken the playground away from.

MRS. HAWE: It's my understanding, Mr. Wider, that this will resolve the question of the Division Street lot. I don't believe that they are going to do anything in terms of finding another place for the tot lot.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, I think the Board members should be aware in the future when property is requested that's being used for recreation, we should be very, very careful as to who we allow to take it away and who is responsible for replacing it.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I concur with Mr. Wider. It was my understanding that when the Connecticut Newspapers took over this land, that was one of the stipulations, that they were to provide a tot lot; and I cannot understand why now the Federal Government would suddenly renege on it. It really is a puzzle and I understand Mr. Wider's concern.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I, too, agree with Mr. Wider. I'm very surprised that Fiscal did not call the representatives in to speak on this item. I knew the item was before you. I did not attend Steering. But I did speak to the Mayor's office. I would support Mr. Wider in what he is saying and ask that this particular item be Returned to Committee because I have some very upset constituents about the whole thing. I have had one meeting with the Mayor, and we have not resolved the problem. So I would like to see this item Returned to Committee.

MR. BLUM: This Board, along with the district people, namely, Ann Summerville, fought very hard that time when the tot lot was given to the Stamford Advocate or the Connecticut Newspaper as to where the location of the new tot lot would be put; then we voted on also the grant, and this is the grant that the newspaper now says we cannot give you this lot and they're giving the money back to the Federal Government. It isn't a question that the Federal Government is taking it back; it's a question that the final portion was that they claim that they couldn't give them that lot, there was a lot of things that the district people, namely, Ms. Summerville, and now Mr. Dudley, has to look into this matter. I think that the Stamford Advocate owes this City and that district a playground because it was promised as a result of taking that and giving that to the Stamford Advocate, and it was done right in this Board. Because I voted for that and that Motion, I agree that this item should go back to Committee. It's a cop-out on the part of the Advocate.

MRS. CONTI: I voted against this in Committee because there were grave questions in my mind also. As I understood it, we did give this to the Connecticut Newspapers in exchange for another piece of land that would be used to replace the tot lot which their building now covers. However, it appears, from what I can gather, that the land that was purchased for the replacement of the tot lot is completely unsuitable for the purpose, and somebody is responsible for this. I don't know who but I think we should find out.

MR. ZELINSKI: I agree with just about everything everyone said pertaining to the sequence of events. I remember it well because under the last Board of Representatives, this item did come before this Board through the Legislative

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: (Continuing)  
and Rules Committee which I was Co-Chairman of, and there was a great deal of discussion as far as the then Stamford Advocate making arrangements to take over the land that they are presently on and in turn, they would build another tot lot in the area. However, I think we're missing a very important point. This resolution, not this resolution, this appropriation of \$13,300, as Representative Hawe, the Co-Chairman of Fiscal, has very clearly stated, is an amount that has to be repaid to the Federal Government. And that's all there is. There's a second question that has been raised as far as the obligation of the Connecticut Newspapers to appropriate a piece of land for use as a tot lot; but I don't think that we should Return this to Committee because I think we're talking about two separate distinct items, just as apples and oranges. This appropriation is to give money back to the Federal government, regardless of where the tot lot goes or the sequence of events or what is owed to the City. It has nothing whatsoever to do with this \$13,300 which has to be repaid to the Federal Government, and we should not hold that up. I think that it's very important that we do get a clarification and find out what the status of that park is, and it should go on Steering under a committee, possibly Legislative & Rules or Park & Rec, whatever, to get to the bottom of the sequence and what the problem is. But I do not think it would be right to put this back to Committee to answer questions that have no bearing on the \$13,300.

MR. DZIEZYC: Move the question. SECONDED

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion to move the question is lost, 15 yes, 10 no, 5 not-voting.

MR. DUDLEY: It is my understanding that the original parcel of land was by the newspaper, the Advocate, whatever you want to call it; that land was then moved to another area which is the area we're talking about. That area is not feasible for a tot lot. However, Rep. Summerville and myself met with the Mayor and I disagree with Mr. Zelinski, this has a lot to do with it. We met with the Mayor and I understand the need to return it to the Federal Government because we did not use that land for the purpose of a tot lot. However, when we did speak with the Mayor, it was my understanding that he would get back to us and let us know indeed where the tot lot would go, where there would be an alternate place for this tot lot. To this day, I have not heard anything and I don't know if Rep. Summerville has heard anything as to where the tot lot will go; and I think there is an obligation here. I do think that we should return the money, but I am not in favor of returning it at this time until we find out what the status of this tot lot is. Therefore, I urge everybody to vote against this and I would like to see this returned to Committee.

MRS. HAWE: One thing I just wanted to mention which I skipped before. On the Agenda it says it's to be funded from the Capital Non-Recurring Fund and that is incorrect; it will be funded from Taxation.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: It's as simple as this. A commitment was made by the City, a commitment was made by the State, a commitment was made by the Advocate. My only reason for asking to send it back to Committee is to give this Board in writing who reneged on the commitment. I think you will be able to intelligently vote for yourself at the next Board meeting. You have been given some misleading information and some incorrect information tonight as I understand it after having served on the Board two years and working with it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (Continuing)

Somebody has reneged on the agreement, and I think that even the Mayor said in his letter in so many words, that something happened. I would ask you to please reconsider and send this back to Committee for correct information.

MRS. McINERNEY: I am a little bit distressed to hear that a meeting was held with the representatives and then communications was cut off about the park. I am also distressed to find out that this \$13,300 will be funded through Taxation. It was my understanding that this grant money is not spent unless it's spent for the purpose for which it was intended. Why it wasn't sitting in the account marked for the tot lot and unexpended, I don't know. I am not sure whether we fund this through Taxation and hold it up for one month, whether the Government will require us to pay interest on holding this. I think there's a lot of things that have to be resolved. It's obvious that someone has reneged on their part of the bargain; we don't know who. I think we owe, as a courtesy to the residents who were deprived of the park, the right to have this Held in Committee and the right to have it resolved. I think we also have the right to find out what happened to the money and why we're being forced to pay for it through Taxation. I would support holding it in ommittee.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Having also served on the Legislative and Rules Committee on the 16th Board, I remember quite well the commitment on the part of the Advocate to both put up a basketball court as well as put up the tot lot. I think the answer or the key is the ordinance that was passed, selling the land to the Advocate and their commitment within the ordinance, will tell you just whose responsibility it was to put the tot lot up, etc. If that's researched out, we'll find out who should do what. I will vote in favor of Holding this \$13,300 in Committee until next month, hoping that the Fiscal Committee can resolve whose responsibility it was to put up the tot lot. It's almost ironic indeed that the Advocate had an article just a few weeks ago about the lack of open spaces and play areas downtown. But yet here we are talking about the lack of such and why don't we have it right now.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a couple of questions to Mrs. Hawe through the Chair in line with what Rep. McInerney was speaking about recently. Is there any particular reason in the grant cycle that this has to be returned at this particular time or was this a choice of the City?

MRS. HAWE: I don't believe that there's any time limit and that we have to have it done this week or anything like that. It has to be done soon, but I don't think we're incurring any great liability on the City, if that was the question.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Would it affect any other grants or anything like that? Would they withhold funds because of this?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, I believe it's a possibility if the City decides not to give this money back to the Federal Government.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would certainly support Returning it to Committee then and request that we find out why this money has not been kept aside.

MS. De GAETANI: I too, have a question that perhaps Mrs. Hawe can answer. If we do not repay this money to the Federal Government and by some minor miracle a piece of property shows up that everybody agrees is appropriate.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MS. DeGAETANI: (Continuing)

for a tot lot, etc., can we at that point, retain this grant or does it have to go back and we have to apply all over again?

MRS. HAWE: No, I don't believe you can retain this because this was for a specific purpose. If I might just clarify a little bit about where this money is right now, people seem to think that this \$13,000 should be floating around in some account, and it's not. This letter that we got from the Mayor, March 25, if I might just condense a small part of it, explains the question that some people have. In the fall of 1977, the City was approached by the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund and they wanted the City to apply for funding to purchase a vacant lot at 9 Division Street for use as a vest pocket park. A Federal grant would reimburse the City for the expense of half of the property and the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund would raise the other half of the purchase price and would, in addition, organize the neighbors to maintain the park. On January 3, 1978, we approved a Resolution authorizing the City to apply for this grant. The grant would pay for half of it, and the CHIF would pay for the other half. In May of 1978, the Federal grant of \$13,300 was approved; that was for half of the purchase price. However, the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund could not find the matching funds with which to purchase the property. An agreement was then reached in June of 1979, with Connecticut Newspapers, whereby they would purchase the entire property and be reimbursed for that portion which would be covered by Federal and State funds. Connecticut Newspapers would provide the local share plus \$2,500 to develop a tot lot as a replacement for the children's recreational area which was destroyed when they built their building on Tresser and Washington. We approved this in an ordinance on March 3, 1980. The lot was then bought, the title turned over to the City. In June 1981, \$13,300 were received and we gave that from the City to Connecticut Newspapers. So we don't have that money; it was given to Connecticut Newspapers as part of the agreement. Now the City is requesting it to repay the Federal government since the site for the tot lot was not an appropriate site.

Regarding the question as to why it is coming out of Taxation and not out of the Capital Non-Recurring Fund, we have a letter from Commissioner Marra that says that it was incorrectly designated to come from the Capital Non-Recurring Fund. While money from the Capital Non-Recurring Fund would be used to acquire open space land, the current transaction does not involve the acquisition of either land or equipment, but involves the repayment of Federal grant funds. It was not appropriate to come out of the Capital Non-Recurring Fund.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mrs. Hawe, you explained what I was trying to say. The Connecticut Newspapers got the money. They would not return the money to the City. Somebody in the City government like a chief executive officer has to put their foot down or else they come to this Board; and you say to keep everything quiet and everybody friendly and we continue to get the newspaper, we're going to pass this and say we forgive and we forget. Well, my constituents are saying let's settle the issue and find out really what happened; and if we have to pay the money back, we will, but not without an explanation.

MR. WHITE: All I can say is that some very bad judgement was used here in terms of exchange for lots. That lot that was acquired by the paper was a beautiful lot, it was a corner lot, a huge lot, it was no tot lot either. It was filled full of the basketball courts. Everytime I went by it was jam full of kids no matter what time of day it was used. Then you're talking about a tot lot down on Division Street someplace; I just don't

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WHITE: (Continuing)  
get the switch involved. It seems to me there's a piece of open space right across the way from the Advocate now. I don't know who owns that; perhaps that could be used as some sort of a park. It couldn't be any tot lot in Vest Pocket Park. It would be a very large piece of land on a corner lot in the middle of the town, and I'm sure it's right near a lot of residential areas and probably used the same way as the original park was used.

MRS. SAXE: I have some interesting pieces of information that I've had for a long time consisting particularly of a communication that was sent to this Board on April 7. These letters were written, however, on March 25. The ordinance that was passed by the past Board was Ordinance #414. The Division Street lot, it's my understanding, is 50' x 133' and it is fenced-in now as a combination of land which is owned by a group of builders. I don't know what the disposition is on the title of that particular piece of land; but as it was told in the same letter that Mrs. Hawe read of March 25, from Mr. Clapes, that the piece of property in the area where values are increasing, has been re-appraised and its worth from \$26,000 to \$53,000. There's a discrepancy which I can't figure out. The exact location of 9 Division Street I've never been able to find out, I think that would be interesting to us to know. And, who owns the title? If we're going to re-sell this or if Connecticut Newspapers is going to re-sell it, I think we should participate in the profits, if we're going to give back the money. There's a lot of things that I don't understand, and I do think it would be wise to have this go back to Committee: But when it does go back to Committee, I just hope that there's going to be someone whose going to follow all of the details and come up with some answers.

MRS. PERILLO: Move the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RETURNED TO COMMITTEE: 24 Yes; -0- No; 1 Abstention; 7 Non-Votes.

MRS. HAWE: Items 1, 5, 6, 19, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23 and 25 are placed on the Consent Agenda and I so Move. SECONDED; CARRIED.

MR. STORK: Items 1 and 10, the Personnel Committee unanimously concurred 4 - 0.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wiederlight has left the Meeting.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" De Luca.

PRESIDENT SANTY: MR. GAIPA will give the Report.

MR. GAIPA: Parks and Recreation Committee met on July 8. Present were Chairman DeLuca, Mr. Rybnick and myself. Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 are on the Consent Agenda and I so Move. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (1) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ERECT GOSPEL TENT AT MILL RIVER PARK from August 19-29, 1982. Hours for services to be 8:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. From Pastor Bobby Davis, of Miracle Faith Outreach, 91 Hope St., Stamford 06906, 357-7933; 325-1954. Letter 6/15/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT

- (2) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG BANNER AT RIDGEWAY SHOPPING CENTER BY THE STAMFORD YMCA for their Annual Fall Membership Drive, from Sept. 13-18, 1982. From Wm. G. Kane, Director Membership/Program Services; letter June 18, 1982 (YMCA 909 Washington Blvd.)

APPROVED ON CONSENT

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (3) REQUEST FROM UNITED WAY OF STAMFORD, Deirdre Berzok, Director of Communications, to start its annual campaign 9/29/82. An event is to be held Friday, October 1st, from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the downtown area, being a parade by the MUMMER'S BAND starting at Latham Park and concluding at Champion Plaza (will go on Broad St., Greyrock, Tresser, Atlantic, to Champion Plaza). Her letter 6/15/82. 62 Palmer's Hill Rd., 348-7711.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) REQUEST FROM ST. FRANCIS PARISH HOUSE, 2810 Long Ridge Road, Ms. Betty F. Orsey (73 Dundee Rd., 329-8387) to hang a street banner on Summer St. at I-Hop from Oct. 25th until Nov. 7, 1982, to promote their 14th Annual Antiques Show. Her Letter June 18th.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO CONSIDER ITEM NOT ON AGENDA; MOVED, SECONDED, CARRIED.

- (5) REQUEST FROM MIRACLE FAITH CHURCH to have a Christian Parade on Saturday, July 24th.

MR. GAIPA: The Miracle Faith Church requested on June 4 for permission to have a parade but they did not know that they needed the Board of Reps approval also. We did not receive this until July 7th from Mr. Tommy Fitzpatrick of 133 Tresser Blvd. I hereby Move, based on a 3-0 vote of the Parks & Rec Committee, to approve this request. SECONDED.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

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

MR. DZIEZYC: The Health and Protection Committee met on July 6, with the following members present: Michael Wiederlight, Co-Chairman, Barbara DeGaetani, Joseph Tarzia and myself. Audrey Maihock, Phil Stork and Jim Dudley also attended.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED NEW NOISE ORDINANCE - submitted by Dr. Ralph Gofstein 3/15/82. Held in Steering 3/22; in Comm. 5/3. Approved for publication 6/7/82.

MR. DZIEZYC: We also held a public hearing on June 15 to hear all those wishing to speak on the Noise Ordinance. About 20 speakers urged the Board of Reps to approve this ordinance. Our committee voted 4-0 to move for final adoption with the following amendments, a copy of which every member received. Plus there's one more addition there that was left out. On Page 1 ...

MR. ZELINSKI: Do these changes represent major changes in the Ordinance?

MR. DZIEZYC: No, On item 1, it's just the numbering there, Section 3.21 should be 3.2. 3.22 should be 3.3, and 3.23 should be 3.29. On the bottom there 3.6, we're adding after Sundays 'and State and Federal holidays', On page 2, 3.16, Muffler, shall mean a device for abating sounds such as those produced by escaping gasses. On page 3, 3.25 Residential Zone, shall mean all City-owned property use for recreational or educational purposes and all residential districts through, and any commercial district.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DZIEZYC: (Continuing)

On page 6, on top of the page, c, 'within 30 minutes' has been changed to 'within 15 minutes'. 5.5 Exemptions (a) is a typographical error, should be 'provided'. Page 7 we're adding 5.5(j) which is 'Sound created by any mobil source of noise. Mobil sources of noise shall include but are not limited to such sources as aircrafts, automobiles, trucks or boats. However, notwithstanding this sub-section, motorcycles shall be subject to the standards set forth in Section 7 hereof.'

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, you're making substantial changes. This list of changes and amendments, did this come after the public hearing?

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, definitely.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would concur with the Parliamentarian but I think there are significant changes and it might have to be re-published, or you can make a Motion to waive publication; but I think we should act on that.

MR. DZIEZYC: I'll go through all the changes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I will ask my Parliamentarian and the Parliamentarian can be thinking about that in her mind.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I hate to even bring this up but don't all these amendments have to be voted on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: They certainly do.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If that's the case, I would make a Motion that it goes back to Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Can we let Mr. Dziezyc finish his report? I feel this will have to be published and I'm waiting for the Parliamentarian to decide on that. Mrs. Guroian, do you agree with me that you feel this should be published?

MRS. GUROIAN: I don't know if it has to be published, but since the changes are substantial, I think the Committee should consider strongly publishing it and having another hearing.

MR. DZIEZYC: What I'll do is we'll have another public hearing, that's all.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you Move then to keep this in Committee?

MR. WIDER: I Move that we Return this to Committee. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Point of information. I just wondered, if it's going to go back to Committee, is it possible to, at this point, list my amendments so that it can all be considered together?

PRESIDENT SANTY: All you have to do is attend the Committee meeting but give your amendment this evening which I have in my hand to Mr. Dziezyc and it can be considered at the same time.

MOTION TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE PASSED: 20 Yes; 4 No; -0- Abstentions; 8 Non-Votes.  
(There may be a re-publication and/or a public hearing).

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE (Text. 5/10 W. Dennis White) -  
Request from Reps. Guroian and Betty Conti to investigate health hazard involved in satellite transmission facilities and possible legislation regarding same - submitted 4/19/81. Held in Committee 5/3 and in Steering 5/24/82.

MR. DZIEZYC: We voted 4 - 2 to publish and hold a public hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that, publication of proposed ordinance. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC: Everyone received a copy of the Law Department's answers to our question. The final statement said "contrary in my opinion, the proposed ordinance is so defective that it will merely result in an unjustifiable infringement on property rights and the intended potential liability to this Municipality from same. Do not adopt it. Very truly yours, P. Benedict Fraser, Corporation Counsel by Barry Boodman."

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on publication of this ordinance taking in mind the opinion from Corporation Counsel.

MR. WHITE: First of all, I'm somewhat thoroughly confused. We didn't get this opinion, and I stress the word opinion, from our illustrious Corporation Counsel until I got here tonight. Of course, the fact that the ordinance had been in about two months didn't seem to make much difference, but we get the opinion now. I was going to make a plea to have this ordinance published at which time we could perhaps meet some of the objections of the Corporation Counsel during the public hearing, but I wonder now. Frankly, I'm looking for some sort of guidance. I wonder now if I should make a plea for publication or in fact, if we should return it to Committee to hold another hearing, at which time I could once again make the pitch. My point is, I don't agree with the opinion. I've read the opinion here rather superficially, I agree. The opinion doesn't seem, well, frankly, like a very well reasoned one. It's completely contradictory; there are holes in it, very serious holes in it. It seems to me like a very frightened opinion of a Corporation Counsel that was suddenly hit with a real tough ordinance and he got very scared because the Municipality might get involved with some pretty tough litigation. I'm sure you're going to be involved with litigation if the ordinance is passed. For example, this last bit - the Ordinance is also confiscatory as it would expunge already existing property rights prior to the enactment of this Ordinance. Such an attempt at regulation, flirts I love the terminology, flirts with serious potential liability for this Municipality in the form of damages owed any individuals whose established private rights are wrongfully affected thereby. I'd simply like to point out the fact that the Federal Government is in the process now, and I supposed what he is talking about is the retroactive part of the ordinance, retroactive cause of the ordinance. The Federal Government is in the process now of saying look, if you in fact have done something that is damaging to the health of the community, then in fact you are responsible in a retroactive fashion. For example, the Federal Government and the states now also are making industries clean up chemical dumps, chemical dumps that were licensed four, five, ten, twenty years ago; in fact, they were closed four-five years ago. As far as the danger of the microwaves, that's what we're going to try to prove in the process of the public hearing that is going to be held once this is published. Indeed, the whole question of allowing certain exemptions, the point for that is that these exemptions have a justification in terms of the welfare of the community and in fact they are not terribly dangerous. For hospitals, and police to transmit by microwaves is one thing, to have an earth station satellite established is quite another. It's far more massive.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are speaking on the Motion to publish.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) I thought I was too, Madam President, perhaps I'm getting carried away. I'm thoroughly confused by the fact of the procedure now. Quite frankly, I don't know what the procedure is.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would make a Motion to Hold this in Committee.

MRS. CONTI: I'm opposed to Returning this to Committee just on the basis of Corporation Counsel's opinion. The problem here is you can understand Corporation Counsel's opinion because he would have to defend the Ordinance. But we still have a detriment to the public health here, and the State's Statutes do give us the right to regulate anything that's detrimental to the public's health. I am opposed to sending it Back to Committee.

MRS. GUROIAN: I concur with everything Denny said and I concur with Betty Conti. I think we should publish this and hear what the public has to say about it and then try to resolve our differences with Corporation Counsel. I am certainly not in favor of voting for legislation which would end up in court but, as Dennis said, we could easily end up in court if we ignored the situation, so I think we should publish and have a hearing and then work out a compromised solution after that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are no further speakers. We will move right to a vote on returning this to Committee.

MOTION TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE DEFEATED: 16 No; 7 Yes; 1 Abstention; 8 N.V.

We now have the main Motion on the floor which is for publication of this proposed Ordinance. No speakers, we will move right to a vote.

APPROVED TO PUBLISH: 17 Yes; 5 No; 2 Abstentions; 8 Non-Votes.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE, AMENDED, FOR BURGLAR AND FIRE ALARM CONNECTIONS TO A CENTRAL CITY TERMINAL - from Barry Jay Boodman of the Law Dept. dated 5/4/82; also Rep. Wiederlight's memo 5/10. Held in Steering 5/24. Finance Commissioner Marra asked, on 6/10, that this be held for one more month.

(Some dialouge lost - end of tape)

APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.  
Public Hearing Thursday, July 29th, 7:30 p.m.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EXISTING ORDINANCE REGARDING CONTROL OF PIGEONS - submitted by Rep. DeLuca 6/1/82 re problems on 7th and 8th Streets.

MR. DUDLEY: Currently, there's a State statute saying that you cannot entrap birds of any type. There is a serious problem in my district and in other districts, and all I would like is a strong letter saying that we would like to see the State's statute revised.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think that would come out of your Committee, wouldn't it, Mr. Dziezyc?

MR. DZIEZYC: What I wanted to do was...the reason why we voted against it was because the State statute says no person shall trap, net or snare any bird for which a closed season is provided or which is protected by statute or set bait, or use any net traps, snare or other device for the purpose of taking any bird. This is the State Statute.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, if you see me after the meeting, I will compose a letter and will send it as President of this Board.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of personal privilege. Through you to Rep. Dudley, what would you ask the State to revise? What are you going to ask them to do, trap or not trap or what?

MR. DUDLEY: No, all I am looking for is an outlet you could pass this ordinance eventually, which would allow you to entrap pigeons where there is a problem and they do cause a nuisance where the Humane Society would take care of those birds and either dispose of them or whatever need be done. Dispose is the wrong word. What I'm saying is, the Humane Society, there are homing pigeons that would be returned to the owners and so forth.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have a Motion to favorably publish this amendment although the Committee is reversing that opinion.

MRS. CONTI: There's two things I have to say. I think that Mr. Dudley made a Motion about a letter. I assume we're going to act on that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's no Motion needed for the letter. The President of this Board can send a letter to anyone. I'm not going to get in an hour-and-a-half debate on this letter.

MRS. CONTI: I assume what Mr. Dudley wants to do would be to exempt pigeons from that Statute that Mr. Dziezyc read. I think that would be the simplest thing, just to ask them to exempt pigeons from that language.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to proceed to a vote.

MOTION TO PUBLISH IS LOST: 17 No; 1 Yes; 2 Abstentions; 12 Non-Votes.

- (5) REQUEST FROM REP. WIEDERLICH REGARDING ROCK-CRUSHING PLANT IN OPERATION ON CAMP AVENUE - the control of which is asked to be included in the new noise contract ordinance. Letter 6/18.

MR. DZIEZYC: The Committee voted 4 - 0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) LETTER OF JUNE 10, 1982 FROM REP. ELIZABETH GERSHMAN REGARDING "LIFELINE", A VOLUNTEER PROGRAM TO FACILITATE EASY CALLING BY THOSE WHO NEED ASSISTANCE - detailed in her letter.

MR. DZIEZYC: Sue Hyatt, head of the Regional Lifeline Program spoke to the Committee about its operation. There is a Resolution that everybody received in regards to Lifeline and the Committee voted 4 - 0 to approved the Resolution.

MR. BLUM: Didn't we have an item in Fiscal in regard to this Infoline or Lifeline?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't think this is the same item.

RESOLUTION BY MRS. GERSHMAN APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES TO TAKE AN ITEM OUT OF ORDER

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, due to the lateness of the hour, we have some items that really should be addressed before we adjourn this evening. I would like at this time to make a Motion to suspend the rules to take an item out of order, that being Planning and Zoning, Item #4, The Master Plan Application MP-254. SECONDED.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES DEFEATED: 14 Yes; 7 No; 2 Abstentions; 9 Non-Votes.

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

MR. ZELINSKI: The Legislative and Rules Committee met on Tuesday, July 6, 1982, 7:30 in the Main Room. Present were Reps. Zelinski, Conti, McInerney, Bonner, Maihock, Dudley, Stork and White.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES SEC. 6-17(3) - concerning definition of gross income, etc. - submitted by Asst. Corp. Counsel Alice Perry 1/11/82. Held in Steering 1/18 and 2/16. Held in Committee 4/5 and 6/7. Approved for Publication 5/3/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION/FINAL ADOPTION - AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE #474 WHICH AMENDED ORD. 260 CONCERNING THE LEASHING OF DOGS - APPROVED BY THIS BOARD 6/7/82. Submitted by Rep. Zelinski 6/23/82.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Committee voted 6 in favor first of all, to waive publication and I so Move. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're moving on whether to waive publication of Item #2 for the imprisonment section.

MOTION TO WAIVE PUBLICATION PASSED: 21 Yes; 11 Non-Votes.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Committee voted 6 in favor for final adoption and I so Move; SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made for final adoption concerning the leashing of dogs.

APPROVED FOR FINAL ADOPTION UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - ORDINANCE REGARDING SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT/ CONVEYANCE BETWEEN LOUIS F. BUCCIERI AND JOAN BUCCIERI AND THE CITY. Published in June, 1982.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Committee voted 6 in favor and I so Move. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE. Mrs. Maihock asked it be noted that she voted Yes.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - AMENDING ORD. #449 "TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY" - Revision per State Statute. Text to follow. His letter 5/14/82. Also May 4th memo from Rep. DeLuca on Ord. 449 which expired 5/15/82 per Deputy Tax Assessor Faski's comment at Special Meeting on proposed tax phase-in. Held in Committee 6/7/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING A TAX CREDIT FOR REFUSE COLLECTION TO OWNERS OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN MULTIPLE UNIT RESIDENTIAL COMPLEXES. Re-submission for February consideration. Held in Steering 1/18. Held 3/1, 4/5 and 5/3 in Committee. Held in Steering 5/24/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 429 OVERNIGHT PARKING OF TRUCKS ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS - submitted by City Rep. Marie Hawe 2/8/82. Held in Committee 3/1, 5/5 and 5/3. HOLD TIL AUGUST.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday, July 7, at 8:00 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Members of the Committee in attendance were Reps. Dziezyc, Gaipa, Gershman and myself. Due to a simultaneous Committee meeting, Rep. Hogan attend Fiscal. Rep. Dudley was also present.

- (1) REP. JEREMIAH LIVINGSTON'S REQUEST OF 3/5/82 for AMENDMENT to Code of Ordinances Section 11-4 (Ord. 171 adopted 10/2/69 creating Human Rights Commission) granting of pension benefits retroactively from date of employment for Secretary-Director of Human Rights Commission. Held in Steering 3/22/82. (Personnel Commission had this on their Agenda.) Held in Committee 5/3 and 5/24/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) REP. DAVID BLUM'S 4/13/82 REQUEST THAT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS (a/k/a Merit Rules System) that ANY COMPENSATION PLAN MUST BE SUBMITTED TO BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THEIR PRIOR APPROVAL, AMENDMENT, ETC., BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION. Held in Committee 5/3 and 5/24/82.

MR. STORK: In a letter to the Corporation Counsel dated May 19, 1982 I asked for a legal opinion to this question. Did the Board of Representatives have the right to approve or deny compensation plans? Mr. Fraser referred my request to the Deputy Corporation Counsel, Barry Boodman. Mr. Boodman in his reply dated May 24, 1982, directed my attention to a previous legal opinion prepared by former Corporation Counsel, Leonard Cookney, dated February 25, 1981. In discussing Charter Section 734, Mr. Cookney talks about the differences in classified and un-classified employees. Mr. Cookney goes on to say, and I quote, "The import of this section of the Charter is that there are specified, unclassified positions. The Personnel Director and Commission may create at the request of a department head, any other position and place it within the classified service. The Board of Representatives is not required to approve any classified position. In point of fact, it is contrary to its duty; and any attempt to do so would usurp the jurisdiction of the department head, personnel director, and commission".

In view of this information, and the emphasis the Deputy Corporation Counsel places on this opinion, it was the unanimous decision of the Personnel Committee that new compensation plans do not have to be submitted to the Board of Representatives for amendment or approval before implementation.

MR. BLUM: Madam President, according to the compensation plan that is a part of the Personnel Commission, we on the Board of Representatives have a right that was voted by this Board in 1977, to vote on any compensation plan when it comes to the employees. We do not vote on the merit rules, but we do vote on the compensation plan. I think Mr. Stork ought to send a letter to the now Corporation Counsel and have him look at...I believe it's in the Merit Rules, where it says that the compensation plan will be voted upon by the Board of Representatives.

- (3) REQUEST FROM REPS. DeLUCA AND BOCCUZZI dated 4/14/82 FOR A BREAKDOWN OF TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS BY UNION, PRESENTLY IN EFFECT FOR MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES INCLUDING SUCH ITEMS AS MEDICAL AND LIFE INSURANCE, CLOTHING ALLOWANCE, VAGATION, IN DETAIL, PERSONAL DAYS, LONGEVITY, PAID TUITION, ETC.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (4) REQUEST FROM REPS. BETTY CONTI AND GRACE GURIOIAN 4/19/82 FOR "STUDY AND EVALUATION OF MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL PRODUCTIVITY".  
Held in Committee 5/3/82 and 6/7/82

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) STUDY FINANCIAL IMPACT OF FUTURE LABOR CONTRACTS AND ALL SALARY ACCOUNTS OF THE CITY. Submitted by the Steering Committee 5/24/82. Held in Committee 6/7/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE: On June 30, the Planning and Zoning Committee meet with Mr. Stork, Mr. Dudley, Mrs. Signore and myself in attendance. A public hearing was held that night on item 4 and we held a meeting directly afterwards for the rest of the Agenda.

- (1) ACCEPTANCE OF HUCKLEBERRY HOLLOW as a City Street - Atty. Fusaro's letter 4/28/82 to Mr. Donahue re Performance Bond Agreement and Maintenance Bond. Held in Committee 6/7/82. Acting City Engineer Roloff CERTIFIED 6/28/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF FROST POND ROAD as a City Street - from Oak Ridge Development Corp., 123 Main St., White Plains, N.Y. 1,452.67 ft. in length, running west from Cascade Road. Submitted 5/7/82. (Phone 914-966-4800). Held in Committee 6/7/82. Acting City Engineer Roloff CERTIFIED 6/28/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) ACCEPTANCE OF ASPEN LANE as a City Street - from Oak Ridge Development Corp., 123 Main St., White Plains, N.Y. 1,192.92 ft. in length, running north from approximately the middle of Frost Pond Road. 5/7/82. Held in Committee 6/7/82. Acting City Eng. Roloff CERTIFIED 6/29/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) REFERRAL RECEIVED FROM PLANNING BOARD 5/17/82 10:45 A.M. on APPL. #MP-254; Application is Thomas Lyman, Jr., whose application was heard 4/20/82 and APPROVED by the Planning Board, with decision filed with Town Clerk 5/7/82. Application amends the Master Plan from "Commercial, Neighborhood or Local Business", to "Residential, Single Family Plots, One Acre or More" for property located at High Ridge Road and Trinity Pass Road. The PETITIONER requesting reversal of the Planning Board is T. Ward Cleary, Trustee. Held in Committee 6/7/82.

MR. DONAHUE: The impact of the proposed change in the Master Plan would limit the intensity of development that would be allowed on the site, which is located on High Ridge Road near Trinity Pass. Under current regulations, an office building could be built on a site surrounded by single family homes. Area residents who brought the application to the Planning Board made a very convincing case for the change and demonstrated that if such a development were to be permitted, it would be incompatible with historic surroundings and would far exceed the intent of the local or neighborhood business classification. A store which is located on the site is now being converted to a small office. I would add that those who brought the referral to this Board which is one of the property owners in

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

question, did not attend the public hearing but sent a letter to the Committee, copies of which were distributed to the Board. They basically address the issue of creating a non-conforming use, and such use would be created by this change. However, as has been brought to this Board's attention in the past under current zoning regulations, non-conforming uses are protected to a great extent so that no one would be put out-of-business by this change. By a vote of 4 in favor and none opposed, the Committee recommends the approval of this application which would agree with the Planning Board's decision. With that in mind, I would move that Appl. #MP-254 to change the Master Plan classification for the property described therein and located at the intersection of High Ridge Road and Trinity Pass from "Commercial Neighborhood or Local Business" to "Residential, Single Family Plots, One Acre or More" be adopted. SECONDED.

MRS. GUROIAN: Although I'm on the Committee, I was not at the meeting so I have a question to ask of the Chairman. How big a piece of property are we talking about?

MR. DONAHUE: .661 acres.

MRS. GUROIAN: The property we're talking about is less than one acre and we're re-zoning it to one acre or more?

MR. DONAHUE: This is a Master Plan change.

MR. DONAHUE: Yes. Under similar actions that this Board has taken and the Zoning Board has taken, we have done the same type of thing. However, because of the properties past uses of residence and because of the way the zoning regulations and master plan classifications are set up, if someone were to want to construct a single-family house on this site, if they assemble the .661 acres involved, they could build a residence there.

MRS. GUROIAN: How? If you change the zoning, how can they build a residence if you change it to one acre or more?

MR. DONAHUE: Because it's only .661 acres, they would be allowed to build a single-family residence on the site. To not allow it, would be confiscatory. The City would allow them to build that.

MRS. GUROIAN: If they made application for special exemption or something? But you're now forcing them to make an application, and that application could be denied.

MR. DONAHUE: That's true. At this point in time, there are two parcels involved that make up the .661 acres. One is now being converted to a small office; 15 people who will work there. The other parcel is a nursery and is leased to Shanty Bithi Nursery. There is no indication that any kind of a residence will be planned for that site; however, what this does in much the same way as we restricted the kind of development that could be placed on the Groesbeck property, the Giovanni's Restaurant property, the store on Old Long Ridge Road, we've done the same thing there only with zoning regulations, restricted the kind of development that could be constructed there. The present structures will be protected because they would have a year if through some catastrophe, the present structure should be burned down, for example, they would have a year to begin re-construction. If it should be vacant for less than a year, a similar type of commercial operation could be placed in the same building. It's very doubtful that any kind of a residence would be constructed there.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: Why did they pick residential, single-family plots, one acre or more when the property is substantially less than one acre? Why didn't they make it residential, half acre or a quarter acre?

MR. DONAHUE: In much the same way the Zoning Board brought application before the Zoning Board itself, the residence use that classification because it is compatible with the Master Plan classifications of all the surrounding property.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Very briefly, I would urge the Board to support this because I think that by making this kind of a change, at this point, will eliminate future problems in the area such as we have experienced with properties like the Groesbeck property, or Giovanni's, both of which have been built on part-residential, part-commercial, it's been a mish-mash. I think this would clear the whole thing up, and I do hope you'll support it.

MR. WIDER: Move the question. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will vote on Motion by Mr. Donahue for approval of this appl. APPLICATION APPROVED: 21 Yes; -0- No; 2 Abstentions; 9 Non-Votes.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION ABANDONING A PORTION OF THE ROAD BED OF STILLWATER AVENUE ADJACENT TO THE INTERSECTION OF WEST MAIN STREET, TRESSER BLVD. AND GREENWICH AVENUE. Per Mayor Clapes' letter 4/12/82. On 6/8/82 Community Development mailed to Board members.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

- (6) PROPOSED RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE TRANSFER OF PROPERTY AT THE INTERSECTION OF WEST MAIN STREET, GREENWICH AVE., AND TRESSER BLVD. FROM THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION TO THE CITY OF STAMFORD; RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR'S OFFICE TO FORMULATE DISPOSITION PLAN; RESOLUTION REGARDING MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF PROPERTY. (All one resolution.) Per Mayor Clapes' letter 4/12/82. On 6/8/82 Community Development mailed to Board members. This goes with Item #3 above.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE: Items 1, 2, and 3 are on the Consent Agenda and I so Move. **SECONDED. PASSED TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE** - Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman **UNANIMOUSLY.**

MRS. MAIHOCK: The Transportation Committee met in the Main meeting room, Wednesday, July 7, 1982. Sandra Goldstein, Chairman and Audrey Maihock were Committee members present. Others present were James Ford, Director of Traffic and Parking, Deputy Chief George Mayers of the Police Department and Reps. Paul Dziezyc and Phil Stork.

- (1) THE MATTER OF UNENFORCED PARKING RESTRICTIONS AT THE CORNER OF KNICKERBOCKER AVENUE AND ST. CHARLES STREET. Submitted by Rep. Joseph Tarzia, 17th District, 6/23/82.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The problem regarding this item, it was felt, could be resolved for the neighborhood with help from the representatives of the 17th and 15th districts. Mr. Ford's help also was solicited and we also recommended that the Board of Education, perhaps Mr. Donahue, could assist in solving the problem that exists there. We also were the Secondary Committee on Fiscal items 8 and 9, which we mentioned before and on which we voted favorably.

MR. ZELINSKI: What is the disposition of Item 1 on the Agenda?

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK: The disposition of Item 1 on the Agenda was that we took no action; but as I said, we referred the issue to the representatives from the 15th and the 17th districts for their resolution of the problem in conjunction with help from Mr. Ford and perhaps Mr. Donahue as the Board of Education representative.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Lathon Wider and David Blum  
NO REPORT

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - CO-Chairperson John Roos and Annie Summerville

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The Urban Renewal Committee met tonight, 6:30 in the Republican Caucus Room. Present were Co-Chairmen, John Roos and Ann Summerville and Ann Saxe, Elizabeth Gershman and Mr. James Dudley. On your desk tonight, you will see a Resolution. The Committee's vote was unanimous to approve this Resolution and I so Move. SECONDED.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION APPROVING CONTRACT FOR SALE OF LAND IN THE SOUTH-EAST QUADRANT (EXTENDED) URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT FOR PRIVATE REDEVELOPMENT TO BLUEBERRY ASSOCIATES (RE-USE PARCEL #11) FOR THE PRICE OF \$68,500.00. Appraisal of Samuel G. Boyarsky, Fairfield, enclosed; as well as packet of papers by Mayor Clapes 6/16/82.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask the Committee Chairman what is the appraised value on this land as of United Appraisers' recent re-appraisal?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The only appraisal that we have is \$24.50 a square foot.

MRS. CONTI: No, but I'm talking about all the land the City has just re-assessed and I want to know what the assessed value on that land is.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I have no idea. We didn't bring anybody in to ask that question.

MRS. CONTI: We have a letter here from Corporation Counsel which I read saying that that wasn't, the \$68,500, was not exactly a good price and I wondered what the assessed value was.

MR. GAIPA: I think that since the United Appraisal assessments are the basis for market assessments throughout the whole City, I don't see how we can even consider this type of sale without knowing what that appraisal is. I therefore would Move to send this back to Committee. SECONDED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I can't answer what the United Appraisal was, but I can answer the question I put to the Mayor today. I couldn't get the answer from the illustrious Mr. Clapes today at 12:00. I too sympathize with your feelings on this, but I was assured by Mayor Clapes that... if you notice, I don't know if all of us got the package that was sent down, it was a lengthy amount of material that we got; and the Mayor said to me that there was no problems with his present Commissioner. If you notice in the previous correspondence, there had been some correspondence with our past Corp. Counsel Cookney and the Mayor said to me they had been conversing with the people that are involved in this particular piece of property and also the Urban Renewal. If you will look at the Resolution, you will see that the Resolution was revised to fit into the agreement that Leonard Cookney had asked for in the beginning. The Mayor assured me today at 12:05 that the persons that we had working for us upstairs were happy with the agreement that is before us tonight, and the Resolution will take care of any of the questions that we might have by having the Urban Renewal to oversee what goes on on the property and that these particular persons that will own the property, fulfill the agreement to the fullest. That's as much as I can answer, Mr. Gaipa, I'm sorry.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WHITE: Forgive me, but I'm always very much confused over Urban Redevelopment anyhow. Why is Urban Redevelopment selling part of its land to private developers? Now, it rousted private ownership out of there. Now they tore the buildings down, I don't remember which buildings were tore down exactly; why is it now turning around and selling this land to private developers and who are the private developers? Are they involved with Urban Redevelopment in any way? The whole thing doesn't make a hell of a lot of sense. Perhaps I'm just obtuse, I don't know, but I'm very much puzzled by these rather weird transactions.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Maybe I can explain to you, Mr. White. The piece of property that we are talking about; it's not unusual that Urban Renewal sells property to private development, if you know the history of the Urban Renewal and I don't think we want to go into that tonight. But the piece of the property that we are talking about tonight is behind the old Sarner's department store. I looked at it today; it's a piece of land that you can do nothing with other than parking. I mean, I can't see putting up a high-rise building or something. To answer your question about the Urban Renewal, it is not unusual for the Urban Renewal to be involved with property to private developers, if you know the history of Urban Renewal.

MR. WHITE: So URC is selling to private development to build a parking lot?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: They are selling property to a private developer who happened to be in the Urban Renewal project. It's a part of the quadrant, just like all other lands are sold. This is a part of, adjacent to, the Urban Renewal quadrant. I hope that answers your question.

MRS. GUROIAN: First of all, I'd like to make a comment on the fact that the Mayor says the present Corporation Counsel has no problems...

MR. ZELINSKI: Excuse me, Madam President, Point of information. There is a Motion on the Floor to send this back to Committee. That is the only question to be addressed.

MRS. GUROIAN: Sorry.

MR. DUDLEY: I would just like to summarize much of what Ms. Summerville has already said. This is a parcel of land which, in my eyes, I don't see anybody developing at all, and it would be practically worthless to anybody else.

MRS. GUROIAN: If I'm out of order, then he's out of order.

MR. DUDLEY: I am speaking to the Motion. Therefore, I would urge you not to send this back to Committee. It's a parcel which, as Ms. Summerville said, would be used basically for parking. It would be practically worthless to anybody else and I urge you not to send it back to Committee,

MRS. SAXE: I think Mr. White would like to know how large that piece of property is. It's 2,796 square feet.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't think he asked that question, Mrs. Saxe.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. SAXE: The cost runs about \$24,50 a square foot, I believe, and 2,796 sq. ft. is a very small portion of an acre. The appraisal, if you read the material, shows that it is going for what the appraised value would be on an acre.

MRS. GUROIAN: I don't think I could vote for this until I know what the recent appraisal is on that piece of property. As long as nobody here can answer that question, I would vote to put it back in Committee.

MRS. McINERNEY: There is a definition of fair market value on page 10 of this information that we got tonight, and it is "the highest price estimated in terms of money which a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, allowing a reasonable time to find a purchaser who buys with knowledge of all the uses to which it is adopted and for which it is capable of being used." This information was compiled in February of '82, and in a letter that we have here, dated the 22nd of March, by former Corporation Counsel Leonard Cookney, he indicated that he felt in addition to Blueberry Associates paying the \$68,500 for the property, that the City would be supplied with in-kind items, such as sidewalks, landscaping, streetscaping. I would like to know, before I make a decision on putting this back into Committee, whether that has been effectuated or not.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are way off the track. We are discussing returning this to Committee. Ms. Summerville, you are the last speaker; we are going to go right to a vote.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would vote in favor of not returning this back to Committee. I asked the Mayor the question and the Urban Redevelopment the question, what would happen if we did not approve this tonight. The Urban Renewal told me that this has been before the Mayor a long time. Somewhere the papers got lost in the shuffle. If we do not pass this tonight, the Urban Renewal thinks that the developer might say forget it because they have been waiting 30 days with their bank for a closing. They have to meet a deadline, and they asked the Mayor's office plus the Urban Redevelopment's office plus the persons who are buying the property asked us to do either one or the other, vote it up or down, so they will know how to proceed on their development.

MR. TARZIA: I attended the Committee meeting also, by the way. I made some inquiries today, and I found out it really is only of value to the people that would like to purchase it. Therefore, whether we can get a thousand or ten thousand dollars more really would be out of the question because if later on, if we return this to Committee, as Ms. Summerville mentioned, they have a deadline with their bank and other commitments that they have to make, Blueberry Associates, which is where the Sarner's Building is. They are going to use it for parking space. That's really not the question or it's irrelevant in a sense. It only has a value to them. I think by postponing this we may be will do ourselves harm because we'll be stuck with a piece of property in the back there with 2,700 square feet. It has no value to the City; you cannot turn it into a small park. I asked the possibility of doing that maybe. It's either take the \$68,500 and run or just leave it there, hoping that maybe someday they will want to buy it. I don't know. I just caution you in sending it back to Committee.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BLUM: I want to say that I am against returning this to Committee. I think there's been so many items going back to Committee. This is an item that's in the URC, a small parcel that no one has any other use but this Sarner's Bldg. for parking. I ask that we vote for this and get it over with.

MR. ROOS: I would like to say that this was appraised at \$31,000 a few years back. The city at that time felt that this was not a good appraisal and it was appraised low because of its size and its location and what have you. Now we're up to \$68,500, it's \$24.50 a square foot, and if it were prime land useable to many other sources, it would be around \$30.00 a square foot. I think to put this back to Committee and to lose the sale of this land, which is mostly useless to anybody but Sarners or Blueberry Associates, I think we should get on with this and not put back to Committee.

MR. WIDER: I always appreciate seeing district Board members work within their district, and Ms. Summerville is working within her district and I feel that she is doing the best thing that she sees to be done in that district. I would hope that we would support her resolution so we could get this property off our hands.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move right to a machine vote.

MOTION TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE DEFEATED: 15 No; 8 Yes; 9 Non-Votes.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the question, say aye. Opposed? How many people do not want to Move the question. We need 21 votes to Move the question. Yes votes to Move the question, please raise your hands. We are not Moving the question; we'll continue with debate.

MRS. McINERNEY: Now I can ask the question. In accordance with this letter from Mr. Cookney, he said that in addition to paying the \$68,500 for the property, that the City should receive in-kind items from Blueberry Associates, such as sidewalk, landscaping, streetscaping improvements to the immediate area. Do you know whether or not they are agreeing to that, Ann?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I know what Mayor Clapes said to me at 12:05 today. It is all taken care of. The Resolution is as they would like it to be. He has been assured by the Urban Renewal Commission that they will be the overseers to see that this developer lives up to his commitment to the fullest.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, but we don't know for a fact that that's part of his commitment or whether he just pays the \$68,500 and leaves.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: If you read the Resolution, it does say something to the intent that he felt that the Resolution, when it talked about the Urban Renewal, it would take care of what you are asking. That's why I questioned the Mayor today because I wanted to make sure that they were going to live up to their commitment. I explained to the Mayor, the letter that he sent us did not say he was in favor of or against; and that is why I spoke to him for 45 minutes today and he strongly suggested that we support it for that reason. I agree that it doesn't say; I'm just agreeing with the Mayor.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: Can anybody tell me what commitments they have made?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: They have made the commitment that Mr. Cookney asked for as far as taking care of the City sidewalks, etc., as stated in the letter from Mr. Cookney to the Blueberry Associates.

MRS. GUROIAN: And that commitment is in writing?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't think you heard me say that.

MRS. GUROIAN: So then it's not a commitment at all. It's just a verbal promise.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Which is not unusual. As long as the Urban Renewal has the right to oversee the development of the property for the intent for which it was purchased, it is not unusual for that to happen in the Urban Renewal Quadrant when they're dealing with people who are going to buy some land from them. If you do some research on the properties that have been sold to the private developers before, the same kind of intents in the Resolution that we have before us...it's past practice.

MRS. GUROIAN: And we've been burned in the past too. But that was not the question I was going to ask. I would like to know what the Urban Renewal Commission had planned for this piece of property if it were not sold to Sarners

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Nothing. Garbage. It would become a dump, an eyesore in downtown, because it's not useful to anybody.

MRS. GUROIAN: Because it would be left vacant, it would become a dump?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: That is my own personal opinion, Mrs. Guroian.

MR. GAIPA: This property value is very complicated to arrive at. It made some sense to me to employ the experts that we hire to assess all the property in the City of Stamford in terms of what the market value would be. How we can overlook it and forget the use of United Appraisal to set some type of value on this property is beyond me. This is not what a prudent person would be even if it would delay a decision for three weeks. I can appreciate Ms. Summerville's commitment to her district and to her Committee, I really do. All I'm saying is that perhaps we should be thinking more in terms of determining price before we go ahead and sell something and then later find out that United Appraisal, our experts that we paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to, has assessed at a higher price than we sold it. I don't mean \$5,000, I'm talking \$30,000 or \$40,000 more. I don't know, but we should find out.

MRS. CONTI: Despite all the assurances we are hearing here tonight, I would just like to remind this Board that a few hours earlier we discovered that we were fleeced out of \$13,300 and out of a proper parcel for a tot lot.

MR. BLUM: Mrs. Conti just took the words out of my mouth.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN: I think that we have let property go in different places at different times for less than it was worth. We may well be doing that now. But this is a piece of property that evidently cannot be used for anything else. The only people who would be interested in buying it are Blueberry Associates. I would like to point out that Sarners is an old-established building. It's being restored. I think that in time it will be a show-piece in downtown Stamford. I think they should be given points for that. We have committed several hundred thousand dollars here tonight for various projects and so forth. We may be able to get \$3,000 or \$4,000 more for this lot by waiting, and perhaps we can't. The people who own Sarners may decide, well, that's it, we're not interested anymore. For a few thousand dollars, we're not giving the money away. We're not trying to get grant or something. We're selling a piece of property that's of no value to anyone else. It will be kept up by the people who own the building. It will not become an eyesore, and I think that it's something we can do for a long established merchant. I suggest we support it.

MR. DUDLEY: I can appreciate everybody's concern about a parcel of land and how we have gotten the shaft before. I really do appreciate that. We are talking about a parcel of land that means nothing to anybody other than the Blueberry Associates who now owns the Sarners Building. In my estimation, maybe the assessment is higher than it should be. That's quite possible. It's valueless to anybody else. I don't think anybody here in this room can see that land develop for any other purpose other than a parking lot. We are talking about a space that's in between the ramp going up to the Town Center and Sarners. Now, what other purpose it could be used for, I don't know. I don't see any other purpose. If it becomes any other purpose, we are straightening out the Veterans Park to make it look more beautiful. You want to know where the bums will go? The bums will go in between that area. And that is my opinion of what I think will happen. I think it's time, you got an opportunity, take the money and run; I really feel that if we don't move on this tonight what's going to happen is we're going to come back to them at a later date and say it will be a higher price and they're going to reject it. So I urge everybody please to accept this tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI: Three quick things. Number one, I'm concerned about the price that United Appraisal might put on this. Number two, I'm very concerned about the fact that some papers were lost and this thing is so important that we have to pass it here tonight or else the world comes to an end. If it were so important, these papers would not have been lost no matter who lost them. And thirdly, I am sick and tired of coming here to a Board meeting and saying this has to be passed tonight or we're going to lose it. Baloney! If these people are concerned with purchasing this piece of property, whatever it happens to be, even though it's useless to anybody else, it may be more important to them in the future and they may be willing to pay more money. I don't think it's proper for us to be shot-gunned tonight to say we've got to act on this or else. I don't think one month is going to make a darn-bit of difference here, and I think we have to stop moving with haste without sound reasoning; and I hope this goes back to committee for one more month.

MR. BOCCUZZI: May I ask Ms. Summerville, if Blueberry does not buy this piece of property, does this become a piece of land-locked property?

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Yes, it is.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think that right there should solve a lot of problems. If something is land-locked and nobody can use it, you're not going to ever sell it. We've had that problem before. The thing that amazes me, and I sat here through three or four Board meetings, and the people who are now so excited about getting an appraisal from United Appraisal have been condemning them because they don't know how to appraise property for the taxes. What do we do, we use somebody when we can get some use out of them and we condemn them when they do something we don't like. I really think the most important thing you have to worry about here...

MR. GAIPA: Point of personal privilege. Mr. Boccuzzi has said that I have been criticizing United Appraisal.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I didn't say you.

MR. GAIPA: Yes you did. Because I'm the one who made the Motion to have that appraisal taken care of.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If the shoe fits, Mr. Gaipa, wear it. Now to go back to what I was saying, I think the most important thing here is this piece of property becomes land-locked. Land-locked property is worth zero. That's what this Board has to decide.

MRS. SAXE: I would like to read from Page 40 of the appraisal on this piece of property. It says: "To effectively utilize the subject parcel additional land is the major requirement. This site has no aesthetic appeal and in the judgement of the appraiser, has a very serious locational obsolescence for conversion to a higher use. In the opinion of the appraiser, the highest and the best use for this site would be a park in order to utilize its maximum utility." Now, since that time and since this particular appraisal, they put up the road which went up there and, therefore, made this piece of property almost unusable except for parking or for next to no use at all in back of a building. And Sarners is willing to buy the property at \$68,900 and I'm willing to say at this time if the United Appraisal's amount of money for that property is \$68,000 or less, that we go ahead and pass this with that particular contingency. If the contingency goes on like that, then it will be over and done with at that point.

MRS. McINERNEY: It has become very apparent to me that the Resolution contains no guarantees other than that the City will receive \$68,500 for the property. The Redevelopment Commission will watch the activity, but there is no guarantee that these other commitments mentioned by Mr. Cookney are included; and I happen to feel that perhaps I made a mistake and that Mr. Gaipa is right; that the experts that the City hired to do the fair market appraisal on all of the properties in town should have been consulted or at least, we should have looked at that appraisal value. Saying that this is a land-locked piece of land and that it is absolutely valueless to anybody but Blueberry Associates is not, in fact, true because I remember several years ago when the city had a piece of absolutely valueless land opposite the town yard that could not be used for anything and it was sold to a man who combined it and utilized it and made a profit on it three-fold, four-fold, what the city sold him the property for. I think, based on the information and the lack of not knowing what the

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

goals and the commitments are other than the \$68,500, I would make the Motion to return it back to Committee until we have more specifics as to whether they're going to come up with other commitments. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney, I'm not accepting that Motion because that Motion is out-of-order. We've already had that Motion and we voted on it.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm very sorry, there has been other information that came to light with this Resolution and we don't know the total commitments and it is very much in order.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Parliamentarian. We have already defeated a Motion to return to Committee. Is another Motion to return to Committee on the same item acceptable at this time?

MRS. GUROIAN: As far as I know, as long as substantial discussion has ensued since the Motion was previously made, the Motion can be made again.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney, the Parliamentarian and I will go along the ruling. Motion has been made and Seconded to return this to Committee.

MRS. HAWES: Move the question. SECONDED.

MOTION TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE: DEFEATED.

MR. DONAHUE: Two points. I think enough has been said about the location of the property and it's only being of value to owners of the old Sarner's Building, and I think that's quite evident. The fact that we're getting approximately \$.80 on the dollar, and that's compared to...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Donahue, you're actually speaking on moving this back to Committee. That's the main Motion now.

MR. DONAHUE: I'm stating why it should not be moved back to Committee. We're getting approximately \$.80 on the dollar to a piece of property that is not valuable to the City; and even if the City could put a park in there, it would be something we would have to maintain. I doubt that its location would provide for a very attractive area in any way, shape, or form. The price seems to me to be a good price for the parcel in question, that's point number one. Secondly, in terms of Mr. Cookney's statement about inkind services, not inkind services, but their providing for streetscapes and planting, etc., I believe that the Urban Renewal Commission has complete site plan and architectural view capabilities in the entire Urban Renewal area, and they in fact have to review a site plan before it's completed. They can reject it or request an amendment to that site plan. As a matter of fact, when Blueberry Associates or Development went in with their original architectural plans for the building and its renovation, the front was glass and steel; and the Urban Renewal Commission told them that they wouldn't accept that and they wanted it restored to its original condition and its original architecture and that's what's being done now. So there is contingency. There is a method of enforcing the types of things that Mr. Cookney spoke about. There is no reason to send this back to Committee.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BLUM: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will move the question which is returning this to Committee. MOTION DEFEATED by a tie-tie vote, 11-11. We will continue discussion on the main Motion, which is the Resolution.

MR. GAIPA: I would like to propose an amendment to the Resolution that we accept the \$68,500 if it has been determined tomorrow morning that it is within 5% of the United Appraisal's price. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Who is going to be authorized to approve this? The Committee?

MR. GAIPA: Yes, the Chairman of the Committee, Ms. Summerville.

MR. DZIEZYC: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will continue with debate.

MR. STORK: I was just wondering if Mr. Gaipa would be receptive to the wording of his motion to 'this morning' instead of 'tomorrow morning'.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Gaipa would be receptive to that.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

MR. DONAHUE: Point of information. Can I just ask a question? Aren't we assuming here that this parcel is isolated in its entirety as a parcel and it's not included in the Urban Renewal property in the downtown area? In other words, can we go to the records tomorrow and find this exact piece of property listed there in its current dimensions as described in the sale agreement?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, I don't think there's any one here that can answer that question. I understand why you're speaking against the amendment.

We are now going to Move the question on whether we accept Mr. Gaipa's amendment to the resolution.

AMENDMENT DEFEATED. 11 no, 8 yes, 3 abstentions and 10 not-voting.

MR. DUDLEY: I would like to also amend the resolution. The way I would like to amend the resolution would be as such. It appears to me one of the problems is the upkeep and the improvements on the sidewalks and the surrounding area. I would like to amend it as such where if we get it in writing, again tomorrow morning, if that is possible. I want to amend the Resolution subject to the approval of a letter stating, I don't exactly know how I would word it. I'll pass for now.

MRS. CONTI: This is very much in keeping with Mr. Dudley's proposed amendment. Is this, and I think it is but I'm not positive, area part of the downtown streetscape program which means in fact the City has already appropriated the money to do this downtown streetscape program. And therefore this group, Blueberry Associates, would not be responsible for it; they would be relieved of that responsibility which is all the more reason they should pay a bigger price for the land.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DUDLEY: If I may just comment on what Mrs. Conti said. It's my opinion that that parcel is not part of that streetscape program. The parcel is nowhere near that. It is over on the side which would not involve that, if that clarifies anything.

MRS. CONTI: Well, you said this was a land-locked piece of property and therefore, I assume that the part that they would be responsible for the streetscape would be the front of the store which I believe is part of that downtown streetscape area.

MR. BLUM: I make a Motion we Move the question. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to Move the question on approval of the proposed Resolution. There are 24 members present.

RESOLUTION APPROVED: 12 Yes; 10 No; -0- Abstentions; 10 Non-Voting.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Walter Gaipa and  
Mary Lou Rinaldi

MR. GAIPA: E, W, & G met on July 8. Present were Co-Chairperson Ms. Rinaldi, Mrs. Gershman, Mr. Blais and Mrs. Conti. All items, 1, 2 and 3 were Held.

- (1) REQUEST FROM REP. McINERNEY AS TO WHY ROADS BROUGHT UP TO CITY ACCEPTANCE have never been invoiced for a period of the past ten (10) years. Similar request made by Rep. DeLuca. Short report made 6/7/82.

- Above also referred to PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) LETTER OF 5/17/82 FROM REPS. B. CONTI, G. GURIOIAN, J. FRANCHINA, AND J. HOGAN REQUESTING A SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEE TO LOOK INTO THE ASSESSMENTS MADE BY UNITED APPRAISERS. Held 6/7/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) LETTER OF 6/8/82 FROM REP. GERSHMAN REQUESTING DETAILED INFORMATION ON TAX ABATEMENTS GRANTED FOR 1980 AND 1981, and broken down as specified in her letter.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen John Roos and  
Jeremiah Livingston

MR. ROOS: Charter Revision met on July 1, had a quorum and agreed to request the establishment of a Charter Revision Commission.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO INITIATE A CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION; also proposed resolution to appoint members to the Charter Revision Commission. Held in Committee in April. An organizational meeting was held 4/19/82. Mayor's letter 4/13. President Santy's letter 4/15/82. Held in Committee 6/7/82.

MR. ROOS: We ask if the Board of Representatives Administration and the public send suggestions regarding Stamford's Charter and be sent to our Committee. We then agreed a full Commission of 15 members would be desirable. This is the maximum allowance of the State's statutes. The minimum allowance is 5. I have a Resolution to present; you all have a copy. Shall I read it, Madam President?

CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We all have that, but, Mr. Roos, I have some very sad news. There are only 24 members present and according to the Connecticut State Statutes, Chapter 99, Section 7188, any such action shall be initiated by a 2/3 of the entire membership which makes it 27 and there are only 24 people here. I am so sorry, but your Committee can keep working anyway although we didn't adopt the Resolution.

MR. ROOS: That means we're going to lose a whole month.

MR. STORK: Madam President, if it would be in order, along with what has just happened with the lack of being able to vote on this item, I would ask that you write another letter to the members of this Board to please ask their indulgence and their attendance at these meetings.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, I will send a letter but it is 10 to 3 in the morning; and you can understand some of the people, why they're leaving and we do have several members that are ill.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I think that it is time that we ask that this item be taken off this year's Agenda. It's as simple as this. It's urgent, we've lost almost half a year. I mean, how much productivity can we have in four months. I am asking that we take this item off the Agenda for this year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That Motion is out-of-order, Ms. Summerville; we can discuss that at Steering if you want to take it off. The Steering Committee has committed this to Committee.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

NO REPORT.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairman Gerald Rybnick

NO REPORT.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONCERNING MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEE CONTRACTS, AND/OR PERSONNEL NOT COVERED BY MUNICIPAL CONTRACTS - submitted by Reps. John Boccuzzi and Gabe DeLuca 5/28/82.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I make a Motion to Hold the Resolution until next month.  
SECONDED. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Holding the Resolution in Committee, please say aye. Opposed? How many no vote. 4 no votes and all the rest yes. We will submit that next month.

MRS. PERILLO: I make a Motion to adjourn. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Steering Committee has been changed until the 20th instead of the 19th because of the Democratic Congressional Convention and also, there is one Committee re-assignment. Mr. Wiederlight has resigned from the Personnel Committee due to other commitments and Rep. Dudley has been appointed in his place.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to vote on the Motion to Adjourn. All in favor of adjourning, please say aye. Opposed? Who does not want to adjourn? The Motion to adjourn has been DEFEATED, but I do not think we have a Quorum at this time, so all the Members who want to stay, take your seats and we will see if we have a Quorum.

MR. DUDLEY: If we do not have a Quorum, I think it should be noted who is not present.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will mention who stayed. We are counting a Quorum at this time. Mr. Donahue, would you see if we have 21? I would ask the Members who are here to please use the machine so we have a final calculation of who is here. If you are here, just vote yes, you are present at five-minutes to 3:00 a.m. We have 19 Members present. Because of a lack of a Quorum, we will adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:00 A.M. (No Quorum)

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

A PPROVED:

Jeanne-Lois Santy  
Jeanne-Lois Santy, President  
17th Board of Representatives  
City of Stamford, Connecticut

TG  
Encs.

69.

69

STAMFORD BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

07/12/82 <sup>time wrong</sup> 02:31:56 - ATTENDANCE

Regular Meeting of July 12, 1982  
Started 8:30 P.M. (Adjourned 3:00 A.M.)

- 1 Y CONTI BETTY
- 2 Y GURDIAN GRACE
- 3 N FLOUNDERS BURTIS
- 4 Y WIDER LATHON
- 5 Y SAXE ANN
- 6 Y McINERNEY BARBARA
- 7 Y GERSHMAN ELIZABETH
- 8 N OWENS BOBBY
- 9 N ESPOSITO PAUL
- 10 Y STORK PHILIP
- 11 Y ROOS JOHN
- 12 Y HAWE MARIE
- 13 Y DEGAETANI BARBARA
- 14 N CONTI ANTHONY
- 15 Y TARZIA JOSEPH
- 16 Y WHITE W. DENNIS
- 17 Y MAIHOCK AUDREY
- 18 Y GAIPA WALTER
- 19 Y BLUM DAVID
- 20 Y SUMMERVILLE ANNIE
- 21 Y LIVINGSTON JEREMIAH
- 22 Y BOCCUZZI JOHN
- 23 N HOGAN JOHN
- 24 N FRANCHINA JOSEPH
- 25 Y DZIEZYC PAUL
- 26 Y BONNER JAMES
- 27 Y DIXON HANDY
- 28 N GOLDSTEIN SANDRA
- 29 Y PERILLO MILDRED
- 30 Y DUDLEY JAMES
- 31 Y ZELINSKI JOHN
- 32 Y SIGNORE MARY JANE
- 33 Y PERILLO ALFRED
- 34 Y BLAIS PETER
- 35 Y RINALDI MARY LOU
- 36 Y RYBNICK GERALD
- 37 Y DONAHUE DONALD
- 38 Y WIEDERLIGHT MICHAEL
- 39 N DELUCA ROBERT
- 40 Y SANTY JEANNE-LOIS

32 Present

8 Absent: Flounders, Owens,  
Esposito, A. Conti,  
Hogan, Franchina,  
Goldstein, DeLuca.  
(several were ill and one had  
a sudden death in family-DeLuca)