

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1983

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, JUNE 6, 1983, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 p.m. by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in Caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am honored this evening to ask the Rev. Dennis Albrecht, Pastor, of St. John's Lutheran Church, to open our meeting with prayer, and please remain standing to Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

INVOCATION: Rev. Dennis Albrecht, Pastor
St. John's Lutheran Church, 884 Newfield Avenue, Stamford, CT

REV. ALBRECHT gave the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Santy led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Our Clerk will prepare for the Roll Call and I think that we should all welcome our beloved JERRY RYBNICK back this evening. It's delightful to have you back. We prayed for you many, many times, Gerry, we knew you would be back with us. Jerry would like to say a few things at this point.

MR. RYBNICK: May I take this time to thank the Board of Representatives for their cards and prayers: Mrs. Santy for her flowers and Mr. John Boccuzzi for the basket of fruit. It feels great to have fine people and friends like this who cared. Thank you very much.

ROLL CALL: CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 36 members present
Absent were Reps. Joseph Tarzia; John Roos, out-of-town; Handy Dixon; and David Blum, ill.

PRESIDENT SANTY declared a quorum.

TEST VOTE: The President conducted a test vote, asking the members to vote, in turn, yes, no, abstain. The machine was declared to be in good working order as of that moment.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I have an inquiry. Do you know what happened to the microphones on this desk, please?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Apparently, we are having problems with the microphones. You have to share. Mr. Roos called me before he left for Texas and he tried very much to repair them, but I think tonight, several of them will have to be shared.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, very much. I don't mind sharing with Marie.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE - NONE

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'd like to take this opportunity to wish Happy Birthday this month to Gabe DeLuca, Walter Gaipa, Jerry Livingston, Phil Stork and Joe Tarzia. Happy Birthday.

STANDIND COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE

- Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I'd like to waive the reading of the Steering Committee minutes, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several seconds. All in favor of waiving the reading of the Steering Committee minutes, please say aye. Opposed? Minutes reading are waived.

ak-----
HMMSTEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met on MONDAY, MAY 23, 1983 in the Democratic Caucus Room in response to a CALL for 7:30 P.M. The meeting was Called to Order at 7:30 P.M., at which time a QUORUM was present.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman
 Barbara McInerney, Republican Leader
 John J. Boccuzzi, Democratic Leader
 Robert "Gabe" DeLuca
 Mary Jane Signore
 Marie Hawe
 Anthony Conti
 Philip Stork
 Burtis Flounders
 Paul Dziezyc
 Barbara deGaetani
 Audrey Maihock
 Donald Donahue
 Sandra Goldstein
 Lathon Wider, Sr.
 Anne King Saxe
 Mary Lou Rinaldi
 John J. Hogan
 Jeremiah Livingston
 Advocate reporter
 Helen M. McEvoy

Note:

In the Main Room, the following Representatives were waiting for the Special Charter Revision Meeting which was to take place immediately after Steering Meeting; they were in and out of Steering:

Betty Conti
 Walter Gaipa
 Joseph Tarzia
 Grace Guroian

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(1) FISCAL MATTERS

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

(2) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the first item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The other item was removed from the agenda by Rep. Donahue, concerning installation of meters on Beehler Street parking lot which had been City employees' parking lot.

(3) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were six of the items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, as well as an additional item, a resolution authorizing S.H.A.P.E personnel to receive benefits. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was Rita Hogan's request to buy back pension time. Ordered removed from the agenda was Rep. Hogan and Blum's request that Personnel Dept. sponsor a safety program for all City employees.

(4) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

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

(5) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

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

(6) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

The first item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda was ordered removed from the Agenda, requesting an inquiry into the Fair Rent Commission and staff problems. Ordered transferred to Planning and Zoning was the second item concerning accessory apartment program to be administered by the Southwestern Conn. Agency on Aging, Inc.

(7) APPOINTMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were nine of the names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Three were ordered held for next month, being Ms. Helen Gewirtz (Commission on Aging); Charles DeLuca (Environmental Protection Board); Walter Seely (Fair Rent Commission).

(8) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

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

HMM

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(9) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the Committee Report on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(10) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also ordered on the agenda was request to hold a bicycle race with a new date of 6/12 by the South End Community Center.

(11) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The matter of a safety program for City workers was to be included as part of one of the Personnel Committee items.

(12) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were eight of the items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered Held in Committee were five items: (a) publication of proposed ordinance for tax credit for those in sewer districts not receiving garbage collection; (b) publication of ordinance setting fine for violators of Chapter 10 regulations; (c) Rep. Zelinski's request about Code of Ordinances; (d) waiver of building permit fee for Greenwich Affordable Housing Development; (e) publication of ordinance re hazardous substances and materials. Ordered transferred to Planning and Zoning was the matter of sale of City-owned property on Hallowe'en Blvd.

(13) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items transferred from other Committees: (a) Accessory Apartment Program; (b) Sale of land on Hallowe'en Blvd.; also the sale of land at Hill St. and a portion of North State Street.

(14) COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the Committee Report on Tentative Steering Agenda.

(15) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on Tentative Steering Agenda; also explanation of Mayor's position of Zero offer to labor unions.

(16) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

ORDERED removed from the Agenda was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a letter from Alice Perry, Law Dept. re hazardous materials.

(17) NEW BUSINESS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a third request for investigation of Public Works Department.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion made, Seconded, and Approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 P.M. A Special Meeting of the Board followed immediately thereafter for the purpose of Charter Revision consideration.

HMM:MS

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman
STEERING COMMITTEE

5.
ak

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1983

5.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, may we have about a 15-minute recess; no more?

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a motion for a 15-minute recess. Is there a second? All in favor of a 15-minute recess, please say aye. Opposed? We'll recess for 15 minutes. (Recess from 8:20 p.m. until 9:33 p.m.)

The Recess is over. Representatives, please take your seats.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, Madam President. For the record I would like the Chair to note that Mr. Bonner has left the meeting. He's not feeling well, and he asked to be excused.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. Mr. Bonner has left the meeting. We now have 34 members present.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President, thank you. For the record I'd like to be recorded as here. I arrived during the recess. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski is now present. We have 35 members present.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John J. Hogan, Jr. and Marie Hawe

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, June 1. Present at various times throughout the evening were Reps. Donald Donahue, Burt Flounders, Jerry Livingston, Betty Conti, and myself. However, when the time came to vote, one of the members had already left; thus, leaving us with only four members. We, therefore, did not have a quorum, and were unable to vote. I, therefore, have no Committee report. I would like at this time to Suspend the Rules so we can take up the items on the Fiscal Committee Agenda without a Committee report.

MRS. CONTI: Point of order, Madam President. What Rule are we Suspending?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It doesn't need a Suspension of the Rules, Mrs. Hawe, to bring out the Committee report; just a majority vote; just that you want to waive the Fiscal Committee report. It doesn't have to have a Suspension.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to then waive the Committee report, Fiscal Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that?

MRS. GUROIAN: Point of order. I think it needs a Suspension of Rules.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It does not need a Suspension of the Rules.

MRS. GUROIAN: Because, let me explain. Because in our Rules, it specifically says, "We cannot entertain any fiscal appropriation over \$2,000.00 without first having a report from Fiscal Committee." So, it needs a Suspension of the Rules.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It does not, Mrs. Guroian, need a Suspension. It needs to be brought out of Committee by a majority vote. We will proceed to a vote. Is there a second to waiving the Fiscal Committee report? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Fiscal Committee report for lack of a quorum, please say aye. Opposed? 1 no vote. 2 no votes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (1) \$850,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - CULTURAL CENTER - amend the Capital Projects Budget by adding to the project known as #735.0701 CULTURAL CENTER, the sum of \$850,000.00 to be received from the State of Connecticut (this is in addition to the \$500,000 already appropriated to this project by the City.) Board of Finance approved March 3, 1983. Held in Committee 4/4 and 5/2/83.

Above also referred to COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: At their August, 1982, the State bonding commission appropriated \$850,000 for the Stamford Cultural Center. This represents the State's share of the Cultural Center project, phase 1. On August 2, 1983, this Board passed a resolution authorizing the Mayor to file an application and to enter into a contract with the State to obtain matching funds for the development of Stamford Center for the Arts. You all received a copy of the contract that has been negotiated with the State. It should be on your desks tonight. In order for the City to enter into this contract with the State to secure the funds, the full amount of the State's share must be appropriated by us. For information purposes, we had voted on this last month in the Committee and at that time, the Committee voted 5 to 1 for this appropriation, but that was last month, and I would like to make a motion to approve this amount.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Seconded. Secondary Committee.

MRS. GERSHMAN: No report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No report. Is there a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report? So moved. All in favor say aye. Opposed? The Secondary Committee report is waived. Any discussion on \$850,000 amendment to the Capital Projects budget, Cultural Center?

MR. FRANCHINA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We don't have to move the question, Mr. Franchina, there are no speakers. We'll move right to a machine vote. We are voting on the approval of #1 under Fiscal, \$850,000 Cultural Center. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 27 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining and 1 not-voting.

- (2) \$637,119.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - MEDICAL AND LIFE INSURANCE - CODE 290.1330 - additional appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request 4/12/83. Returned to Committee 5/2/83. Board of Finance approved _____. (Approved 4/21/83)

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: On the Agenda, there is a blank where it says, "Approved by the Board of Finance." That should be April 21st. If you want to write that in, that's when the Board of Finance approved it, April 21st.

We had held this last month because there were questions that were brought up by Mr. Wiederlight concerning the reserve that is carried over from year to year in this account. I don't know whether Mr. Wiederlight would like to speak to this, but I understand he had his questions answered satisfactorily.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: I believe that Fiscal unanimously approved this last month, and I would make a motion to approve this amount.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several Seconds. Education, Welfare and Government, Ms. DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: E, W, & G voted 5 - 0 in favor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, very much. Any speakers?

MRS. SAXE: Through you to Mrs. Hawe. At what date did the Fiscal Committee pass this?

MRS. HAWE: The Board of Finance approved it on April 21st. There is a blank on the Agenda with a question mark. At their April 21st meeting.

MRS. SAXE: Were there any conditions?

MRS. HAWE: Excuse me.

MRS. SAXE: Were there any conditions from the Board of Finance?

MRS. HAWE: No, they just approved it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of \$637,119.00 Finance Department - Medical and Life Insurance. Please use your machine. These items require a two-thirds vote. There are 35 members present. 24 votes are required. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 26 affirmative, 1 abstention, and 7 not-voting.

MRS. CONTI: Point of order, Madam President. Please let the record show that I abstained on this vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your machine should show it. It's automatic, Mrs. Conti.

- (3) \$ 6,053.00 - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CODES 573 VARIOUS W.I.C. PROGRAM - additional appropriation which amount is in addition to the preliminary grant of \$140,947.00 received from the Federal Government, making the total contract \$147,000.00 for the 1982/1983 fiscal year, to be allocated as follows:

573.1110 Salaries	\$5,150.
573.1310 F.I.C.A.	450.
573.1340 Workmen's compensation	50.
573.2610 Maintenance of equipment	100.
573.2740 Telephone	150.
573.3721 W.I.C. Clinic lab supplies	153.
	<u>\$6,053.</u>

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: The original contract with the State this year was for \$147,000 for the W.I.C. program, but because the State of Connecticut was not sure exactly how much money was going to be forthcoming from the Federal Government, they had only given us so far, \$140,947.00. This is the additional money to bring us up to the original contract amount which was \$147,000.00.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: I make a motion to approve \$6,053.00 for the W.I.C. program.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several seconds. Health and Protection Committee,

MR. DZIEZYC: I make a motion that we waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We'll waive the Secondary Committee report. Any speakers? No speakers, we will move right to a machine vote. We are now voting on #3 under Fiscal, \$6,053.00 W.I.C. Program. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 28 affirmative, 4 negative, 1 abstaining and 2 not-voting.

- (4) \$ 5,992.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - CODE 650.3645 - SUMMER BUSING -
 additional appropriation per Mayor's request 4/19/83 to be received from State Dept. of Human Resources for this year's Summer Busing Program (for which this Board authorized Mayor to file for grant 5/2 meeting). Board of Finance approved 5/10/83.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEET.

MRS. HAWE: At last month's meeting, we passed a resolution for this program and this is for the Mayor to apply for this and this is the appropriation of the money that is to be received from the State for the Summer Busing program. This is for the kids they take from the vacation playgrounds to the State parks throughout the summer. I make a motion to approved \$5,992.00 for the Board of Recreation Summer Busing program.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Seconded. Secondary Committee, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: We concur.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. No speakers. We'll move right to a vote. We'll use the machine. We're voting on #4 under Fiscal, \$5,992.00 Board of Recreation Summer Busing. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 28 affirmative, 2 negative, and 4 not-voting.

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. Item #5 and 6 are related, and if it is alright with the Chair, I will speak to them both together and then make a separate motion.

Items #5 and 6 involve the close-out of Capital account #280.823 which is entitled the Bell Street Garage Repair. There's \$5,604.00 left in that and the project is completed. They don't need the money anymore. So, what they want to do is close that out and transfer that money into two accounts; one account is concerned with item #5 and that's a new account.

- (5) \$ 5,000.00 - CAPITAL BUDGET/CLOSE-OUT & TRANSFER - request for approval
 (Transfer) of an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget by adding thereto a project to be known as #280.697 STARK SCHOOL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL - to be financed by the transfer of \$5,000.00 from project known as #280.823 BELL STREET GARAGE REPAIR, per Mayor Clapes' request 5/3/83. Approved by Board of Finance 5/10/83 CONDITIONAL UPON RECEIPT OF A PLANNING BOARD ADVISORY OPINION. PLANNING BOARD APPROVED.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: The State had put in a temporary signal on Glenbrook Road near Stark School when work was being done on the Courtland Avenue Bridge. The Traffic Department has found that this signal has increased the safety for the school children who have to cross Glenbrook Road to get to Stark School and St. Maurice's also. The State will sell the City for \$5,000.00, the signalization. If we do not buy it, it will be removed within a couple of weeks. If the City was to buy it new, it would probably cost around \$9,000.00. As I said, the Traffic Department found that being there is such a large number of children who cross Glenbrook Road at that point, they really felt that it could be justified by safety standards. So that is #5.

Now I will make a motion to approve \$5,000.00 for item #5. This is the Capital Project close-out and transfer into the Stark School Pedestrian signalization account.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Secondary Committee, E, W, & G.

MS. GAETANI: E, W, & G voted 4 - 1 in favor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, I read in the paper that Stark School was possibly one of the schools to be closed. If it is going to be closed, why do we need this signal there?

MRS. HAWE: We wouldn't except for the fact that St. Maurice School is also there, but maybe the Board of Ed by now has voted. I don't believe Stark was one of the ones discussed. It's Toquam and Riverbank that they're thinking of closing. I can't answer that.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Through you Madam Chairman to Mrs. Hawe, I'd like to find out what kind of signal they had in this intersection before, and if they did have a signalization, what happened to it?

MRS. HAWE: There was no traffic light there. They had a traffic guard, a crossing guard who would go out into the middle of Glenbrook Road with the hand-held stop sign and stop the traffic going both ways on Glenbrook Road and then the children would cross. A year or two ago I guess it was, the State put up this traffic light there. Now, it can be actuated by pushing a button, and then the walk signal would come on. There was none there before.

MR. BLAIS: However, if getting by with a crossing guard has sufficed us for the past how many years since the school was built, and this seems to be a special request for this particular school, the other schools and the other neighborhoods may request, I can't see expending \$5,000.00 when it's a proven fact that before this time, we had no signalization and things worked adequately.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Through you, Madam Chairman to the two Representatives from the district, may I hear their opinion? Do they think that this is a necessary light; do they support it or do they not?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, is that your district?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, it is. Yes, we do support this because we've had a great deal of development on Glenbrook Road, and this is an elementary school and you have small children walking to school. By all means, I would support it, but if I'm supporting it, it makes others not support it, that's unfortunate.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I have no quams about whether or not we need a light there or not. The only question I have is that I'm looking at a letter dated April 14, from Mr. Robert W. Gumbala, PHD, Transportation Chief Engineer, and one of the sentences that he has over here is that regardless of whether or not we pay this \$5,000, now or not, they would withhold a like portion from our 1983/84 fiscal year Town Aid grant. So, my question would be, why couldn't we use this \$5,000 transfer for something else and just let them take it out of the fiscal year Town Aid grant. They're not saying that they are going to take the light down whether we pay them \$5,000 now or not. No, it doesn't. There is no where that says that they are going to take it in two weeks. Look at the letter of April 14. The State is going to get their money one way or another; whether we put up the money now or they just reduce our Town Aid grant. I would recommend that we reject this \$5,000 transfer this evening and just let them take it out of our Town Aid grant and maybe we can use the \$5,000 for a more worthwhile project. I'm not saying this project isn't worthwhile but based on what the Transportation Chief Engineer is saying, the light will stay there regardless of what we do this evening.

MRS. HAWE: Let me address myself to the letter which would appear to be saying what Mr. DeLuca said. However, what the letter is really saying is that the City of Stamford has said that they want the light. If we don't pay for it by the end of the fiscal year, they're going to withhold the money from the Town Aid grant. That's right, but that doesn't mean that they're going to leave it there if we didn't want it, then we would have to dismantle it and return it to the State. They're not saying that they are going to leave it there no matter what, and that Town Aid money is used for paving of roads. You would have that much less money to pay for paving of roads next year.

MR. GAIPA: Madam Chairman to Mrs. Hawe, through you to Mrs. Hawe. I have a question in regard to the Planning Board Advisory opinion. The Board of Finance approval was conditional. What was the Planning Board's opinion on this?

MRS. HAWE: I have it right here. At its meeting held on Tuesday, May 17, the Planning Board reviewed your letter setting forth a proposed close-out of funds in connection with the Bell Street Garage repairs and a transfer to the Stark School pedestrian signal account and existing Public Works rolling stock. The Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of the close out and transfers described in your letter. This is a letter to the Mayor. So, they approved it unanimously.

MR. GAIPA: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you finished, Mr. Gaipa?

MR. GAIPA: Yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I think that as Mr. DeLuca has indicated, the City has notified the State that they really would like to have that light remain as a permanent fixture on this Road, and I do agree that there are many children that walk to that school, I believe from the Lawn Avenue housing site, and although Glenbrook. It's a walking area. However, since the City has clearly pointed out to the State that they want this light, I feel as Mr. DeLuca does, that it's not necessary for an additional appropriation; that that money can be taken out of the Town Aid grant, and I would prefer that it be done that way.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you. Whether the money comes out of the Town Aid or a direct appropriation or direct transfer, I'm at St. Maurice's School almost every weekday morning, very early when the children are starting to go in and it's an area that ices-up. It's one of the first areas in the City that will ice-up in bad weather. We need a light there to keep that traffic under control; to keep it slowed down. It's a straight-away; people tend to speed. Both St. Maurice and Stark Schools are up a hill. The water drains down into the road. Please, I ask you no matter which way you fund it, let's keep that light in.

MR. DONAHUE: First of all, I believe this is not an additional appropriation. It's a transfer to the Capital Projects budget. We're not asking for additional money, we're asking for money to be transferred from one account where it doesn't have a major need at this time, to one where it does. I would also remind the members of the Board that not only is this used for Stark School students, and St. Maurice's School students, it is also used for a very heavily used park during the summer. There is a baseball field there; a Little League field there. There is Board of Recreation playground there which starts soon after the close of the school year and I would not want someone coming down in a week or so from now, and disconnecting this traffic light because we haven't acted. I don't see any problem with transferring these funds to maintain what is a good facility for the people of that area and for that whole neighborhood.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you Madam Chairman to Chairlady Hawe, if we continue to keep the light, will the crossing guard also still be there or is that something that is going to eliminate the crossing guard?

MRS. HAWE: I believe that the crossing guard will still be there.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Does the Traffic Department believe that?

MRS. HAWE: I think the crossing guard is put there by the Board of Education, or the Police Department, yes. As far as I know, yes, the crossing guard will still be there.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The reason I asked that is that in Caucus I heard something about it is the regular system where you push a button to cross. I wouldn't want to think they're going to take away the crossing guard and depend upon the children to push that button to cross. In reality, you don't use the two.

MRS. HAWE: From what was indicated the other night, the crossing guard will still be there.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Thank you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'd like to move the question, but you're dealing with something that's very close to me and that's the most important product. We can spend money for everything else in Stamford and now are we going to argue about the State paying for a light that protects our kids. I think it is about time that the City pays. If the light can be there by paying, I think we ought to pay for it and not depend on the State Aid grant to the City. I don't think that's right. I think that's wrong.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider. There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of a \$5,000 transfer Capital Projects Stark School pedestrian signal. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 30 affirmative, 2 negative, 1 abstaining and 2 not-voting. A transfer just needs a majority.

- (6) \$ 604.00 - CAPITAL BUDGET/CLOSE-OUT & TRANSFER - request for approval of an amendment to the Capital Projects budget by adding to the project known as #311.142 PUBLIC WORKS NEW EQUIPMENT ROLLING STOCK the sum of \$604.00 to be financed by the TRANSFER of said sum from Project #280.823 BELL STREET GARAGE REPAIR, per Mayor Clapes' request 5/3/83. Approved by Board of Finance 5/10/83 CONDITIONAL UPON RECEIPT OF A PLANNING BOARD ADVISORY OPINION. (PLANNING BOARD APPROVED)
- (Transfer)

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES.

MRS. HAWE: I make a motion to transfer \$604.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Public Works, Mr. Flounders. Do you want to make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report?

MR. FLOUNDERS: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report. That's right we don't have to; it's only \$604.00. You're right, Mr. Flounders, we don't need a Secondary Committee report.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, as a point of clarification, I noticed that it was referred to two committees.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It should have been just to Public Works. That's a mistake on the Agenda. Just Public Works.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion? No discussion.

MR. BOCCUZZI: What are they going to buy with the \$604.

MRS. HAWE: To tell you the truth, I don't know. We had the Traffic Department come in to talk about the Stark School and all that, but neglected to have Public Works come in to talk about the \$604.00. I assume it's going into their New Equipment Rolling Stock account which is quite a substantial account, and they want to close out that Bell Street account, and they are putting the \$604.00 in there. But, it is not going to buy much.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, would you like to speak to this?

MRS. MAIHOCK: My question was just answered. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. We'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of \$604.00 Capital budget close out and transfer Public Works New Equipment Rolling Stock. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 31 affirmative, and 4 not-voting.

(7) \$2,172,359.00 - FUNDING OF STATE LABOR BOARD'S BINDING ARBITRATION DECISION OF MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION (MEA) LABOR CONTRACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1981/1982 AND 1982/1983. Approved by Board of Finance 5/10/83; as follows:

F/Y 1981/1982:

994.9202 Retroactive Pay - City.....	\$ 441,035.
--- Retroactive Pay - Bd. of Ed.	125,850.
Pension.....	64,625.
F.I.C.A.....	<u>37,981.</u>

\$ 669,491.

F/Y 1982/1983:

Various Salary Accounts - City...\$	967,997.
Board of Education - Salaries....	<u>261,128.</u>
	\$1,229,125.

Various Permanent Part-time acct\$	39,200.
Various Overt-time accounts.	8,852.

290.1410 Classified Pension.....	140,120.
290.1310 F.I.C.A.....	<u>85,571.</u>

	<u>\$ 273,743.</u>	<u>\$1,502,868.</u>
		<u>\$2,172,359.</u>

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: If you will notice on the Agenda, this money is not for the upcoming year. That request will probably be before us next month. This is to pay for work that has already been done this year and the year before. \$669,491.00 is for fiscal year 81/82 and \$1,502,868.00 is for the current fiscal year. So, I make a motion to approve \$2,172,359.00 for the MEA labor contract binding arbitration decision.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. Is there a second? There is a second. Mr. Stork, Secondary Committee.

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee voted 6 in favor, 1 against for approval.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. Any discussion? No discussion, we're going to move right to a machine vote. We are voting on \$2,172,359.00 funding for the State Labor Board Binding Arbitration decision of Municipal Employees Association labor contract for fiscal years 81/82 and 82/83. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? You can vote yes, no, abstain, or not-vote. We need two-thirds to pass this. We need 24 votes. Has everyone voted? The motion is LOST 19 affirmative, 3 negative, 10 abstaining and 3 not-voting. The motion is LOST. (Upon reconsideration, approved - see page 17)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd like the record to show that the reason I abstained on the vote is because of a possible conflict.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

- (8) \$ 1,823.76 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET BY THE TRANSFER
(Transfer) of \$1,823.76 to Project #610.896 GAME COURT RECONSTRUCTION (Tennis Courts at Leone Park) to be financed by the TRANSFER from Project #610.808 Cummings Park Tennis Court Reconstruction, per Mayor's request. Approved by the Board of Finance 5/10/83, having received a favorable advisory opinion from the Planning Board.

MRS. HAWE: The Parks Department is requesting that the already completed Cummings Parks tennis court reconstruction project be closed out and the remaining balance of \$1,823.76 be transferred to project #610.896 which is entitled Game Court Reconstruction for tennis courts at Leone Park. This construction at Leone Park will be considered as part of the City's contribution to the grant for the West Side Improvement. Several years ago, we approved a grant for the West Side Parks including Jackie Robinson and Leone Park, and the City has to contribute some money towards it, and this money will go towards our share of that. I make a motion to approve the transfer of \$1,823.76 from Cummings Parks tennis courts to game court reconstruction.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. No discussion?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I don't mind voting the transfer to the next project, but what was the original appropriation. Do you have an idea of the original appropriation for the tennis courts to start with? I'm trying to find out how come we have so much left over from a project.

MRS. HAWE: The original for Cummings Park?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Yes, what they are transferring it out of.

MRS. HAWE: I don't remember but I can tell you that to reconstruct one tennis court, I believe it was close to \$20,000.00. They're very expensive and they did the six there at Cummings, I think. This is a very small percentage of what was appropriated.

MR. BOCCUZZI: The only reason why I brought it up is that it seems like a large amount to be left over from a project. Maybe too much money was asked for in the first place.

MRS. HAWE: Maybe, but it's a very small percentage of the total amount. It always comes in under or over; a little bit, a very small percentage.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of a transfer of \$1,823.76 to the Game Court Reconstruction to Leone Park from Cummings Park. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 29 affirmative, 2 abstaining, and 3 not-voting.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (9) \$ 1,500.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 562 PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE TRAINING AND SEMINAR MENTAL HEALTH GRANT - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 5/9/83, representing grant to be reimbursed totally by State to extend and complete the Nursing Mental Health Training Program on a regional basis. Approved by Board of Finance 5/10/83.

562.5340 Instructors for Seminar	\$	800.	
562.2942 Travel		82.	
562.2930 Materials and supplies		318.	
562.5120 Audit - State		200.	
562.2933 Books, printing & misc.		100.	\$1,500.
Previous Grant Balance - expended		<u>589.</u>	
			\$2,089.

MRS. HAWE: This is a grant which will be totally reimbursed by the State and the money includes funds for the extension of the Nursing Mental Health Training Program on a regional basis. Last year, we approved a grant that would enable nurses in the Stamford Health Department to take courses in mental health training to enable them to deal with patients who had been released from mental care facilities and also to teach them how to administer certain medication to these people. According to Dr. Gofstein, the program went so well that this grant will be to expand this mental health training on a regional basis to some surrounding towns. \$200.00 of this grant will also pay for an audit. The State has mandated that this grant be audited and there's is \$200.00 in this money to pay for this audit that the City has to do anyway. I would make a motion to approve \$1,500.00 for various codes in 562. entitled Public Health Nurse Training and Seminar Mental Health Grant.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Several seconds. One speaker.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you Madam Chairman to Mrs. Hawe, I note that the item "travel" has a very small amount compared to the other figures here. Where are they going, Marie?

MRS. HAWE: I believe it's in Bridgeport. Bridgeport Mental Health Center. That's why it's such a small amount.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There not being any further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on \$1,500.00 Health Department, Public Health Nurse Training and Seminar Mental Health Grant. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has been DEFEATED 23 affirmative, 3 nos, 3 abstentions, and 6 not-voting. The motion DID NOT PASS. Wait a minute, Mr. DeLuca. What's your number; we'll check your vote. You voted yes and what showed up there? Mr. DeLuca, it is a yes vote on the machine. (Note: See page 17 for reconsideration - approved)

MR. FRANCHINA: Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Franchina.

MR. FRANCHINA: It was defeated by what?

PRESIDENT SANTY: By one vote. We needed 24 votes. It was 23 affirmative, 3 negative, 3 abstaining, and 6 people were not-voting.

MR. FRANCHINA: Thank you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: That concludes the Agenda. However, there's several sheets of paper that were sent out on May 27, which include items that were inadvertently left off the Agenda for Steering last month, and I think we've all received them. There's ten items and I would like to Suspend the Rules to enable us to take these up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, there's a motion to Suspend the Rules to consider the items that were left off the Agenda. Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? We'll use the machine. The Chair is in doubt. We are voting on Suspending the Rules. If you want to Suspend the Rules, vote yes. If you're against Suspending the Rules, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion to Suspend the Rules has been DEFEATED 10 affirmative, 22 negative, and 3 not-voting.

- (10) \$ 6,700.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.3441 ALARMS SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 4/4/83. Approved by Board of Finance 4/21/83.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (11) \$ 5,900.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.2510 VEHICLE REPAIR - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 4/4/83. Approved by Board of Finance 4/21/83.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (12) \$ 25,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT (AMBULANCE) Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 4/20/83. Approved by Board of Finance 4/21/83, their amended agenda.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (13) \$ 7,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - Code 280.3532 EMERGENCY SIGNAL REPAIRS - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 4/4/83. Board of Finance approved 4/21/83.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

- (14) \$ 2,680.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Additional Appropriation requested Mayor Clapes 3/24/83 and attachment for:
- | | | |
|----------|------------|-------------------|
| 240.2923 | Photo-copy | \$1,500.00 |
| 240.2740 | Telephone | 1,180.00 |
| | | <u>\$2,680.00</u> |
- Board of Finance approved 4/21/83.

- (15) \$ 6,650.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET #687 DIVISION STREET TOT LOT - Board of Finance approved from their pending agenda after favorable opinion received from Planning Board 3/16/83. Finance approved 4/21/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (16) \$ 1,800.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.2930 STATIONERY & SUPPLIES
Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor 4/8/83. Board of Finance approved 4/21/83, their amended agenda.
- (17) \$ 4,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - by the addition of \$4,000 to the project known as #520.969 SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM EXPANSION; to be FINANCED BY BONDS, deficit spending authorized by Finance Board Chairman Everett Pollard 4/11/83 pursuant to Charter Section 619.9; Mayor's letter 4/14/83 and attachments to Planning Board, Boards of Finance and Representatives. Board of Finance approved 4/21/83, their amended agenda.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

- (18) \$ 62,200.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Additional Appropriation (various codes as below) per Mayor's request 4/18/83. Approved by Board of Finance 4/21/83, their amended agenda.

510.5130 Professional Medical Care	\$ 1,600.00
510.3610 General Hospitals	56,000.00
510.3612 Burials	4,000.00
510.2740 Telephone	600.00
	<u>\$62,200.00</u>

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

- (19) \$ 250,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3601 CASH RELIEF - Additional Appropriation per Mayor's request 4/18/83. Approved by Board of Finance 4/21/83, their amended agenda.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

(Note: Items 10 through 19 to be put on next Agenda)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, may I just ask as question that perhaps you can answer for us at some point, and I'm certain not now. There were many of us that were very confused by the covering letter to the additions, and it confused us in relation to the additions. I asked the Co-Chairman of the Committee John Hogan, if he had sent or he had requested such a letter and he indicated to us that he had not. I would just appreciate it if you would be kind enough to let me and, perhaps, the rest of the Board what had transpired because it was quite confusing in relations to the additions that came to us.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, Mrs. Goldstein. They were inadvertently left off the Steering Agenda. They were in the packet. They were not brought on to the Agenda through the office. When it was brought to my attention, I said that no letter would be sent out. I contacted Mr. Hogan. I couldn't reach Mrs. Hawe. I understood that no letter would be sent out, but they would consider them in Fiscal for a possible Suspension of the Rules. The letter was a surprise to me because it had Mr. Hogan's heading; that he was responsible for it. I did not authorize the letter and I think that's what confused many people. The letter was sent out without my authorization.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, do you have a question? A reconsideration?

MR. STORK: Yes, Madam President. I'd like to move for reconsideration of Fiscal item #7 and I did vote no on the item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: On item #7, it passed.

MR. STORK: No, it didn't.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #7, alright, fine.

MR. OWENS: I'd like to second that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want to move for reconsideration. You voted no and it did lose. You're on the prevailing side. There's a second to that. All in favor of reconsideration of #7, which is the funding of the State Labor Board's binding arbitration decision, Labor contract for fiscal years 81/82 and 82/83, please say aye. We're voting for reconsideration. We better use the machine. A motion has been made and duly seconded that this be reconsidered; the labor contract, #7 under Fiscal. Please use your machine if you want to reconsiderate it. It was defeated. Has everyone voted? A majority vote is necessary for reconsideration, and it has PASSED for reconsideration 19 affirmative, 12 negative, 1 abstaining and 3 not-voting. We will now move for reconsideration. Do you want to make a motion, Mr. Stork?

MR. STORK: Yes, Madam President. I move for approval of \$2,172,359.00 for the funding of the State Labor Board's Binding Arbitration Decision on the MEA Labor contract for fiscal years 81/82 and 82/83. (Note: See page 13 for item #7 of Fiscal)

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a second to that. Any discussion? No discussion, we are going to move right to a machine vote and we are voting on the approval, the funding of the State Labor Board's Binding Arbitration Decision on the Municipal Employees Labor contract for the fiscal years stated; \$2,172,359.00 so that you all know what you are voting on. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? We need 24 votes for approval of this contract. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted in the Caucus room? The motion has been DEFEATED. 23 affirmative, 2 negative, 8 abstaining and 2 not-voting. (Note: The motion had PASSED - see below for correct count)

MRS. HAWE: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Hawe. You need 24. Mr. Wiederlight, what did you want to vote?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I went from abstention to positive.

PRESIDENT SANTY: To yes. What is your number? We'll check.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: 38.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It was recorded as a yes on the printout. That's what you want?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: That's what I want, yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We still only have 23 affirmative.

The motion has PASSED 24 affirmative, 2 negative, 7 abstaining and 2 not-voting.
The motion has PASSED.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to make a motion to reconsider item #9, \$1,500.00 for the Health Department. I abstained.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, an abstention doesn't count, Mrs. Hawe. The Chair is in doubt. I'll ask the Parliamentarian for a ruling on that.

MR. HOGAN: An abstention is on the prevailing side, Madam Chairman, because it lost.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Because it lost. I accept the Parliamentarian's ruling. Fine. Do you want to make a motion to reconsider?

MRS. HAWE: Yes. I make a motion to reconsider.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to reconsideration? Seconded. All in favor of reconsideration, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to have to use the machine. We are voting on reconsideration of #9 under Fiscal, \$1,500.00 Health Department. This is a reconsideration. Has everyone voted? We're voting on the reconsideration.

MRS. PERILLO: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I ask a question? There were times, I should do through you to Mr. Hogan, when others abstained and asked for a reconsideration, and they were told "no." It was either a yes or a no, the only ones that could reconsider. I'm not a lawyer, but I do understand a few things in the Charter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Perillo. The Parliamentarian rules that an abstention was on the prevailing side because it lost and I accepted that ruling. I don't know what happened previously, but the Parliamentarian ruled that at this time. The motion to reconsider has PASSED 22 affirmative, 6 negative and 6 not-voting. Now, would you make a motion, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: (Note: See page 15 for item #9 of Fiscal) I move for the approval of \$1,500.00 for the Health Department Code 562 Public Health Nurse Training and Seminar Mental Health Grant.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Any discussion? We're going to move right to a vote. We are voting on approval for the second time, of \$1,500.00 Health Department Public Nurse Training and Seminar Mental Health Grant. Has everyone voted? We need 24 votes, Ladies and Gentlemen. The motion PASSED 25 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 3 not-voting. The motion PASSED on a reconsideration.

MRS. HAWE: That concludes my report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. Thank you very much Madam President. At this time, I received a request from members of the audience here this evening, and I'd like to move that we Suspend our Rules to take an item out of order. It is item 2 under the Legislative and Rules Committee. Just for information purposes, it deals with the final adoption of a proposed ordinance requesting a \$ 1.00 to City-owned property to New Neighborhoods for building much needed housing in Stamford and I so move. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're moving for a Suspension of the Rules. Seconded. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? We'll use the machine. If you are in favor of Suspending the Rules, vote yes. If you are against, vote no. Has everyone voted? We're voting on Suspending the Rules to take an item out of order on the Agenda. Has everyone voted? The motion to Suspend the Rules has PASSED 24 yes, 7 no, and 4 not-voting.

- (2) FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL - MAYOR LOUIS CLAPES' REQUEST TO GIVE FOR \$1.00 CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (SOUTHWEST CORNER OF WEST MAIN STREET AND GREENWICH AVENUE) TO NEW NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. - (URC returned portion of this land to City as no longer needed.) Dwelling units to be sold for approx. \$60,000.00 each. Mayor's letter 4/8/83. Single-family, owner-occupied housing to be provided. Approved for publication 5/2/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to move that we now discuss item 2 under Legislative and Rules. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You or Mr. Conti, is going to move for adoption?

MR. ZELINSKI: Mr. Conti, will give the report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, do you want to give the report on this item, please? You have to share the mike.

MR. CONTI: Thank you. This went through Committee and it passed 6 - 0. It was going to go on the Consent Agenda and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a second to that. Any discussion?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would not agree with the Consent Agenda. I certainly agree that New Neighborhoods is a fine concept, but I do not believe City-owned property should be used for any other than City-use.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I'd like to congratulate New Neighborhoods and the work that they've been doing over the past few years; taking some of blighted sections of Stamford and turning them around into viable, living communities where people are happy and able to, for the first time, own their own home.

I would like to bring one thing to the Board's attention that the State of Connecticut has identified \$100,000.00 for in-field projects which is only available for residential development on City-owned land that's to be developed for future use for moderate housing. Provision of this particular in-field project is that the City must put forth an in-kind donation such as land. The appraised value of the land is about a \$100,000.00 which amounts to the in-field identified \$100,000.00 for this project being given by the State. I think that, certainly, this whole section of Stamford can be turned around. I think it's a worthwhile cause and I would urge the Board's support for this item. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. ZELINSKI: (end of tape - dialogue lost)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Corner of West Main Street and Greenwich Avenue to New Neighborhoods, Inc. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 30 affirmative, 4 negative, and 1 not-voting.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Transportation Committee did not have aquorum for the evening. So, we will discuss this matter at our next Committee meeting.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE LIMITATION OF TRUCK TRAFFIC ON CITY STREETS - submitted by Rep. Guroian and B. Conti 5/6/83. Has been reviewed and approved by Corp. Counsel Fraser.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday night, June 1, at 8:00 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Members of the Committee present were Reps. Dziezyc, Gaipa, Gershman, Dixon, Dudley, Jachimczyk, and myself. Other members of our Broad present were Reps. McInerney, Wiederlight, and Wider.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT FUND 1/13/83, for Cost-of-Living adjustments to pensions of retirees. Returned to Committee 2/9, 3/7, 4/4, and 5/2/83.

MR. STORK: Mr. Canavan who represented the Mayor at a previous Personnel Committee on this item, flatly stated at that time on three separate occasions in response to direct questioning, that this resolution would not cost the City any money. That was a suspicious pill for our Committee to swallow, and our suspicions did not go unfounded. Thanks to information supplied by the Martin Segal Company and an in-person explanation of same by Finance Commissioner Marra, the Personnel Committee has learned that the "no cost" to the City of Stamford actually amounts to \$1,470,000.00. Therefore, the Personnel Committee voted unanimously to defeat a motion to approve this Cost-of-Living adjustment resolution by a vote of none in favor and 7 opposed. Likewise, I move for approval of this resolution with the reminder that the Personnel Committee unanimously recommends that this Board votes no.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. There's a motion on the Floor to approve the resolution of the Classified Employees Retirement Fund bearing in mind that the Personnel Committee unanimously voted to reject this proposal. Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Per Section 754 of the Charter, 27 affirmative votes are necessary. Any discussion? We're going to move right to a machine vote. Mr. Wider, did you want to speak to this?

MR. WIDER: Yes, I certainly do.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider would like to speak.

MR. WIDER: I am indeed surprised at some of what I heard. I know many people who have served many years with this City, and who today are suffering, and here we are holding up money that's already available to them on some technicality that some public servant comes forth and gives the wrong information.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: (continuing) I talked with some Trustees. They personally called me. I didn't call them; they called me, and they asked me how could the Board act in this way. I am really concerned at what they are really doing with the Trustees. I think the Trustees must know what they are doing. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you to the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee, Mr. Stork, I have two questions. The first one being, which specific classified employees does this cover and the second question is since this Board has been in existence, have we granted any cost-of-living adjustment to any other retirees of the City? Thank you very much, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, can you answer those questions? The second question is readily available. There was an adjustment in 1972. Now, if I understand his first question, if you could just clarify your first question, Mr. Zelinski?

MR. ZELINSKI: I think I'd rather clarify my second one first. I meant not this particular group of employees, Mr. Stork, but any other employees of the City, have they been granted any type of cost-of-living increase since this Board has been in existence? Any group of City employees whether they be classified or unclassified or what have you.

MR. STORK: Not to my recollection, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you. The first question was simply which group of classified employees does this cover in the City? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Can you answer that, Mr. Stork?

MR. STORK: I'd have to look it up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Okay, fine. While we're waiting, Mr. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I, from the beginning, was very reluctant at some of the statements made before the Committee. Mr. Stork said it very well. We were told that this item was a full-funded item. We find out it is not a full-funded item. We were told that it would be of no cost to the City, and through much debate we found out it would cost \$1,470,000.00 a year. During the funding period, it could amount to \$10 million. That is the only reason that I can't support this. Along with some other problems, I have to question whether people are telling us the truth. If they lied to us before, are they going to lie to us again, and when someone comes before a Committee and after being questioned a number of times and saying, "yes, yes, yes," and find out the answer is no, no, no, I don't like to see any one who is a retired person suffer, but I can't support something like this. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley. Mr. Stork, do you have an answer to that question?

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: Mr. Zelinski, the best way I can answer it is that this applies to the retirees of the classified pension fund.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. It's on the proposed resolution from the Board of Trustees of the Classified Employees' Retirement Fund cost-of-living adjustment to pensions of retirees. Please use your machine. The recommendation from Personnel is to approved although the Committee voted negative. Has everyone voted? One moment, we're having difficulty with the machine. I'm sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen, we had a little malfunction with the machine. We'll vote over again. We are voting on the approval of the cost-of-living adjustment to the retirees of the classified employees' retirement fund. 27 votes are needed for passage. Has everyone voted? Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask you to please come and vote if you would like to. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 11 affirmative, 21 negative, and 2 not-voting.

- (2) REQUEST FROM REP. ELIZABETH GERSHMAN FOR: INVESTIGATION INTO THE FEASIBILITY OF FREEZING THE ENTRANCE OF ALL EMPLOYEES CURRENTLY EMPLOYED IN ANY CAPACITY BY THE CITY INTO THE CITY PENSION FUND AND MEDICAL BENEFITS, UNLESS SUCH EMPLOYEES ARE NEW EMPLOYEES AND QUALIFY FOR ENTRANCE. Held in Committee 5/2/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: Thank you. The Committee, thanks to the diligent research by Rep. Gershman, has come up with a proposed ordinance dealing with this situation which I have forwarded to you, Madam President, for a placement on next month's agenda, along with a rewording of this item. The Committee approved of submitting this proposed ordinance unanimously by a vote of 7 in favor and none opposed.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO GRANT TO 23 EMPLOYEES OF THE STAMFORD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EXPANDED LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE (to the lowest thousand of any employee's annual salary) as per list of job titles submitted, to be paid for from Community Development funds - submitted by Mayor Clapes 5/4/83 and Nancy Mitchell 4/20/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: The cost of this coverage is only \$390.00 per year and is fully reimbursable from federal funds. The Personnel Committee voted unanimously 6 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention to approved this proposed resolution, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several second. Public Housing and Community Development Committee, do you have a report? You are the Secondary Committee.

MR. WIDER: We did not have a quorum, Madam Chairman. I move for the...

PRESIDENT SANTY: We don't. You don't have to do that. Mr. Stork, any other questions? Any other speakers? We are going to move right to a machine vote. The vote is on the proposed resolution to grant 23 employees of the

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SANTY: (continuing) Stamford Community Development Program expanded life insurance coverage.

MR. DUDLEY: Just a point of information. It is now 21 employees.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's 21. Thank you, Mr. Dudley. 21. Please use your machine. Mr. Stork, it's 21?

MR. STORK: Madam President, I believe the resolution is correct at 23. There are two vacancies at the moment. So, those slots will stay there.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 21 affirmative, 5 negative, and 7 not-voting.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO CREATE POSITION OF "SAFETY AND TRAINING OFFICER" - submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding 3/21/83. Also 5/5 Rep. Wiederlight's letter to Risk Manager.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: Invited to address this matter were Rep. Wiederlight, Commissioner Spaulding, and Risk Manager Ingrid Center. Rep. Wiederlight was the only individual to show up. Ingrid Center had previously written me that she could not attend due to prior appointments.

At the time of our meeting, Madam President, Commissioner Spaulding was a no show. It wasn't until I arrived home after the meeting, that I received a letter from Commissioner Spaulding, dated May 26, 1983, stating that both he and his Productivity Planner would not be available for our meeting. The final paragraph of Commissioner Spaulding's letter is so ludicrous, Madam President, that I've had it placed on everyone's desk tonight; draw your own conclusions.

Two Public Works employees have died in the City since December, 1983, Madam President. It is preposterous to imagine that those individuals in our Administration, responsible for doing what they can to protect our employees lives, can't find time to attend our meeting for the reasons given, is beyond me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, I wish you would limit your remarks to the item on the Agenda; no personalities, please.

MR. STORK: I am, Madam President. The Personnel Committee voted unanimously 7 in favor and none opposed to hold this item in Committee for one more month. As Chairman of this Committee, I urge you, Madam President, to use the power of your office to see that the requested individuals attend our next meeting scheduled for July 6, or I will recommend to Steering, the removal of this item from the August Agenda until such time as a cooperating individual sits in the Chair of Commissioner of Public Works.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, please limit your remarks to the items on the Agenda. We are not making personal attacks on any one this evening.

MR. STORK: One final word. Even if it means waiting until the 18th Board of Representatives. As a courtesy to Mr. Wiederlight, Madam President, I would like to yield the Floor to him at this time.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President and Mr. Stork. I, indeed, did attend this meeting out of concern for the safety, health and welfare of all of the City workers. This item placed on the Agenda is in itself a complex one, and not as simple as it may seem or you might recognize by virtue of the letter of May 26, by Commissioner Spaulding.

This item raises certain other questions which, I am sure, should be answered by our approving or not approving a safety training officer. For example, 1. Do we have a safety program right now enforced for City employees? Does this safety program, if it exists, include the Public Works Department? If not, why not? If so, why does the Public Works Department need its own safety training officer? I would also like to know how many other municipalities have the safety training officer report directly to the Public Works Commissioner versus the other governmental head such as Risk Manager, City Manager or Mayor. This item when it was originally put before the Steering Committee of the Board of Representatives was do so the night of Steering, and the Steering Committee was castigated publicly for not putting it on the Agenda, but keeping to the Rules of the Board, but yet it was so important for this item to be put on the Agenda and the full Board to be castigated in the press, but yet the people that did make this criticism of this Board, did not show up to put this important item before the Personnel Committee. I think that's a shame.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

- (5) FACTFINDER PETER R. BLUM'S REPORT OF MAY 4, 1983 ON LOCAL 464, COUNCIL 4, AFSCME, STAMFORD REGISTERED NURSES, CASE #8182-MBA-195 - 8% increase each for years beginning 7/1/81 and 7/1/82. Received 5/6/83.

Above also referred to LABOR LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: Rep. Dudley left the Floor of our meeting on this item and did not participate.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Stork. I'm very sorry. There are two speakers. Do you want to speak to the item that was held in Committee the safety and training officer? I'm sorry, Mr. Stork.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I heard you lash-out at the Chairman of our Committee for doing a job, and I think he's right. I think he's right because we are dealing with human lives here, okay. If we have people on the payroll that aren't concerned about our human life, I recommended to the Personnel Committee the other night, that they should be eliminated, and they should be eliminated before we lose two more lives in Stamford. I am upset about the fact that something isn't done and no cooperation being offered; the Committee just wants to deal with the safety officer. This upsets me to see that my tax money is going to pay a man that is this careless with our people. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, Mr. Wider, but this Board does not get into personal attacks on this item and it was submitted by the Commissioner. A report is fine, but no personal attacks. It's clearly stated in Roberts' Rules.

MR. ZELINSKI: The only comment I had, Madam President, was that the Committee Chairman, Mr. Stork, mentioned this item was being held. We shouldn't even be discussing it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I agree with you, Mr. Zelinski.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: I have to agree that maybe the item shouldn't be discussed, but I also have to agree with the President of our Board who is only trying to adhere to the Roberts' Rules of Order. We are here to discuss the items on the Agenda; not to discuss personalities. I think that when we begin to discuss personalities and chastise people in the manner that has been done this evening, doesn't serve our Board any justice. I think we should refrain from that in the future.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

- (5) FACTFINDER PETER R. BLUM'S REPORT OF MAY 4, 1983 ON LOCAL 464, COUNCIL 4, AFSCME, STAMFORD REGISTERED NURSES, CASE #8182-MBA-195 - 8% increase each for years beginning 7/1/81 and 7/1/82. Received 5/6/83.

Above also referred to LABOR LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: Rep. Dudley left the Floor on this item and did not participate. This is a two-year contract running from July 1, 1982, to June 30, 1984, and it's fully retroactive. The contract offers an 8% wage increase during each of the two years, resulting in a salary cost to the City of \$237,470.00 and with fringes added in, there is a grand total of \$238,853.90 in costs to the City.

The 8% increases are about twice what our Committee is an affordable raise supported by comments from Commissioner Marra, and we voted unanimously none in favor and 6 opposed for approval. I move for approval of the Factfinder's report on the Stamford Registered Nurses with the reminder that the Personnel Committee unanimously recommends a vote of no.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're making a motion to approve the Factfinder's report bearing in mind that your Committee voted unanimously to no. Is there a second to that motion to approve the Factfinder's report on this? Seconded. Secondary Committee, Labor Liaison Committee.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you very much. The Labor Liaison Committee met in conjunction with the Personnel Committee on June 1. Unfortunately, there were three members present: Mr. Dudley, Mr. Stork and myself, therefore, we did not have a quorum and we're not able to obtain a vote both this and the next contract.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you, and I think the record should state that Mr. Dudley is off the Floor during the debate and will not partake in this vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you to the Chairman Mr. Stork, if this is defeated tonight, what happens as far as this contract goes and #2, if the answer is that it goes to binding arbitration, and the arbitrator comes back with a recommendation as they did not in the City's favor but in the union's favor as was the Municipal Employees, will then we have to vote to accept this even though it is three or four months down the road? Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I can't let that statement go by without some kind of an answer. He said, "What happens?" I don't know if Mr. Stork wishes to answer, but there is a meeting that is going to be held by the Labor Liaison Committee within a couple of weeks, next week, and I can assure you that we are going to make some recommendations to the Administration of our feelings so that, maybe there will be a

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing) different recommendation from the City when it goes to arbitration. I don't want anybody to feel that if we vote no, not to accept this that we're going to get stuck with 8 or 8½. We do have alternatives, and we are going to start working on them next week. So, don't let that decide your vote as to what happened with the last contract.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Boccuzzi and Mrs. McInerney are Co-Chairpersons of the Labor Liaison Committee, Mr. Zelinski, so it's proper for him to answer that. Mr. Stork, do you have anything further to add?

MR. STORK: Just that Mr. Zelinski did ask a particular question and the answer is should we vote no on this tonight, it does go to binding arbitration. Any other speakers?

MR. ZELINSKI: Excuse, me. My question wasn't answered by the Mr. Boccuzzi or Mr. Stork. The question I'll repeat again for the record was that twofold: #1. If this is rejected, does it go to binding arbitration? That question was answered. Secondly, if the arbitrator votes or shall we say, yes, I guess votes in favor of the union which would be 8% which is on the board now, will we be indeed bound to approve it as we were the Municipal Employees Association being they asked for the same thing of 8%? That was my question. I'd like an answer. Thank you, Madam President.

MR. STORK: When the binding arbitration award comes back to this Board, Mr. Zelinski, the next procedure for this Board would be to vote on the funding of his award.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. HOGAN: Just one question through the Chair to either Mr. Boccuzzi or Mrs. McInerney. Will they as the Labor Liaison Committee be meeting with Representatives of the employees involved also as well as the City?

MRS. MCINERNEY: We don't have a planned meeting with them at the present time, Mr. Hogan. We aren't the negotiators; we're just questioning the negotiator and the Mayor.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote. We are voting on the Factfinder Peter R. Blum's report of May 4, 1983 on Local 464, Council 4, AFSCME, Stamford Registered Nurses, 8% increase. We're voting on the Factfinder's report. A majority vote is necessary. A majority of those present and voting. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? I'll give you an opportunity to come out of the Caucus Rooms. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 5 affirmative, 18 negative, 5 abstaining, and 7 not-voting. The motion has LOST.

- (6) FACTFINDER PETER R. BLUM'S REPORT OF 5/4/83 ON LOCAL 1083, AFSCME, COUNCIL 4, STAMFORD SCHOOL CUSTODIANS, CASE #8182-MBA-183 - 8½% increase for the first year, and 8% for the second year, constituting a two-year contract.

Above also referred to LABOR LIAISON COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: This is also a two-year contract running from July 1, 1982, to June 30, 1984, and is fully retroactive. The contract offers an 8½% increase in the first year and an 8% increase in the second year resulting in a salary cost to the City of \$873,259.00 and when you add in the cost of fringes which are \$20,174.20, you get a total cost of \$893,433.20. Again, these percentage increases are about twice what we think is fair, and have voted none in favor and 7 opposed for approval. I move for approval of the Factfinder's report on the Stamford School Custodians with the reminder that the Personnel Committee unanimously recommends a vote of no.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Thank you, Mr. Stork. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to either Mr. Boccuzzi or Rep. McInerney, the Co-Chairpersons of the Labor Liaison Committee, I just like to know for my own information what type of influence and how binding is any recommendation from our Labor Liaison Committee to the Mayor inasmuch as that the recommendations have already been put in and this is what the City is recommending so what is the Labor Liaison Committee going to do to influence the decision of the Administration or the union? I'd just like to know for my own information. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, would you like to answer that?

MR. BOCCUZZI: First of all, I think the Liaison Committee strictly could put some input on how we feel. Nothing we tell them will be binding, but I don't know if I misunderstood what John said or not, the Factfinder's report is not the recommendation of the City. John, I think that's what you said.

What they did was take the City's position and the union's position and then the Factfinder decided how it should go. All we are saying is that we are going to discuss the City's position for the time when we go to binding arbitration. Because when you go to binding arbitration, both sides have to prepare and present a brief. Before they go to binding arbitration, maybe the City can sit down with the union again if some changes could be made, and that's what we're hoping we could do. What we're trying to do is get away from the 8%.

MR. ZELINSKI: I wasn't finished, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, at some point you have to finish your questioning. Continue.

MR. ZELINSKI: I only asked one question. Are we limited to how many questions we can ask, Madam President, because others have asked.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, continue, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: To continue, through you Madam President to Rep. Boccuzzi, just so I understand how I'm going to be voting on this this evening, it is my understanding as Rep. Boccuzzi mentioned, that the Factfinding is not binding, okay, but it is my understanding that now that it would go to binding arbitration, the arbitrator would either pick one of the two offers; 1. The union's position which in this case is 8½%; 2. The City's which is zero percent. It's either one or the other, there's no middle ground. So, I'm just wondering what we're accomplishing by putting off the inevitable; we're going to have to vote approval for this if the arbitrator votes in favor of this based on the other City Municipal

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) Employees union that has already been approved. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, will you answer or Mrs. McInerney?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Zelinski, the Factfinder's report is done by somebody who is an impartial judge picked and satisfied by both groups. If this Factfinder's report is turned down, the City has the right to make, I think it's the right of the last best offer and technically, if it's possible, they can reopen negotiations before going into binding arbitration. Binding arbitration is a group of people that would be picked to come out and whatever the decision is, we are stuck with it.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. The question is on #6 under Personnel, Factfinder Peter Blum's report, Stamford School Custodians 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ % increase; #6 under Personnel. A majority vote is necessary. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Yes, Mr. Blais. We voted on moving the question. We are voting on the item on the Agenda. #6 under Personnel concerning the Factfinder's report on the School custodians. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 3 affirmative, 20 negative, 5 abstaining, and 2 not-voting.

(7) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING S.H.A.P.E. (HEALTH DEPT.) OMBUDSMAN TO RECEIVE MEDICARE BENEFITS PER ASST. CORP. COUNSEL ALICE PERRY'S LETTER AND TO BE REIMBURSED FOR PREMIUMS HE PAID.

MR. STORK: Item #7 is a proposed resolution authorizing the Controller to reimburse medical payments previously granted for the SHAPE Ombudsman per Board Resolution No. 1038, such reimbursement totaling \$1,288.00. We are going this route at the direction of Corporation Counsel's office. The Personnel Committee voted unanimously 7 in favor and none against for approval and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I'm very happy to see this coming up for approval. It was requested by me at the last Board; unfortunately, it wasn't successful. This does affect one of my constituents. It is justifiable and he is deserving of it and I would urge my colleagues to please approve it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. Being there are no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote and it's on the proposed resolution authorizing SHAPE Ombudsman to receive medicare benefits and to be reimbursed for the premiums he paid. Is there an amount there, Mrs. McInerney?

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, it's \$1,288.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: \$1,288.00. This is an appropriation resolution and 21 votes are necessary. Please use your machine. The motion PASSED 25 affirmative, 2 negative, and 8 not-voting.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: That concludes the report of the Personnel Committee, Madam President, and in a week of difficulty for everybody attending their Committee meetings, I'd like to thank my Committee for everybody showing up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen David Blum & Lathon Wider

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Public Housing & Community Development Committee met on May 25, 1983. Committee members present at the meeting were Mr. John Roos, Mrs. Ann King Saxe, Mr. David Blum, and your truly, Lathon Wider. Mr. Ted Lewis from the Planning Board attended for a brief minute to report on item 1.

- (1) REQUEST THAT BOARD CONSIDER THE SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON COLD SPRING ROAD (LOTS S/7, S/8 and S/10) for \$60,000 to MR. FRANK PELLI - Mayor Clapes and Nancy Mitchell's letter 2/9/83; and Atty. Howard Shiffman of Epifanio, Tooher & Shiffman's letter 2/9/83, for housing development with 4 units with sale price limit of \$93,000 and 4 units to be \$105,000; or lower, if interest rates permit Board of Finance has this on their Pending Agenda; their 5/10/83 meeting minutes state "Deferred pending an appraisal, info from Assessor's Office and Planning Board advisory opinion." Held in Board's Committee 5/2/83. (awaiting Planning Board)

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. WIDER: Mr. Lewis reported that the Planning Board had voted to hold the land for one-family housing and has been no further vote taken on item 1.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, you're holding item #1?

MR. WIDER: It's remaining the same. They're holding it, not me; the Planning Board is holding it up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, thank you.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE EMERGENCY JOBS PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD FOR \$323,000 - submitted by Nancy Mitchell, Director of Community Development, 5/18/83, including back-up material, budget, etc.

MR. WIDER: The Public Housing and Community Development Committee met on May 18, 1983, at 5:00 p.m. in the Mayor's Conference Room to review and finalize the Community Development Emergency Jobs Program Budget totaling \$323,000.00. This meeting climaxed the budget preparation process that began in April, 1983. The Mayor's office and the Committee held a public hearing on May 5, 1983, to review the new Community Development Emergency Jobs Program legislation, to receive citizens' comments ^{on} Community Development performance including housing needs, receive citizens' comments on proposals, emergency priority plan statements and objectives on Emergency Jobs Program proposals.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: (continuing) The Public Housing & Community Development Committee received all of the submitted Emergency Jobs Program proposals in depth and had developed a balanced budget. Did all the Board members receive a copy of the budget? Okay, and if you had time to review that, then I would move the following resolution: To authorize the Mayor of the City of Stamford...I'll read the resolution.

"Whereas, the City of Stamford, Connecticut is entitled to receive \$323,000.00 for Community Development Emergency Jobs Program, and

"Whereas, the funds are subject to filing of application and final statements of Community Development objectives and projects use of funds and related forms and completion of all citizen participation.

"Be it resolved that the Mayor is authorized to file the Emergency Jobs Program Application final statement of the Community Development objectives and projected use of the funds and related forms for the Community Development Program including and understanding assurance contained therein, the Mayor is directed and authorized to act in connection with the application a final statement of Community Development and projects use of the funds and related forms to provide such additional information as maybe required.

"The above resolution shall take effect upon its adoption."

And, I so move, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the resolution as read by Mr. Wider. It's #2 under Public Housing and Community Development.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would just like the record to show that Mr. Wider did state those that were present, I was absent but I was on a long, overdue, two-day vacation and I was vacationing in Connecticut.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I did not concur with the rest of the panel on this particular grant. The reason being, the resolution that is made before you is part of the entitlement program of the United States Government which we are all a part. The money to fund this program is coming directly from your Federal income tax. Although there are parts of money that I feel is going to be well spent and the productivity will be accountable in the use and return of the program, I feel that most of the money we request is another way of stocking continuing programs that are not cost-effective and the accountability is questioned. Therefore, at this time, I feel that we should not ask for the complete entitlement of \$320,000. The amount that we should request is for the following programs: The Greenwich Youth Shelter \$17,700; the Food Program driver, a contract for 1 year's salary \$12,000; the Council of Churches staff person for a 1 year contract \$13,000; and the City Administration costs which are the indirect costs to us as taxpayers of \$5,000. This coming to \$47,700, therefore, I move to request that the Mayor of the City of Stamford apply for a grant of no more than \$50,000. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe, you're going to have to put that in writing; that motion, please and hand it to me and repeat it. You are amending the resolution. You are amending the resolution as proposed. You're changing it and what is your motion? Please repeat it.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SAXE: I move that we request the Mayor of the City of Stamford to apply for a grant of no more \$50,000.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. SAXE: Would you like me to type this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: As long as your writing is legible, I'll accept it writing. A motion has been made by Mrs. Saxe and seconded by Mrs. Conti to authorized the Mayor to apply for a grant of \$50,000.00. Any discussion?

MR. WIDER: Under the regulations, I'm sorry but this cannot be accomplished. You must take the grant or you lose it. I think that we can hurt more people by not taking it than we can by trying to cut it and losing the whole thing. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider. There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the motion made by Mrs. Saxe and seconded by Mrs. Conti to authorize the Mayor to apply for a grant of not more than \$50,000. Please use your machine for a vote if you're in favor of the resolution as proposed by Mrs. Saxe. Please use your machine for a vote. Mr. Flounders has left. We now have 34 members present. Has everyone voted? Mr. Flounders is ill by the way; he had to leave and he did request to leave the meeting. The motion is LOST 6 affirmative, 21 negative and 7 not-voting.

We will now return to Mr. Wider's resolution for final adoption. There has been a motion made and seconded. We are now going to move right to a machine vote on Mr. Wider's resolution which is the proposed authorization asking the Mayor to file Emergency Jobs Program Application for the Community Development Program of the City for \$323,000. Please use your machine for a vote. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 25 affirmative, 4 negative, and 6 not-voting.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman, that ends my report and I want to thank the Committee who has worked on two very strenuous programs in 1983 and I pray that we don't have another. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

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

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to report that my Co-Chairperson is vacationing in Texas. That is the reason he's isn't here to give the report. We have no report. Thank you.

- (1) THE MATTER OF THE AVAILABILITY OF TELEPHONES IN DOWNTOWN AREAS. Submitted by Rep. Dudley. Held 3/7 and 4/4. Report made 5/2/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) LETTER OF 4/29/83 FROM 19TH DISTRICT REP. AUDREY MAIHOCK regarding problems with markings of exit signs, etc.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT SANTY: Both items are held, Ms. Summerville?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Yes.

MR. WIDERLIGHT: Madam President, if I may go back a second to Ms. Summerville?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIDERLIGHT: What is this item #2 on the Agenda under Urban Renewal, if I may ask?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Summerville, would you like to address it or shall be ask Mrs. Maihock, the maker? It's being held anyway.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I was not at Steering. I was vacationing that week. I have no idea. I cannot talk about it. I wouldn't like any debate on it until the Committee decides whether Steering should have it on the Agenda or not; we haven't had a chance to discuss it with them. It was placed there without my presence. I will speak to the person who submitted it and try to have an idea for the next meeting.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Based on Ms. Summerville's answer, I will not pursue this any further. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT - Co-Chairwomen Barbara DeGaetani & Mary Lou Rinaldi

MS. DeGAETANI: E, W, & G met this evening at quarter to seven. All five members were present. The only business that we had was items on which we were the Secondary Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani.

MR. DZIEZYC: I would like to move for Suspension of the Rules to consider an item not on the Agenda. This is the sheet of paper that you had regarding the closing of the Toquam and Riverbank Schools; Suspension of the Rules.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc has a motion to Suspend the Rules to consider the resolutions on our desks. Is there a second to Suspending the Rules? Several Seconds. We are now going to vote to Suspend the Rules. Let's go right to a machine vote on Suspending the Rules. Please use your machine if you want to Suspend the Rules. We're Suspending the Rules to consider the resolution we have on our desks. We need two-thirds vote; 23 votes. Has everyone voted? The motion to Suspend the Rules has FAILED 19 affirmative, 7 negative, and 8 not-voting. We need 23 for two-thirds.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Handy Dixon and Mary Jane Signore

MRS. SIGNORE: The Appointments Committee met Thursday evening, June 2, 7 o'clock in the Democratic Caucus Room. In attendance were Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. Conti, Ms. DeGaetani, Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Dixon, Mrs. Perillo, Ms. Summerville and Mrs. Signore. Eight of our nine Committee members were present.

I'd like to move the following items on to the Consent Agenda: Item #3, Mr. Richard Mollo for the Board of Recreation, term to expire December 1, 1983 and it is the correct date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Mollo on Consent.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #8 for Consent, Mr. Rocco Colatrella, Zoning Board of Appeals Alternate; term to expire December 1, 1986.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti? Mr. Colatrella off Consent.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #9, Mr. James Rubino, Fair Rent Commission; term to expire December 1, 1987.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rubino is on Consent.

COMMISSION ON AGING

(1)	<u>MS. JANET WEINTRAUB (D)</u>	Re-appointment	<u>Term Expires</u> Dec. 1, 1985
	100 Wedgemere Road		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: Ms. Weintraub was held. She was unable to attend the Appointments Committee meeting.

FAIR RENT - ALTERNATE

(2)	<u>MR. GERALD LONGO (D)</u>	Replacing R. Ramos whose	Dec. 1, 1987
	11 Hearthstone Court	term expired.	

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Longo is a long-term City worker who has retired recently. He expressed an earnest desire to aid in judging a fair rent not only for the elderly but for all of the people. He impressed the Committee as being very sincere in his attempt and wishes to serve the City. The vote was 6 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made...(end of tape) Discussion?

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to the Co-Chair of Appointments, was it brought out in your Committee meeting that Mr. Longo was a renter or a homeowner?

MRS. SIGNORE: It was. He is a homeowner.

MR. STORK: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other discussion? We'll move right to a machine vote on the Appointment of Mr. Gerald Longo, an Alternate to the Fair Rent Commission. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Mr. Longo has been CONFIRMED by a vote of 25 affirmative, 2 abstaining, and 7 not-voting.

BOARD OF RECREATION

(3)	<u>MR. RICHARD MOLLO (D)</u>	Replacing P. Woodard who	Dec. 1, 1983
	24 Cody Drive	resigned.	

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

(4) <u>MR. WILLIAM CARLUCCI</u> (D)	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1987
84 Rachele Avenue		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Carlucci is held. He was unable to attend the Appointment Committee slot for him. (Note: Agenda shows Mr. Carlucci for Bd. of Recreation)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

(5) <u>MR. PAUL J. KUCZO</u> (D)	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
239 Briar Brae Road		

WITHDRAWN

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Kuczo's name was withdrawn by the Mayor citing City Ordinance which created the Environmental Protection Board states the limitation of time to be served as a member of that Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mrs. Signore. It has been requested would you give the Committee report on the interview with Mr. Kuczo although his name was withdrawn. It's been requested that a Committee report be given.

MRS. SIGNORE: The Committee report stated first of all, that Mr. Kuczo had a very good record of attendance. He said 90% attendance. He's a biology teacher. He's been a very active member of the Environmental Protection Board. He talked at great length about the greenbelt. Extremely knowledgeable on the 100 year storm situation; the floodplains, the flood encroachment lines, and he said that the biggest problem they have in the City right now are doing things against the wetlands. We found him extremely knowledgeable and the vote was 7 in favor and 1 opposed. That was before we had the letter from the Mayor requesting his name be withdrawn.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(6) <u>MR. PAUL PACTER</u> (D)	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
247 Chestnut Hill Road		

MRS. MAIHOCK: Point of information. Was it permissible for me to say something about Mr. Kuczo? No.

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Pacter would be a reappointment to the Human Rights Commission. Mr. Pacter has a very impressive educational and employment background. He's a Michigan State University graduate with a PHD in business administration. He's an executive director of a financial accounting foundation; an executive assistant to the chairman of Financial Accounting Standards Board. The Financial Standards Board, Accounting Standards Board is the board that sets the standards and reviews procedures for certified public accountants. It's a very prestigious group. He impressed us as being extremely knowledgeable. He said that the changes in cases today are virtually employment related dealing with the large corporations who often times have heavy legal staffs. He said that six or seven years ago, the cases were mostly racial discrimination and he said now the rights of women,

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGNORE: (continuing) children, the handicapped and city contracts are what really are using the Human Right Commission. We were very impressed with him and the Committee voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to confirm the appointment of Mr. Paul Pacter to the Human Rights Commission. Any discussion? We'll move right to a machine vote on the confirmation of Mr. Paul Pacter to the Human Rights Commission. Has everyone voted? We are voting on the confirmation of Mr. Paul Pacter for the Human Rights Commission. Mr. Pacter is confirmed by a vote of 24 affirmative, 1 negative, 1 abstaining, and 9 not-voting.

Mr. Owens has left the meeting, and he has notified the Chair. We now have 33 members present.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY

(7) <u>MS. KATIE JANNICKY</u> (D) 96 Alexandra Drive	Re-Appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
---	----------------	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: The Committee voted unanimously to hold her at this time.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - ALTERNATE

(8) <u>MR. ROCCO COLATRELLA</u> (D) 302 Vine Road	Replacing B. Daley whose term expired.	Dec. 1, 1986
--	---	--------------

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Rocco Colatrella is well known to most of us on this Board. He has served on this Board, on the Board of Education, on the Board of Tax Review. He said he has ample time for the Zoning Board of Appeals as an Alternate and has attended their meetings. The Committee voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, could somebody on the Committee tell me why Mr. Colatrella is resigning from the Board of Tax Review. It seems not too long ago we put him on the Board of Tax Review. Can anybody explain why he is leaving that in favor of something else?

MRS. SIGNORE: Yes, we asked him that, Mrs. Conti, and his term had expired.

MRS. CONTI: No, we got a letter of resignation.

MRS. SIGNORE: He was staying on the Board until the position was filled, and he said at this time he has resigned formerly from the Board of Tax Review. I was told his term was up December of 1982.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on the confirmation of Mr. Rocco Colatrella to the Zoning Board of Appeals, Alternate. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? We're voting on the appointment of Mr. Colatrella. Has everyone voted? Mr. Colatrella is CONFIRMED by a vote of 22 yes, and 13 not-voting.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Goldstein, what was your vote?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes. We'll change that to a...Mrs. Goldstein voted yes. It's 23 yes, 13 not-voting.

FAIR RENT COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

(9) MR. JAMES RUBINO (R)
259 Courtland Avenue

Replacing John McCormack
whose term expired.

Dec. 1, 1987

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to move the Consent Agenda at this time; that's item #3, Mr. Richard Mollo, Board of Recreation and item #9, Mr. James Rubino, Fair Rent Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion. All in favor of the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. SIGNORE: That concludes my report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

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

MR. PERILLO: Thank you, Madam President. The Public Works Committee met on May 31. Present were Reps. Flounders, Perillo, Boccuzzi, Bonner, Saxe, Blais, and Commissioner Spaulding. John Roos was out-of-state on vacation.

- (1) REVIEW OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT BONDING SYSTEM FOR STREET OPENINGS -
submitted by Rep. Peter Blais 4/5/83. Held 5/2/83.

MR. PERILLO: The Commissioner explained to us in detail just how the bonding system works. With the way the bonding system is as of today with a one-year bonding, he has no problems at all with it and it seems to be working out very well. It's these little street openings that have little patch holes that the City is having problems with and those are not bonded. Mr. Blais was quite satisfied with the Commissioner's report and that should conclude that item on the Agenda. It should be taken off after this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Perillo.

- (2) REQUEST THAT DETERMINATION AND RESPONSIBILITY BE DETERMINED WHY FLOODING CONDITIONS HAVE EXISTED FOR TWO WEEKS IN THE AREA OF EAST MAIN STREET AT THE RR UNDER-PASS AND CRYSTAL STREET; AND ON HAMILTON AVENUE; WHY LIGHTED BARRICADES HAVE NOT BEEN ERECTED AROUND THESE DANGEROUS CONDITIONS AS REQUIRED BY LAW, ETC. - submitted by Peter Blais 4/18/83. Held 5/2/83.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. PERILLO: The Commissioner went into a lot of details on this issue. Upon inspection of the lines, they find that kids are opening up the manholes, filling them up with rocks; on other inspections, they found blockage of logs in the storm drains. Some homeowners who have the water condition in their cellar, have a sump pump which they pump it out into the sanitary line which causes the back up over on East Main Street.

The Commissioner has put in for \$2,200,000.00 to correct this condition but the monies has been cut out from the Capital items. The Commissioner has hired an engineer on contract for two years to see if he proved himself to catch up on this abusiveness of sump pumps from the homeowners into the sanitary line into the storm line. Right now, he is having them do inspections on regular basis to see if he could catch up on homeowners who are abusing this thing. So that, we can't do anything until the Commissioner can get \$2 million to correct that condition.

MR. BLAIS: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Blais. Do you have a question?

MR. BLAIS: Yes, Madam Chairman. Through you to Mr. Perillo, are you saying that the Commissioner of Public Works has inspectors reviewing the homeowners along the sewer line now or he plans to get an inspector?

MR. PERILLO: He plans to hire one.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you.

MRS. CONTI: If I may ask the Public Works Chairman, what is the 2,000 needed for the correction did you say?

MR. PERILLO: It's 2 million; \$2,200,000.00.

MRS. CONTI: I understood that that condition was caused by the fact that there is a 30 inch main emptying into an 18 inch main at East Main Street and that's why you have the back up? Is that correct?

MR. PERILLO: Okay, that's where the whole line has to be converted, right.

MRS. CONTI: And is that what the 2 million is for?

MR. BLAIS: In addition, Mrs. Conti, right now, a sewer system is suppose to be a closed system. We only have an overflow or flooding problem on this line when you have storm drains. It is estimated that, perhaps, or there's a possibility that the line may be adequate if we can eliminate storm drain inflow, and what the Commissioner has proposed in conjunction with the Committee is, that he get an inspector to go inspect these homes to see if he can cut out some of this infiltration as it is called in the business, to be able to use that line for a few more years rather than have to replace the whole thing.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GUROIAN: Through you, Madam Chairman, may I ask somebody on the Committee, that if the problem is caused by the pumping out of water into the drainage system, then converted to being pumped into the sewer system, will not the same problem occur?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blais, would you like to answer that question?

MR. BLAIS: According to Commissioner Spaulding, in fact, storm drain systems are suppose to be separate lines than sewer systems. According to Commissioner Spaulding, the fact that we have the inflow going into what is suppose to be a closed sewer system, also results in additional cause for a waste treatment of this down at the treatment plant. Okay, what he is saying is that if we can go back to the system and found out where the inflow occurs and straighten it out and get the storm drains taking care of the storm water, and the sewer system taking care of the raw sewage, that there's a possibility that one may not have to upgrade the line for the near future.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think there is a little more to it than just the possibility of homeowners pumping water into the sewage system. That's a very old line and yes, it is true there is different size pipes that go down from East Main Street to the Sewage Treatment Plant. The other problem is that the line itself, if there were no other water going to it from homeowners, that when it rains, the line itself, at all the joints possibly is letting water into the line. In otherwords, this year with the tremendous amount of rain, the table came way up and the regular rainwater gets through the joints of the old pipe. Now there is a system that is being looked into by the Commissioner that someother cities are doing in the surrounding areas, and it's called, "lining the pipe." In otherwords, what they try to do is if they feel that the pipe is big enough, and they can stop the infiltration of rainwater, or any other types of water getting into the system, they put a lining inside the sewer pipe itself. This stops any foreign water from getting into the system other than the sewage, and if them come to the conclusion that that pipe can be lined by stopping all the foreign water, then they won't have to go into the 2 million, but there will still be a certain amount of expense to reline the pipe. This is something that other cities are going and Public Works is looking into. The homeowner pumping in, the only way they're going to stop that is to go into the cellars and catch them. There's a couple of things that can be done with this line at the present time. The alternative, of course, is the big project 2 million plus and that will do the whole East Side all the way down to Magee Avenue.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi. No further discussion, do you want to continue with your report, Mr. Perillo?

- (3) PROCEDURES USED FOR THE AUTHORIZATION OF GAS ALLOTMENTS - submitted by Rep. John Boccuzzi 12/13/82. ALSO UNATHORIZED CITY GASOLINE USAGE AND WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR GASOLINE RATION CARDS - submitted by Rep John Zelinski 12/13/82; which mentions gas issued to Acting Supt. of Sanitation and two Clerks of the Works. Held in Committee 1/10, 1/24, 2/22, and 5/2/83.
Re-submitted by John Zelinski 4/8/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO: The Commissioner did explain in some details about the authorization of this and it's up to him and his deputy to authorize cards for gas allotments. There's two sides to the story here, so item is being held until we get the other side of the story.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (4) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION per Supt. Jerome B. Jones' letter 12/28/82. Held 1/24, 3/7, 4/4, and 4/18/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO: The Commissioner accepted it to approve to accept it and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. E, W, & G. Would you give the report, Mr. Blais?

MR. BLAIS: E, W, & G at our brief meeting before the Board meeting, concurred. I think the vote was 5 - 0.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, thank you, Mr. Blais. There's a motion on the Floor to accept Franklin Elementary School from the Board of Education. Is there any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. We are voting on the accepting of Franklin Elementary School from the Board of Education to the City. Has everyone voted? We are voting on the acceptance of Franklin Elementary School from the Board of Education which was approved unanimously by both Committees. Has everyone voted?

Mr. Rybnick has left the meeting. We have 32 members present. The motion has PASSED 24 affirmative, 1 abstaining and 9 not-voting.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT RYLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION per Supt. Jerome B. Jones' letter 12/28/82. Held 1/24, 3/7, 4/4, and 4/18/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. PERILLO: The acceptance of Ryle Elementary School from the Board of Education, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to accept Ryle Elementary School from the Board of Education. E, W, & G, Ms. DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: E, W, & G concurs.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on the acceptance of Ryle Elementary School from the Board of Education. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 25 affirmative, and 9 not-voting.

- (6) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT BURDICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION per Acting Supt. of Schools, Benjamin R. Reed's letters 4/4/83 and 4/6/83. Held 4/18/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO: That's being held.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (7) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT BELLTOWN SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION per Acting Supt. of Schools, Benjamin R. Reed's letters 4/4/83 and 4/6/83. Held 4/18/83 in Committee.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO: That's being held.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mrs. Guroian has a question.

MRS. GUROIAN: Can I ask why they are being held?

MR. PERILLO: The Board of Education isn't ready to turn it over to the City; not until 1984.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

- (8) REQUEST RE-SUBMITTED BY CITY REP. JOHN ZELINSKI 4/8/83 FOR INQUIRY INTO DEATH OF LABORER AT INCINERATOR; ALSO OSHA QUESTIONS RAISED. Had been Held in Committee 12/28/82, 1/24, 2/22, 3/21, 4/18/83.

MR. PERILLO: That thing is now in Court so we can't act on it.

- (9) THE MATTER OF CONCRETE CURBING AT 237 STRAWBERRY HILL AVENUE - submitted by 12th District Reps. Hogan and Blum 5/13/83.

MR. PERILLO: The Commissioner, his Engineer says it takes \$5,000.00 to correct that condition and he doesn't have it. Comes July 1 with his new budget, he'll put it on a priority list and if he finds money, he'll do it. That ends that one.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, do you have a question?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. I'm sorry. If I can go back to #8 for a moment?

PRESIDENT SANTY: #8?

MR. ZELINSKI: The one previous to that, yes. I was reading a letter. Through you, Madam President to Rep. Perillo on this. You mentioned that the business about the death of the laborer, I believe originally, I had requested the safety procedures used by the City as far as their employees. Did anyone address that particular part of the question at your Committee meeting, Rep. Perillo?

MR. PERILLO: No, not really, but they wouldn't even discuss it. The Commissioner wouldn't talk about it because it's in litigation.

MR. ZELINSKI: Excuse me, I realize that but I'm talking about just in general what safety procedures are used by the City? Not necessarily in this particular case but I'm sure like in private industry, maybe the Board of Education, there are practices adopted for the protection of the employees and I was wondering if the Commissioner had addressed that at all? That was part of my original request.

MR. PERILLO: No, none whatever.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blais, do you have a comment?

MR. BLAIS: Yes, I think the feeling of the Committee that even looking into the safety regulations at the meeting of last Tuesday night or the 31st, at that time, even looking at the safety regulations, may jeopardize the City. As soon as possibly convenient where we will not injure the City's position, I'm sure that the Board, everybody on the Board is interested in it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais.

(10) PUBLIC USE OF THE CITY DUMP - REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES AS SUGGESTED IN MAY 9, 1983 LETTER FROM 15TH DISTRICT REP. PHILIP R. STORK.

MR. PERILLO: The Committee took no action on this and felt to leave the old ordinance as it stands.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Perillo.

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

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I don't have a report, but, Madam President, there is a tentative Charter Revision schedule that I'm hoping is circulated to all of our Members. We're scheduled to have a public hearing tomorrow evening at 7:30 here in this room.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston, let us repeat that. The public hearing is tomorrow evening on the Charter Revision recommendations from the Commission, so I urge all the members to attend along with the public. It's tomorrow evening in this room. Thank you, Mr. Livingston.

MRS. GUROIAN: Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: May I ask the Committee Chairman if there has been a call for a Committee meeting after the hearing?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston, would you address that question?

MR. LIVINGSTON: No, there hasn't, but during my conversation with Mr. Roos, we agreed that at the public hearing, we would allow the Committee to decide when and how it would meet on the proposals after the public hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: And our Special Meeting will be held on the 14th. You will be receiving a notice so save that date for the first meeting regarding the changes.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday evening, May 31, 1983, at 7:30 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Present were Committee members Owens, Gaipa, and myself; Terry Connors Rink Manager Mark Magliola, Park Commission member Kieran Hickey, and Recreation Superintendent Bruno Giordano.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee voted 3 in favor and none opposed to place the following items on the Consent Agenda: Items 1, 2, 3 and 4.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on Consent. Fine, Mr. DeLuca.

- (1) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR MAYOR TO APPLY FOR A PARK DEVELOPMENT GRANT from the Small Business Administration Park and Recreational Area Development Grant Program through the State Dept. of Environmental Protection (no dollar figure stated) - part of the Federal "Jobs" Act - submitted by Grants Director Sandra Gilbane 5/18/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (2) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HOLD THE ANNUAL FEAST OF ST. TEODORO MATIRE ON THE GROUNDS OF THE S. TEODORO SOCIETY, 107 WEST AVENUE for August 25, 26, 27, 28, 1983 - FOR ILLUMINATION, MUSIC AND PROCESSION. From Anthony Melchionne, 20 Robert Court.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (3) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HOLD 15TH ANNUAL STAMFORD COLUMBUS DAY ROAD-RACE ON OCTOBER 9, 1983. Sponsors are Champion Internation and Stamford Running Club. Letter 4/25/83 from E. Arthur Morin, Jr., Atty., 25 Third St.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG BANNER ON BEDFORD STREET AT LATHAM PARK - TO ADVERTISE STAMFORD EXCHANGE CLUB'S ANNUAL BICYCLE SALE to take place May 5, 1984 (1984) - to put banner up April 20th and taken down May 7, 1984. Submitted by Frank Sanfilippo, DDS, PC, Bike Sales Chairman, his letter 5/13/83. 13 Church St., 323-9849.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (5) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FEE SCHEDULE FOR TERRY CONNERS SKATING RINK for for fiscal year 1983-1984 - submitted by Parks Supt. Robert Cook, 5/11/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DeLUCA: We voted to hold this in Committee because we had minor recommendations for changes and we wanted to give the Park Commission an opportunity to approve our changes. We will be voting on this here at our next meeting.

- (6) REQUEST TO CHANGE DATE FOR HANGING BANNER ALREADY APPROVED TO JUNE-12th
DATE CHANGED TO JUNE 26TH, FROM SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTER - bicycle race.

MR. DeLUCA: We voted 3 in favor and none opposed for approval with two exceptions: it should read, request granted to hold a bicycle race on June 26th. The request was from the South End Community Center, and I so move for acceptance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. That date on our Agenda, is the 12th, should that be changed?

MR. DeLUCA: It should be changed to the 26th. We received correspondence this evening from Mr. Macklin.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. A motion has been made on #6 under Parks and Recreation to change the date from the South End Community Center to June 26th. A motion has been made and seconded. Yes, discussion.

MRS. PERILLO: Yes, I'd just like to ask Mr. DeLuca a question. On the Columbus Day Roadrace which is 3 on the Agenda and now you say the bike race is #6, are any police going to have to be involved in that?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I believe as in the past, the police have been paid for by the sponsor of the Columbus Day Race, and as far as the bicycle race, I must confess, I really do not know but I'm sure police will be provided.

MRS. PERILLO: At the cost to the people that are giving it?

MR. DeLUCA: I must say that I do not know the answer at this time. I would presume that it would be taken care of by Chief Considine.

MRS. PERILLO: Okay, and then on the banners, we received a breakdown on the costs.

MR. DeLUCA: Mrs. Perillo, I think maybe it would be nice if you requested that these items be taken off the Consent Agenda before we moved on.

MRS. PERILLO: I didn't want to take them off. I just wanted to know if you....

MR. DeLUCA: I was under the impression you were sitting in the Caucus Room.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you want anything off the Consent? Right now, before you go any further, we have a motion on the Floor which has not been voted on, and that is #6, so we have to move that. Any discussion on that? We're going to move right to a vote on that. Changing the South End Community date to hang their banner June...

MR. DeLUCA: Hold a bicycle race. I said we voted 3 in favor and none opposed with two exceptions. It should be bicycle race on June 26th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of this item, please say aye. Opposed? No opposed. It passed UNANIMOUSLY. The South End Community Center can have their bicycle race on June 26th. You want to go back and move the Consent Agenda?

MR. DeLUCA: Now, I would like to go back and move the Consent Agenda. Item 1 which is a request for permission for the Mayor to apply for a Park Development Grant from the Small Business Administration Park and Recreational Area Development Grant Program. Item #2, request for permission to hold the Annual Feast of St. Teodoro Matire on the grounds of the S. Teodoro Society, 107 West Avenue. Item #3, request for permission to hold the 15th annual Stamford Columbus Day roadrace on October 9, 1983. Item #4, request for permission to hang a banner on Bedford Street at Latham Park to advertise the Stamford Exchange Club's annual bicycle sale to take place May 5, 1984.

As far as Mrs. Perillo's question, we did receive a cost breakdown which I would appreciate if Helen McEvoy could place this on our July Steering Agenda for discussion. I now move for acceptance.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion? All in favor of the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA: Now I have two items. I'd like to bring up under Suspension of the Rules, it's an item that was erroneously left off our Steering Committee Agenda and it should have been on because we received it in plenty of time. I'd like to Suspend the Rules to place this item on the Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you just give us what the item is, Gabe?

MR. DeLUCA: It's a request from the Fairmont Avenue residents to block off the street on June 25, from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of a Block Party. This was granted last year and it's an annual affair by the residents which is a good idea and it really adds to the Community effort.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded to Suspend the Rules.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you to the Chairman, what district is that, please?

MR. DeLUCA: 7th District.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? The Rules are Suspended.

(7) REQUEST FROM FAIRMONT AVENUE RESIDENT TO BLOCK OFF THE STREET ON JUNE 25, FROM 3:00 P.M. TO 7:00 P.M. FOR THE PURPOSE OF A BLOCK PARTY, RAIN DATE 6/26.

MR. DeLUCA: I now move for acceptance to grant the residents of Fairmont Avenue permission to hold their Block Party on June 25, from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. with a rain date of June 26.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Any discussion?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Is that going to be open to the general public?

MR. DeLUCA: As far as I know as in the past, it would just be open to the residents of Fairmont Avenue.

PRESIDENT SANTY: They're closing off the street for the residents of Fairmont Avenue.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you have a question, Ms. Summerville:

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Just for clarification, I think anybody could enter the street. The street is not closed; you can go on the street and participate. I'm sure the residents would invite us there.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of a Block Party on Fairmont Avenue. Please use your machine for a vote. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 28 affirmative, and 6 not-voting.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: I beg your indulgence for more item under Suspension of the Rules. It has to deal with a Historical Preservation grant for Cove Island Mansion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second to Suspending the Rules? Seconded. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? Rules are Suspended, Gabe, make your motion.

(8) RESOLUTION FOR \$20,000 GRANT (CITY TO MATCH \$20,000) HISTORICAL PRESERVATION GRANT to restore Cove Island Mansion

MR. DeLUCA: I would now like to make a motion to grant the Mayor permission to submit to the State a request for a grant to apply \$20,000.00 to be matched by \$20,000.00...1983/84 Capital Budget for renovations to the Cove Island Mansion, the home of the City's Park Department. Cove Island Mansion is on the National Historic Register as one of the oldest structures in this area of Connecticut, and I so move for acceptance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to apply for this grant. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right...

MRS. GERSHMAN: I really must speak in favor of this just momentarily. Cove Mansion is one of our very finest homes and it is badly in need of repair. Please don't let it deteriorate.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other discussion?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Through you, Madam President to Mr. DeLuca. Is the State participation in this project, is it going to do anything concerning our parking facilities? Will it any affect on the allowing how we handle our parking, and in general, is this going to open this facility up to the entire State or perhaps, the nation. That's my question.

MR. DeLUCA: This was the same question I asked regarding item #1 on our Agenda, and according to Ann Sadowski, this will not force us to open up our parks to outsiders. Our Committee was also worried about that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on the motion as made by Mr. DeLuca, a \$20,000 grant. Please use your machine. The motion has PASSED 27 affirmative and 7 not-voting.

MR. DeLUCA: In conclusion, I'd just would like to remind this Board that we have enough people to accept the challenge of the Mayor and his Cabinet to our softball game on June 21, at 6:00 p.m. at Troy Field, and I would hope that everybody that said they would play, would show up and start doing our exercise and jogging so we get into shape for the big game, and that concludes our report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Did you all hear that? Mr. DeLuca, has everybody volunteered to come that day?

MR. DeLUCA: Not everybody, so far I have 23 people. I contacted everybody and there's a few people that will let me know before June 21st.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Besides players, we need cheerleaders and managers and waterboys, and watergirls and a cheering section. We have many volunteers. Let's all 40 show up somehow, even if we have to have a large cheering section where we can watch some of our expert ballplayers.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'm sorry to say that some of us will not be able to attend due to the fact that Mr. Wider's being honored by the NAACP as a past president, the same night, but I would have challenged the Mayor on first base.

PRESIDENT SANTY: By the way, I did appoint Mr. DeLuca as captain of our team. If you have any questions, he's captain. He will be appointing the coaches and the managers and all the assigned spots. Congratulations, Mr. Wider.

MR. ZELINSKI: We'll have to win the game for Mr. Wider.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's right. We're going to go out and win for Mr. Wider.

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

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. The Health and Protection Committee met on May 31st with the following members present: Barbara DeGaetani, Michael Wiederlight, Co-Chairman and myself. Other Board members present were Gabe DeLuca, Barbara McInerney, Marie Hawe, Phil Stork and Dennis White.

PUBLICATION (NEW MATERIAL)

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING POSSIBLE HAZARDS IN SATELLITE TRANSMISSION FACILITIES - submitted 4/19/82 by Reps. Grace Guroian and Betty Conti, W. Dennis White. Held in Committee from 5/3/82 through 2/9/83. Approved for publication 7/12/82. Held 2/22, 4/4, and 5/2/83. Letter 5/16/83 from Chmn. Dziezyc to Corp. Counsel Fraser suggesting amendments to make ordinance more effective.

MR. DZIEZYC: After much discussion with Alice Perry from the Corporation Counsel's office, Hubert Schafley, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Trans Communications, Inc. and Board of Representative members, the Committee voted 3 - 0 to publish and hold a public hearing with the following amendments:

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, you are moving for publication and not final adoption? Am I right?

MR. DZIEZYC: That's right.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's an error on the Agenda?

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do we have the amendments?

MR. DZIEZYC: No, we don't have them in writing yet.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, before you go any further, let me clarify this. We did publish this ordinance once, as I understand it.

MR. DZIEZYC: This is entirely different. Completely different.

PRESIDENT SANTY: So we have to start all over.

MR. DZIEZYC: From scratch.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, we're starting over. That's all I wanted to know. Now, do we all have the ordinance? If we all have that with us now, we can go over the amendments. Hold on one moment, everyone, see if they have their ordinance with them.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, since the amendments are not here, I move that that go back to Committee for completion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion on the Floor that has been seconded and it's very well taken, Mr. Dziezyc, that since we don't have the amendments, that this go back to Committee. That this item be referred back to Committee. Is there any discussion on referring this back to Committee?

MR. WHITE: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I'd like to have it referred back to Committee for a lot of reasons. At the time when the ordinance was first presented, and I looked it over, I saw some very real problems with it but I thought that perhaps we could patch together through amendments and so on, but the more I thought about it and read about it and reflected on since that time, I'm convinced that it's not going to be healed by amendments. At this present time, I think what has to be done, frankly, is to be sent back to Committee and seriously re-worked. I know that has been hanging fire for sometime, been working on it, but it's not necessarily our fault that there has been such a delay on it. I really do believe, Madam President, that if it does not go back to Committee and does not receive very extensive work, that we're going to end up with an ordinance even if it's passed, that we're going to find unsatisfactory. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White. We are addressing the fact the motion to send it back to Committee.

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. I would like to also urge that members vote to return it to Committee. There's some things that we would like to work on with the Committee and I must say that the Committee has been very helpful and done a lot of good work on it so far, but I think there's people that have amendments that they want to propose and I think doing that tonight would get too confusing, so if it can be sent back to Committee, and done this month, I think that will make the issue clearer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. I just would like to voice a token of appreciation of the Committee to Ms. Perry of the City's Law Department, for all the time and effort and hard work she's put into this ordinance.

I hope that Rep. White didn't mean that the ordinance and the preparation thereof was faulty inasmuch as he said that it needs some serious work. This ordinance was put together with a lot of hard work and research by both the members of the Committee and the Law Department, and I would caution anybody that wants to work on this ordinance to do with legal counsel, because you're walking a very fine line between the technological content and the legal content of this ordinance, and any changes that you make to this ordinance, if not made with legal counsel, will, in essence, have the affect of abrogating the affect and intent of the ordinance. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I wonder if those who are talking about there being a problem are talking about the most recent draft? I know the first one we got from Alice Perry, there was a problem because there was no regulation of existing facilities, but this latest one we have, it's quite good and I think it is a good starting point, and I'm wondering if they're addressing that most recent one?

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers?

MR. BLAIS: I would support Mr. White's proposal to send this back to Committee for re-work just simply because of the potentials of the problem of such that it warrants very close scrutiny before we act on it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais. No further speakers?

MR. DZIEZYC: I'd like to make the suggestion that anyone who wants to make changes, should write them and send a copy to me so I could refer these to the Corporation Counsel to see whether it's legal or not. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dziezyc. We're not going to use a machine vote to return this item to Committee which is the motion on the Floor. If you are in favor of returning this to Committee, please vote yes. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has PASSED 30 affirmative, 1 no and 4 not-voting. Mr. Dziezyc, continue with your report.

- (2) REQUEST FOR PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR PUBLICATION CREATING A THREE-MAN TEAM COMPOSED OF FIRE MARSHALS IN THE CITY AND ONE MEMBER OF THE STAMFORD ARSON SQUAD TO INVESTIGATE FIRES - submitted by Carmine Sperenza, Jr., Stamford Fire Dept. Fire Marshall, letter 4/27/83.

~~HELD-IN-COMMITTEE-~~ REMOVE FROM AGENDA

MR. DZIEZYC: This is going to be held.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #2 is held.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Excuse me, could I just add something as the Co-Chairman, please?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Certainly, as Co-Chairman Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The general consensus on that item in addition to being held was that there should be and there will be better communications between the different fire marshals in the different fire districts who have jurisdiction over a fire that they consider of suspicious origin and the City's Risk Manager who is responsible for protecting the City's assets, and we consider this matter, I believe a closed item on our Agenda inasmuch as there's no further action going to be taken by our Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

- (3) PETITION REGARDING HEALTH HAZARDS DUE TO WATER RUNNING FROM HIGH RIDGE ROAD INTO THE BACKYARDS OF RESIDENTS OF McCLEAN AVE. AND CROSS ROAD, dated May 11, 1983.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DZIEZYC: The Committee voted after hearing 20 residents from the area that spoke and after hearing all their complaints, the Committee voted to send a letter to Commissioner Spaulding requesting him to expedite the matter, which I did so.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #3 is held.

MR. DZIEZYC: That's right.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (4) REQUEST FOR DISCOUSE ON ORD. 206 REGARDING THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS FROM COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR HAWLEY C. OEFINGER 4/25/83 - ALSO ORD. 504.
Have turned into the General Fund \$105,064 thus far on delinquent collections.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DZIEZYC: Item #4 is held also.

FOR FINAL ADOPTION

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION-- PROPOSED ORDINANCE (54PAGES) CONCERNING RETAIL MARKETS -
from Health Director R. M. Gofstein 4/20/83 letter, rec'd. 4/26/83.
(This version not distributed yet. First version a year old.)

MR. DZIEZYC: We voted 2 - 1 in favor and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 2 in favor and 1 opposed for final adoption of the Retail Markets ordinance. I understand this was for final adoption, Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes. We had a public hearing and no one appeared at it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is for final adoption. There's an error on the Agenda. This is final adoption.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: That's correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: There was a public hearing and there were no attendees.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Does that mean Dr. Gofstein didn't show up?

MR. DZIEZYC: Just Dr...just the Health Department, that's all.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: That's the difference.

MR. DZIEZYC: No one else.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's been a motion made for final adoption of this ordinance, 54 pages concerning Retail Markets. Is there a second to that motion? A motion made and seconded. Discussion?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. Mr. Dziezyc or Mr. Wiederlight, can you explain this to us, please?

MR. DZIEZYC: Well, I will. This is a very complicated ordinance. It's got 54 pages and there's so many stipulations in here, you would have to a Philadelphia lawyer to figure out and to enforce it. Right now, if we adopt this ordinance, I was the minority against it. If we adopt this ordinance, Stamford will be the first City in Connecticut to do so and I don't think we should be the guinea pig to start it. The Health Department now has the authority to go into any retail store if there's a problem or any complaints, they inspect all food handling as of now, and this would be superflous .

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: Unnecessary.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: My Co-Chairman is obviously going to give the other side of the coin since we were a 2 to 1 vote and he has already said that he was the negative vote. By process of elimination, I was one of the positive votes. In essence, what Dr. Gofstein said trying to summarize 54 pages into a couple of sentences, is that this Market ordinance was drawn up with the idea in mind of trying to keep up with modern times inasmuch as the scope of operations of the retail food markets over the past years have changed inasmuch as it was never thought of that they would be serving food and making sandwiches the way they are right now, and one of the many things he wants to be able to do is to inspect these retail food markets in the areas where they do serve and make food like a restaurant which right now, he doesn't have the power to do. He has to inspect them as a retail food market and cannot meet the same standards there that he would use at a restaurant which are obviously more stringent with their serving food for consumption either on the premises or making sandwiches to take out.

Rep. Dziezyc was 100% correct inasmuch as we would be the first municipality, I believe, in the State of Connecticut to have this ordinance and it was patterned after other municipalities elsewhere throughout the country. It is certainly not a fee producing one where it will hurt anybody. It is meant for the protection of everybody in making more stringent standards for sanitary conditions, and based on that, I feel that we should vote for approval on it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Wiederlight.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm sorry that the other members don't have the copy that we got in March, 1982 regarding this proposed ordinance. It is very complex and 52 pages cannot be concised in five or ten minutes of verbage on the Board. People should have had the opportunity to sit down and read it very well so we understand what we're dealing with. It's items like ventilation, poisonous and toxic materials, dressing romms, locker areas, cleaning physical facilities, lighting; it's very complex; plumbing, water supply, equipment and utensil handling, storage. It's a very complex ordinance and I think that, perhaps, the City would be better served if this item was held in Committee and everybody had the opportunity to review it in details so they knew specifically what they were voting on and I would make a motion to do so.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're making a motion to return it to Committee?

MRS. McINERNEY: That's correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to return it to Committee. First to speak on returning to Committee, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to voice strong objection to holding it in Committee. First of all, Mrs. McInerney, everybody got a copy of that ordinance and had the opportunity to read it. Everybody has known for the last 30 days that it's been on the Agenda. Had you wanted to read this ordinance, 54 pages of it, you could have had 30 days to do it, and now you are sitting there and saying you want to return it to Committee. Nobody came to the Committee meeting to talk about it, to voice any objection pro or con other than Dr. Gofstein, and there is nothing further going to be serve in returning it to Committee. You have an objection to any parts in the ordinance right now?

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, thank you. Mr. Wiederlight, I clearly indicated that this came out in March, 1982 and I believe that your public hearing was held also in 1982. Time diminishes memory. It's very complex as you know and I feel that, speaking for myself, yes, I've read it, I've looked at it, I'm not totally pleased with several of the sections, and I feel that many of the other Board members here might not have had that same opportunity or taken that opportunity, especially, when I heard Dr. Gofstein indicate that it would be very costly to publish this ordinance again because it contains 52 or 54 pages. I think that, #1, it should be published again because of the length of time that has elapsed, and people should have the opportunity to come in and have their say this year, not just last year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now discussing the motion to return this to Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I would be against returning this to Committee. I really don't see any reason for it. We've had ample time since whenever it was published, whenever we first received it. We all know when we get our Agendas that it is going to appear at the Board meeting on June 6, the sub-committee sends out notices, if anyone had any questions of a point of the particular document, they could have went to the Health and Protection Committee to express; that it was not expressed. This is something that is going to benefit the public and safety and I see no reason to hold this up any longer and I would hope that it is voted for final adoption. Thank you.

MS. DeGAETANI: I, too, would like to speak against returning it to Committee. I do think it is for the protection of the public. There's been ample opportunity for both Board members and the public to comment on it, and I would hope that it would be passed this evening for final adoption.

MR. WIDER: I'm not really opposed to the ordinance, but I am opposed, I think I heard Mr. Wiederlight refer that there were no fees involved here. Are we going to have men going in there and doing these inspections, who is going to pay them? I appreciate the ordinance but I don't want to build up more responsibility for our men.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: They are already doing it.

MR. DZIEZYC: There are fees on page 4. It says, "Fees for two semi-annual inspections shall be \$15.00 per annum."

MR. WIDER: Then the statement that was made was misleading to this Board, and I resent that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Relax, the statement is not misleading because they're being charged a fee already for inspections.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think the hour is late and maybe a little short tempered. Mr. Wider, you spoke. Mr. Wiederlight, will you please address what Mr. Wider just said?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: They're already being charged a fee for inspections.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote. The machine vote is returning it to Committee. If you want to return it to Committee vote yes. If you don't, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has FAILED 12 affirmative, 18 negative, and 5 not-voting.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're going back...yes, Mr. Dziezyc. We're going back to the main motion. You have a motion and the next motion...yes, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: I wonder if it would be possible to amend the motion, if that would be the proper term, to vote for waiving publication and voting for final adoption this evening, Madam President? Would that be in order at this time?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're voting on

MR. ZELINSKI: To waive the publication because I think there was discussion by the costs of having to publish this 54 page document, so save some money, that's what I'm asking if we could do that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, it was published in 1982, about a year ago, it was published. It was published previously. That's what we're discussing, the length of time between the publication and now we're voting on the final adoption. That was up for discussion. There's a motion on the Floor now. You understand what we're all voting for now?

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, there is something I forgot on page 4, that we removed. This is what we removed, "The additional inspections beyond the two required semi-annual inspections shall be charged for at the rate of \$25.00 per annum. For any additional inspections required as a result of violations, lack of compliance and/or food-borne disease outbreak or upon the existence of varified complaints," this we removed.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If I understand what Mr. Dziezyc just said, they have two inspections and they still don't come up to the code or the ordinance, then we have to go back inspect again and the store will not be charged a fee for the additional inspection, is that what you are saying?

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, the reason is to prevent possible harassment.

MR. BOCCUZZI: How about the stores just not up to the ordinance and we have to go out and do it.

MR. DZIEZYC: Here's what happens if...

MR. BOCCUZZI: If we have to go to the third inspection because of the fault of the chain store, who pays for the third inspection?

MR. DZIEZYC: The reason why we don't want them to charge for it because there's possible harassment. I'll explain it.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Yes, but I'm asking you if it's the fault of the chain store and not harassment, who pays for the third inspection?

MR. DZIEZYC: The City.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dziezyc. We have a motion on the Floor.

MR. DZIEZYC: Let me explain harassment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll go back and let you explain it. Just one moment. There's a motion on the Floor for final adoption of this ordinance. That's what we're discussing now. Mr. Dziezyc, you may answer Mr. Boccuzzi's question.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DZIEZYC: If there's a customer that wants to try to put a store out of business, he can call up the Health Department and say there are violations in that store and he can keep doing this week after week, month after month, and the Health Department is going to charge \$25.00 for each inspection whether they find anything wrong or not. This is possible harassment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other discussion?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam Chairman to Mr. Dziezyc, I would like to know was this ordinance approved by the Corporation Counsel or looked at by him?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I believe it was. It was sent by Dr. Gofstein through the Corporation Counsel's office.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question, Mrs. Maihock?

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm assuming then that the Committee is not certain as to whether Corporation Counsel has had any part in the formulation of the ordinance or approve the ordinance.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: To the best of my memory, they have. I cannot say with a 100% certainty.

MRS. GUROIAN: The other question I wanted to ask, it's unclear to me and maybe one of the Co-Chairmen can explain to me, who removed that section from the ordinance?

MR. DZIEZYC: The Committee.

MRS. GUROIAN: It would seem to me that we would also have to vote on the removal.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, we should have..that would be an amendment to what we're voting on. That would change the ordinance that we received; that one removal.

MR. DZIEZYC: Okay, I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You better repeat that in a motion, Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: To remove this:

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Guroian, if you would speak softer, we could hear your words and not just your voice. Mr. Dziezyc, continue.

MRS. GUROIAN: Do you want to hear my words?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, continue with your motion.

MRS. GUROIAN: You don't want to hear my words.

MR. DZIEZYC: This is what we're removing: "Additional inspections beyond the two required semi-annual inspections shall be charged for at the rate of \$25.00 per annum, for any additional inspections required as a result of violations, lack of compliance and/or food-borne disease outbreak or upon the existence of verified complaints. I so move.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: What page is that on?

MR. DZIEZYC: Page 4.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney cannot find it. We'll wait until she can find it.

MR. DZIEZYC: It might not be in yours because this was typed in later.

MRS. McINERNEY: It might not be in mine because it was typed in later.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please come to order. Mr. Dziezyc made a motion to delete that. Is there a second to that motion? There's a second to the motion. We now are addressing that amendment to delete that section. Any discussion on deleting that section?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Madam Chairman, I'm very nervous about passing anything that there seems to be so much question and controversy about. I think first of all, we should know if, in fact, the Corporation Counsel did look at this. If, in fact, he is aware of the changes that are being made and what his opinion would be. We just cannot adopt this in a nilly-willy way. We have to have definite proof that he has seen it so we know this is a valid ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, there was a motion on the Floor to return this to Committee and it did not pass. Right now, we are discussing the amendment which is the deletion of a section that Mr. Dziezyc read.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, Madam President. I'm a little bit confused because I have the original ordinance that was given to the Committee which I think was the original ordinance that was published, and as Mr. Dziezyc indicated, I have no section 4 on this particular ordinance on page 4, and I just went back and looked at Mr. Dziezyc's copy and that is a typed in section 4 that was not incorporated within this one, and I guess my question to Mr. Dziezyc was, was section 4 published?

MR. DZIEZYC: It was not.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It was not published.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then, Madam President, I would like to make a motion to have this republished instead of finally adopted tonight.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to publish the ordinance because of the addition of section 4 that was not published in the original publication. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. We are now discussing that. Any discussion?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: It is very important that we get the typed in version. We're voting to publish something that we haven't read either. The typed in part, we don't have it. Would you also see that the Board gets it?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Madam President, the more I hear of this, the more I'm convinced that this should properly go back to Committee. The section they intend to delete, perhaps everyone doesn't agree that this automatically means harassment. I make a motion that we return this entire thing back to Committee.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and Gentlemen, we have three motions here on the Floor. The last motion is the one we already voted on previously, but that takes precedent. The motion has been made to return this back to Committee. Is there a second to that? Seconded. Any discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. I really can't see returning this to Committee. I think we know what we're voting on. If I may continue, Mr. Dziezyc did mention that there was an amendment by the Committee that they recommended deletion of that. There was a motion made to publish it with that. I don't see any reason. I think this is just going on and on and I think we should vote finally tonight. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, we're speaking on returning this back to Committee.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, I see we have no choice because it's incomplete and I don't see where we can adopt an ordinance that's incomplete. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote on returning this to Committee. Another motion was made after lengthy debate. Please vote on returning this back to Committee. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? We voting on returning this back to Committee. The motion to return to Committee has PASSED 26 affirmative, 5 negative and 4 not-voting. I suggest to the Committee that we're supplied with the ordinance with the current typed in section, Mr. Dziezyc, and that would avoid the confusion.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman to Co-Chairpersons Wiederlight and Dziezyc, if they would also give that version to Corporation Counsel in conjunction with the public hearing, we would have a ruling from him. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would just like to remind Ms. Summerville and anybody else who is concerned with the Corporation Counsel, that it is not a direct criteria of any ordinance that we submit it to the Corporation Counsel. It is just a courtsey. We can pass any ordinance we want whether or not the Corporation Counsel has looked at it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I thank Mr. Wiederlight for reminding me of what I already know, but I am asking you to be courteous enough for me to do that for me. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MR. DZIEZYC: That ends my report.

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

MR. CONTI: Thank you. Legislative and Rules met Wednesday, June 1, at 7:30 in the Main room and present were myself, Mr. Zelinski, Mr. Bonner, Mr. Dudley, Mr. Donahue, and Mrs. McInerney and excused for illness was Mrs. Maihock. Also in attendance we had Tom Skidd from Cummings and Lockwood.

- (1) ACCESS EASEMENT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT - submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 2/14/83 - between the City of Stamford and Holiday Inns, Inc., to provide ingress and egress to Holiday Inn site across parkland, in exchange for park improvements not to exceed \$25,000 and park maintenance not to exceed \$2,000 per year, to be provided by Holiday Inns, Inc., Planning Board approved 2/9/83. Held in Committee 4/4/83, 5/2/83.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. CONTI: This was voted 6 - 0 to hold up until this evening to get clarification from the Corporation Counsel's office. Corporation Counsel's office says that we do not need an ordinance on this, and we can put it up for acceptance tonight and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for an access easement and maintenance agreement between the City of Stamford and the Holiday Inns to provide ingress and egress to the Holiday Inn site across parkland in exchange for park improvements. Discussion.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you to Mr. Conti, Madam Chairman. Has it ever been determined precisely who is going to pick up the tab if the improvements exceed \$25,000?

MR. CONTI: They didn't expect it to exceed this ever but I guess it would be the City then.

MR. DONAHUE: The plan right now is they are going to go out and get a design to do improvements to the park. The final plan will be designed not to exceed \$25,000. There is no danger of it going over that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote on the approval of the access easement and maintenance agreement between the City of Stamford and Holiday Inns. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? We're voting on the access easement and maintenance agreement between the City of Stamford and Holiday Inn. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 24 affirmative, 2 abstentions and 7 not-voting.

- (2) FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL - MAYOR LOUIS CLAPES' REQUEST TO GIVE FOR \$1.00 CITY-OWNED PROPERTY (SOUTHWEST CORNER OF WEST MAIN STREET AND GREENWICH AVENUE) TO NEW NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. - (URC returned portion of this land to City as no longer needed.) Dwelling units to be sold for approx. \$60,000.00 each. Mayor's letter 4/8/83. Single-family, owner-occupied housing to be provided. Approved for publication 5/2/83.

MR. CONTI: #2 we've already taken care of. (See page 20)

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL - GOVERNING THE DEMOLITION OF HAZARDOUS BUILDINGS; CREATION OF DEMOLITION BOARD AND ESTABLISHMENT OF RELOCATION/DEMOLITION FUND - per Mayor Clapes' letter 4/12/83, or contact Robert Johnson, Asst. SCDP Director. Held 5/2/83. 5/3/83 amendment by Rep. Elizabeth Gershman (R-19).

MR. CONTI: It was passed 6 - 0 for publication and we will have a public hearing on this after the publication.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made. Any second for publication? Seconded. Discussion.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. I believe that this, as I understand that this is passed without the amendment which I had presented to the Committee and the full Board, and I would like to present that amendment now, if I may?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, you may.

MRS. GERSHMAN: In paragraph 1, page 1, under where it says, "Now therefore," do you see where it is? "1. A demolition board is hereby created composed of

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GERSHMAN: (continuing) the Building Official, Fire Marshall, Director of Health or his duly appointed representative, Municipal Engineer, and a property owner residing in the City of Stamford. The latter to be appointed by the Mayor to serve for a term of 5 years." I would like to amend this and add at that point, "There shall also be one person with a degree from an accredited college in art history or architecture who shall act as consultant to the Board attending meetings as any other member, and with a similar vote. Such consultant shall be appointed by the Mayor and serve for a term of 5 years." I would like to speak to it if I have a second.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that amendment? Several seconds.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. While I realize that this ordinance is primarily for derelic buildings, I do think that this should be added in case there does happen to be a building of historical or architectural significant which should at least be brought to the attention of the committee and I recall, as you all know, the Hoyt-Barnum House which is the headquarters for the Historical Society is the oldest house in Stamford. It was built in 1699. What you may not know is that a house which was its sister-house of the same year, and in fact, perhaps a little earlier, was demolished in Stamford to make way for the Fish Church on Bedford Street. The point was that this house was a derelic house, and we think that there is probably no other house of quite that age or that significant but I think there should be something in there that could just keep us from making a mistake.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I wanted to ask someone on the Committee, what would be the cost to the City of implementing this ordinance?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, can you answer that question? Cannot answer that, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. SAXE: During our budget discussion or so forth, I asked Mr. Wider if we did not already have a fund for demolition and the answer was yes and the figure that he gave us was \$46,000. I'd like to know why we have to have two funds?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, can you answer that question? No, he cannot answer that question.

MR. DONAHUE: Maybe I can answer at least part of what's been asked so far. #1, the question of adding an architectural or art consultant to this group was discussed by the Committee. It was an unanime decision of those present and voting that we not add that because the basic principal of this is to provide for public safety; to prevent a house from being a fire hazard or an attractive nuisance to children. I don't believe that it would be right for the City to consider architectural significant if, in fact, the public were damaged, although that significant is certainly important at times, but it has to be put in perspective.

#2, the question of the cost to the City, an account has been set up that's a revolving account. Once the City makes a judgement that a building is hazardous to the public welfare, and the building is torn down, the City places a lien on the property owner and before the transfer of that property is official, that lien would have to be paid to the City. So, any expenditure would be returned.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) The third part the Community Development issue vs the general account, the money for demolition in Community Development, I believe, is to clear tracks of land where they are affected to provide for such things as new neighborhoods reconstruction of an area. It's got nothing to do with the public safety. This only has to do with general, City wide issue of protecting the common good.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. May I remind the members that we're speaking to the amendment now; Mrs. Gershman's amendment to include what she already read off that we have in front of us into this ordinance for publication. There being no further speakers, we're going to move right to a vote on Mrs. Gershman's amendment as read and received in the mail. Please use your machine if you approve of Mrs. Gershman's amendment vote yes. If you are against it, vote no. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 6 affirmative, 19 negative, 1 abstaining and 9 not-voting.

We now have a motion on the Floor to approve for publication this ordinance. Any discussion? We will move right to a machine vote on publication of the ordinance governing the demolition of hazardous buildings; creation of demolition Board and establishment of relocation/demolition fund. Please use your machine. We're voting on publication. Has everyone voted? Mrs. Hawe has left. I would like the Tellers to just make a head count now, please Mr. Franchina and Mr. Wiederlight, a head count. I have a tally of 31 members present but we better get an accurate tally. The motion to publish has PASSED 24 affirmative, 3 negative, 1 abstaining and 7 not-voting. I'd ask the members to please take their seat while the Tellers take a head count.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL (TEXT TO BE PROVIDED) - LETTER 4/7/83 FROM CORPORATION COUNSEL P. BENEDICT FRASER CONCERNING "HONOR BOXES" BEING PLACED ON PUBLIC STREETS AND SIDEWALKS BY NEWSPAPER VENDORS AND PUBLISHERS. Held 5/2/83. Letter 5/18/83 from Rep. John Zelinski requesting ordinance banning or mandating permits.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: We just received that tonight on our desks so we haven't had time to do much about it and we would like to hold it in Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #4 is held.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO RESTRICT AND CONTROL THE AVAILABILITY OF UNDESIRABLE PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL TO MINOR CHILDREN AND DISTURBED ADULTS IN THE COMMUNITY. Reps. Betty Conti and Grace Guroian submitted Norfolk, Va. local ordinances. Held in Committee from 4/5/82 through 2/22/83. This is re-submission 3/15/83 by Reps. Conti and Guroian. Held 4/18/83 Streering.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: It was also voted to hold that 6 to 0.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #5 is held.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE GRANTING STORM WATER DRAINAGE PERPETUAL EASEMENT BY THE CITY TO PITNEY BOWES, INC. AND PITNEY BOWES REAL ESTATE CORPORATION ON KOSCIUSKO PARK FOR ONE DOLLAR (\$1.00) AND OTHER VALUE - Mayor's letter 5/19/83; also 4/8 and 5/3 letters Asst. Corp. Counsel John Smyth. (~~These will be very expense Legal Notices due to its length & figures.~~)

MR. CONTI: This was passed 6 - 0 and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion made and seconded for publication on item 6 under L&R. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote.

MR. WIDER: Through you to Mr. Dziezyc, was a question as to the condition that they were suppose to leave that park in when they have completed their work?

PRESIDENT SANTY: You mean Mr. Conti?

MR. WIDER: Is it Mr. Conti? Okay, Mr. Conti.

MR. CONTI: I wondered what Mr. Dziezyc was going to say about it. Again, will you repeat the question.

MR. WIDER: Mr. Conti, was the question made to Pitney Bowes, was it put in writing as to what the condition of that park would be when they have completed their work?

MR. CONTI: No, there was no such thing brought up.

MR. WIDER: I move this back to Committee until it's completed. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor, Mr. Wider, is for publication. You are making a motion to return it to Committee. Is there a second to the motion to return it to Committee? There's a second to return it to Committee. We are now speaking to returning this to Committee.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman, if I remember, that is why we held it until the two Representatives asked them to look into that matter. I'd like to ask the Co-Chairperson what did they do on the item?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, you did not discuss that item on the Agenda.

MR. CONTI: No, we didn't.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman, to the Co-Chairpersons Mr. Conti and Mr. Zelinski. Last month we sent this item back to your Committee to act on the questions that we had raised before in the month of May. I ask you again, what discussion took place in Committee on the item? Did you write to Pitney Bowes?

MR. CONTI: We had Mr. Tom Skidd come and we discussed this at length and these are the answers we came up with.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, may I answer the question?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you, Madam President to Rep. Summerville, this was not discussed at the last Board meeting because this is the first time it's appeared on our Agenda. We only received it on May 23. We did not discuss it at the May meeting. There was no request last month to ask any question because it was not on the Agenda.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I recall Mr. Owens asking the question.

MR. ZELINSKI: No, I think it was another item, Rep. Summerville. It wasn't this one. This was only on May 23.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion on the Floor that we're addressing now to return to Committee and that's all we should be addressing.

MR. DONAHUE: The questions that were asked were asked about the Elmcroft-Pacific Street sewer project not about a drainage easement. The drainage easement is a very simple matter and any reference to Kosciusko Park is in there because some of the work will be done in Kosciusko Park. But the Pitney Bowes Corporate complex has made a commitment to not only maintain the Park but to upgrade the Park in close proximity to the area. This is for publication. It should be published tonight. We shouldn't hold this up any longer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Remember we are speaking to returning it to Committee.

MR. FRANCHINA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, I wasn't finish speaking.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sorry, Ms. Summerville, I went on to the next speaker, and there's a motion on the Floor. Is there a second to move the question? There is a second. We have to vote on that. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We'll have to use the machine because we need two-thirds. We now have 30 members present because Mr. Wiederlight has left. We are voting on moving the question. Has everyone voted? The motion to move the question has FAILED 14 yes, 12 no, and 8 not-voting. We are now discussing the motion which is to return this item to Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. I would be against sending this back to Committee. When we received the packet dated May 19th from the Mayor, the last bit of correspondence in the package that we got, is a letter from Supt. of Parks Mr. Cook. To quote from the letter, "The Department of Parks and Natural Resources has reviewed the matter of Pitney Bowes, Inc. installation of a drainage system which is to be installed in a part of Kosciusko Park, and which will serve both the Park and Pitney Bowes. This system is to be maintained by Pitney Bowes and (inaudible) will benefit the Park and thus benefit the citizens of Stamford and the Department of Parks and Natural Resources recommends that the City grant the easement request." This is not going to be detrimental to the Park nor the residents of Stamford so I see no reason to send this back to Committee. I hope it is voted on and acted on tonight. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. The record will show that Mr. Franchina has left, and by the way, everyone is notifying the Chair that they are leaving, and Mr. Livingston has left and Mr. Livingston wanted it noted that he would be refraining from voting on this item on the Agenda anyway. We now are down to 28 members present. We are now still speaking on returning this item to Committee.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: I think there is a little bit of confusion. The letter to the Board was dated May 19, after our May meeting. There was a letter written May 3rd to the Mayor from John Smyth, Corporation Counsel. The letter written April 8th was from John Smyth to Commissioner Bruce Spaulding; that's attached, and then there is a May 7, 1983 letter to Pitney Bowes from Robert Cook as Mr. Zelinski indicated. This is, to my knowledge, the first time that this has been before us. It has not been before us and no questions were directed to the Committee to be asked of Pitney Bowes.

Also, while I'm on the subject, I was wondering why item 6 has some words in parenthesis underneath it indicating that this will be very expensive legal notices due to its length and figures. Is that appropriate, Madam President?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, it is not and it should be removed from the Agenda.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now returning this to Committee.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, in the (inaudible) of my motion, we are assuming too much on a blanket promise. When each item comes before our Committee, we have to find out what kind of condition they are going to leave it in. My question, that's in my district, that is our Park down there and I want the Committee to know what that condition is going to be of that Park. There are some things that are going on that I don't approve of down there right now by Pitney Bowes. Elmcroft Road is so bad so can hardly drive over it and the people have to go back in front of that Park, and they agreed with us sitting at a meeting at Pitney Bowes that that road would be kept in good passable condition the total construction of that headquarters, and it isn't being done. I can't take them at face value anymore. I want the Committee to ask those questions and that's why I moved this back.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I apologize to the Co-Chairpersons for stating that it was last month but I think we should give Mr. Wider that courtesy. I understand who was invited to the meetings and I don't think the district reps were invited. That is a procedure we use on this Board. Sometimes we are not invited and it's negligent on our part not to be there. I wish the Board would give Mr. Wider that privilege and send it back to Committee for one more month. After all, they have to live with it.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. The question is on returning to Committee. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. We're going to use the machine. If you're in favor of returning this item which is #6 on the L&R Committee, please vote yes. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has FAILED 11 affirmative, 13 negative, and 11 not-voting.

We are now going to vote to the main motion for publication of this ordinance. We are voting on publication of the ordinance, #6 under L&R. Please use your machine to vote. I haven't read the vote yet. Mrs. Maihock, what is your vote? Mrs. Maihock abstained. Is her number an abstention? I will put Mrs. Maihock as abstaining. The motion to publish has PASSED 19 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 13 not-voting.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DUDLEY: For the record, please let it be noted that I am leaving the Floor for item #7 due to a possible conflict.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you, Mr. Dudley. Mr. Dudley is leaving the Floor and will abstain from taking part in debate and voting.

MR. CONTI: We'd like to extend a special invitation to Mr. Wider to attend this when we have a public hearing on it.

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE OR AMENDMENT TO EXISTING ORDINANCES - proposal from Rep. Gabe DeLuca (R-14) FOR INCREASING VETERANS' PROPERTY EXEMPTIONS TO CURRENT VALUATIONS - letter 5/20/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: This we voted 4 - 0 to hold. Two had neglected to vote due to conflict of interest, but we are suppose to find out from the Law Department and Tax Assessor's office as to whether this could be done or not, and we find that something has come down from the State that precludes us from acting on it anyhow.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are holding this item in Committee?

MR. CONTI: Yes. We're holding it at the moment, but it will be dropped because there is nothing we can do about it.

- (8) REQUEST FROM LAW DEPARTMENT ASST. CORP. COUNSEL JOHN SMYTH TO RE-PUBLISH ORD. #499 CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY BETWEEN THE CITY AND ABE WEXLER RATHER THAN EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS - Letter 5/9/83.

MR. CONTI: I'd like to make a motion to waive publication and vote for final adoption and the Committee voted 6 - 0 to do so.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to waive publication of this ordinance as requested. Is there a second to that? Seconded. Any discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. Just for the record, the letter that we received regarding this request May 9, 1983, from the Law Department, stated that this was an error. The error being the word "exchange of easements" was used in the original publication on January 31, '83, when it should have been "exchange of properties." It also mentioned the paragraph that the error was discovered and the ordinance was then resubmitted as an exchange of properties instead of easements and it mentions a copy of Mayor's Clapes' letter dated October 5th relative to this matter as well as a copy of the ordinance concerning the exchange of properties.

I would like to know just for the record that the letter referred to dated October 5, 1982 by the Mayor, was addressed to the members of the Planning Board and we did not receive any copy of that, so consequently, we were never notified of that mistake. This is the first time that we have been notified and it was not our error. I'd just like to have that noted for the record, Madam Acting President. Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman, to the two Co-Chairpersons, I have two questions. What were the two words that were changed; the changing of the words. Would you please for the record state them.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I would be more than happy to, Rep. Summerville. It was correctly published "exchange of easements." Easements was incorrect. It should have been "exchange of properties." Properties is the correct word. We're asking to correct that but we're waiving publication, for final adoption.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you, Madam Chairman, to Mr. Zelinski, could you tell me what Corporation Counsel's legal terminology in reference to this ordinance, the words of easement and property?

MR. ZELINSKI: Not being a lawyer, Rep. Summerville, I don't know how to answer that except to say that in his original letter to us on May 9, he just says that we have to correct that. It was a minor change. It doesn't affect the context of the ordinance which is simply an exchange of properties, okay, so in this case it's an exchange of properties is the correct wording. When it was sent down to us it was exchange of easements. Okay, and there was no easements involved here; it's an exchange of properties between an individual, the City of Stamford, and the City of Stamford, so again, they did not feel that it was necessary to republish it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam Chairman, just for clarification of the record, I want the record to show that the 6th District Representative voted on this item previously because the interpretation was easement not properties, and I feel it is totally different when it comes to legal terms. I will be voting against it for that reason. Another question I'd like to ask through you to the two Co-Chairpersons, if, in fact, and I think I heard you state earlier that it was an error on the Mayor's office part, is it not in due just that the Mayor's office pay out of their budget to republish this ordinance?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, well I don't believe it would be the Mayor's office that made the mistake. The draft was submitted and sent to us from the Law Dept., okay. Also, the property in question is on Hillandale Avenue. Is that the 6th District?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Zelinski, that's not pertinent to her question.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: We didn't go to court yet.

MR. ZELINSKI: Well anyway, it's the Law Department that I presume was at fault in this. It was not the Mayor's office. Originally the draft was sent down by the Corporation Counsel's office and they made the mistake on it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam Chairman, through you to Co-Chairman Zelinski, when I used the terminology Mayor's office, I took for granted that the Law Department did come under the Mayor's office, so it would be the Law Department that I meant. Wouldn't it be a fact that it should come out of the Law Department's budget? We cannot be so careless in doing...(end of tape)

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. CONTI: ...so there would be no more expense involved.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Conti. The motion is to waive publication.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to move the question. Seconded.

MRS. McINERNEY: The motion is to move the question. All of those in favor, please say aye. Those against? Any abstentions? I'm afraid the ayes have it. The question is moved. Now we will proceed to a vote on the motion to waive publication. All those in favor, please use your machine.

MRS. CONTI: Point of information. Do we have a quorum present on the Floor?

MRS. McINERNEY: I believe we do. I'll ask the Clerk to count. It takes a majority vote to waive publication. It would take 19 people. I'm sorry, it would just take a simple majority and we have 28 people present. Now we will proceed to a vote. Please use your machines on waiving publication. Just waiving publication is the motion. The machine is cleared, please vote. Has everybody had the opportunity to vote? The motion has PASSED 18 in favor, 7 nos, no abstentions, and 10 people not-voting.

We will proceed to the main motion which is to pass for final adoption on change. Request from the Law Department Asst. Corporation Counsel John Smyth to correct ordinance 499 concerning exchange of property between the City and Abe Wexler rather than exchange of easements. All those in favor, please vote by using the machine. Has everybody voted? Just a simple majority is necessary, 21. The motion has LOST 19 yes, 6 no, 1 abstention and 9 not-voting. Is that the end of your report, Mr. Conti?

MR. CONTI: Madam Chairman, this completes the L&R report. Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: The voting has been concluded on this issue.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, excuse me, that means that, in other words we voted for final adoption but we didn't vote for publication. Where does that leave it?

MRS. McINERNEY: You voted to waive publication.

MR. ZELINSKI: But we didn't vote for the adoption so the motion failed.

MRS. McINERNEY: That's correct. I assume so, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: It has to be resubmitted then.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would assume so, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. DUDLEY: Madam Chairman, voting on the prevailing side, I'd like to make a motion for reconsideration. It was an abstention just for the record.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley. There has been a motion for reconsideration and a second to that motion. All in favor, please indicate by saying aye. No? Any abstentions? The motion has PASSED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Now, I will proceed to the main motion which is a request from the Law Department Asst. Corp. Counsel John Smyth to change the wording of ordinance 499 concerning exchange of property between the City and Abe Wexler rather than exchange of easements. Please use your machine. We're voting for final adoption to change the wording of this. Has everybody voted? The motion has PASSED 21 voting yes, 6 no, no abstentions, 8 non-voting. Thank you. Is that the end of the L&R Committee report?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, just for the record, I'd just like it noted that Rep. Ann Saxe was unable to attend our Committee meeting due to a previous commitment, and also present at our meeting was Bob Johnson from Community Development and Attorney Farina. Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. That concludes the report. Thank you.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE: The Planning and Zoning Committee of the Board of Representatives met on Thursday, June 2, 1983 and considered the following items with Mr. White, Mr. Stork, Mr. Jachimczyk, Mr. Donahue in attendance.

- (1) AREA AGENCY ON AGING - ACCESSORY APARTMENT PROGRAM - PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE SOUTHWESTERN CONN. AGENCY ON AGING, INC. TO ADMINISTER AN ACCESSORY APARTMENT LOAN PROGRAM IN STAMFORD - Mayor's letter 5/18/83 stating State Dept. of Housing will provide funds to Area Agency on Aging to loan to homeowners in any of the towns in Southwestern Connecticut for the creation of accessory apartments. No local funds are to be expended on this program.

MR. DONAHUE: Item #1 is a resolution which would allow the City to participate in a loan program which provides construction funds for accessory apartments in all compatibly zoned areas of the City in a effort 1. make more apartments available to the elderly and 2. to provide low interest loans that may allow an elderly person to construct an accessory apartment in a single-family home and thus benefit from added rental income. Any applicant would have to meet certain age or income requirements in both cases. With this in mind and recognizing the concerns the program seeks to address, the Planning and Zoning Committee voted to recommend the denial of the resolution by a vote of none in favor and 4 opposed due to the fact that there is no ordinance that recognizes or regulates the construction or appropriateness of accessory apartments. Our current zoning regulations allow for two-family homes in certain zones, but these regulations have not specifically dealt with accessory apartments as such.

Accessory apartments could have a detrimental affect on the quality of life in existing R-5 zones and may, in fact, be more appropriate in RA-2 which are single-family residents of more than two acres. Both of these issues should be considered before the City places any kind of acceptance or any hint of acceptance on accessory apartments.

Two other issues should be noted. The only towns as of today, that have passed this resolution are New Canaan, Wilton, Weston, and Monroe. Towns that by their nature may find this type of development acceptable, but at this time don't recognize accessory apartments by any ordinances in those towns. Of all the member towns that may be affected by this program, Stamford could only hope to receive one or maybe two loans and with this background, I move the approval of the subject resolution and remind the Board of the Committee's recommendation to deny the resolution.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded, you are going to put it in a positive motion except for the fact that the motion was denied by the Committee. Fine, this motion has been made and seconded to approve the accessory apartment program.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I hope that people understand what this legislation is all about and not being misled about changing any parts of any city, and most of our cities, I working with the Housing Coalition, we have 12 large municipalities in the State of Connecticut now that have accessory housing committees to try to make additional housing available for senior citizens who are struggling trying to pay the tax on their homes. Many senior citizens are looking for ways to accomodate other people in their large homes because it's hard for them to carry and many of them are people that are left with a big house all by themselves.

This legislation does not seek to change any kind of zoning or any kind of city planning. It was created for the benefit of the senior citizens that need help, and I'm sorry this wasn't put in my Committee. I'm really concerned that this is being recommended not to be funded when the people around here are begging for help. I certainly would vote for it instead of voting against it, and I ask you to vote for it because many of our senior citizens need it, and I can bring you a list of them that need it in Stamford who have big one-family houses that would like to get someone in with them to help them bear their expenses. Madam Chairman, I can't insist on these members to think for themselves. I can't go along with the Committee recommending something against their senior citizens. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider. Many speakers.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you very much, Madam President. I concur wholeheartedly with Rep. Wider. I think it would be a mistake and I'm really surprised at the Committee for recommending denial of this. Both this year and last year at the public hearing on our budgets, we heard a lot of senior citizens and even middle income people who weren't senior citizens, that mentioned the fact how difficult it was for them to continue to keep their homes in the City of Stamford because of the constant, steady increases in the taxes. Also, not only would we be helping the people to help pay their taxes, but also, I think all of us in this room are aware of the dire shortage of available apartments in the City of Stamford. We have seen over the years, so many conversions of apartments into condominiums. Other apartment buildings have been demolished to make way for corporation headquarters, and believe me, this is something that would be a benefit to the people of Stamford and I really can't visualize any way that it would be detrimental. We're not talking about down zoning any neighborhood or any area in the City of Stamford, we're talking about creating an agency on aging that would designate Southwestern Connecticut to administer an accessory apartment loan program in Stamford, and to even top it off to make it even better, there are no local funds that are going to be expended for this program. They're coming out of the State and I really feel that we really should stop and think before we take the Committee's recommendation.

I know that in most cases we don't follow all the different items on the Agenda, myself included, and we have to more or less rely on the Committee's recommendation, but in this case, I would have my colleagues think twice about this because there may be many constituents in your particular district that would be affected by this. I know, personally, over the years, I've been contacted for such legislation to be passed and I'm very happy that the State took it upon themselves to do this and I sincerely hope that we would pass this resolution creating this particular agency

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) that hopefully would create somemore housing and help some of the taxpayers to help not burden them with their taxes. Thank you very much, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I, too, support the two previous speakers, Mr. Wider and Mr. Zelinski. I would like to read into the record a letter that I received from the Commission on Aging tonight. It is not that lenthly and I think it is important enough that we do take time out and have it as part of our record. I, too, as Mr. Wider said, I find it very strange that the Housing and Community Development Committee was not even made a Secondary Committee on this particular item. I find that very strange.

This letter was received tonight and it is from Anita Sanborn, Executive Director of the Commission on Aging. "Dear Mrs. Summerville, It has come to my attention late this afternoon that the Planning and Zoning Committee would report on the following: Resolution to designate theSouthwestern Connecticut Agency on Aging, Inc. to administer an accessory apartment loan program in Stamford, and that their decision is not to support this resolution. Should the Board of Representatives take action on this item this evening, June 6, I hope this letter can be made available to them as part of the record since I believe they should be aware of the following facts: 1. The Stamford Commission on Aging is in support of this resolution. 2. This resolution has no impact on Stamford's zoning regulations or ordinance. Areas currently zoned for multiple family dwellings could be considered. If zoning will not allow for such, then obviously no such demonstration project could be conducted in Stamford. It is my understanding that the area zoned R-5 in Stamford would be eligible. 3. If the Board of Representatives does not pass this resolution, then Stamford will not be eligible for the low interest loan available through the State Department of Housing which totals \$150,000.00 for Southwestern Connecticut. This matter is of high interest to the Stamford senior citizens who are concerned about the availability of housing, their ability to maintain their own homes and remain independent of their homes. 4. Passage of this resolution would mean that one or possibly two loans could be made to Stamford residents to demonstrate the feasibility of developing accessory apartments."

They would like for us to also note, accessory apartments must be created within existing floor space square footage of the residence. No additional rooms or wings are allowed. She also attached on here, "I have attached copies of the original correspondence on this matter sent to Mayor Clapes on March 14, 1983, from the area Agency on Aging. The Planning and Zoning Committee also got copies."

I see a lot of people who are probably not interested but I would like to give this other portion of this letter and if you will bear with me on the last part, I think we should give the Executive Director of that Agency that much courtsey.

"I serve on the Board of the Executive Committee of the area Agency on Aging, and I was part of the Planning and Zoning Committee when they considered this matter. My purpose for sending this letter is to clarify what the resolution proposes to accomplish. Thank you for your consideration."

As a matter of record, Madam President, I would like for this letter to go on record along with the voting of this Board and also I will make available to each Board member, a copy of this letter and what was attached to it tonight for their information. Thank you. I hope you will vote in favor of this resolution.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville. Many speakers.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I concur that this would be an undesirable program. Our City's Zoning assurances that people rely on when investing their life's savings would be shattered. This would mean down zoning. The enforcement alone would be an unmanageable task to limit these accessory apartments to the aged.

MR. STORK: Well, Madam President, coming from a district that's virtually all residential, single-family homes with a few small apartment buildings and a few two-family homes, I can only relate that constituents tell me consistently that they are opposed to any accessory apartment program; at least in the 15th District, and that's from where I'm speaking tonight. It brings more people; it brings more traffic; it brings more problems and for that reason, I'm opposed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. Look, zoning here in Stamford, Madam President is a hodge-podge. The entire zoning has to be rewritten from top to bottom. I think many of us agree with this, at least I do. The whole question of accessory apartments is that they're springing up all over Stamford. Many of them are illegal. They are bringing crowding and noise and all sorts of problems to the community. I would be for accessory apartments if, in fact, they were properly regulated and by regulated I mean enforced. There is a real problem here in Stamford. Any kind of law that you write or any kind of regulation, you not only have to write a long regulation that gives the City the power to act, you also have to include in it an element as much as possible that will make the City act. That's a big problem here in Stamford. The point is that if accessory apartments could, in fact, be restricted to the elderly; if we could designate very clearly where they could go, and if, in fact, it could be enforced, I'd be all for it, but that's not the case at the present time.

You have a problem here in Stamford both with accessory apartments as to where they're allowed in terms of say the R-5 zone, and in areas where they are not allowed, and before we go adopting any programs like this, let's see if we can't straighten out the whole zoning mess and I do mean mess here in Stamford; the whole land use mess here in Stamford, before we start adopting programs like this which just add a continued thrust to the exploitation of land here in Stamford; always the elderly or always somebody who we tend to emphasize and sympathize with are used as shills to get all kinds of programs like this in operation and then we find from various city agencies here in Stamford, "Well, this is what was intended, but we can't do anything about it because of thus and so," and we are constantly running into this problem here in Stamford, so I would say that we should vote this program down at the present time, not with the idea of hurting the elderly, with the idea of getting the whole zoning situation straightened out here in Stamford. We can start from ground zero to start to take care of our elderly.

You know one way to take care of our elderly really, is to start to put pressure on the State to redo this entire tax structure. For example, when a person reaches 65, his taxes should be frozen so he can stay in his property. When he retires, he should get a 10% across-the-board reduction if he is living in his home and it's not an income producing property. This is the way we ought to go in many instances, but to adopt a program like this at the present time is very foolish, and I asked some questions. The people involved may be shocked in terms of why we are turning this down at the present time, but I remember asking some questions of the Committee. You really had a strange situation. You had a lot of these town around here in Fairfield County that were adopting it in principal because they didn't allow it, but they were encouraging us to adopt it. Stamford, once again, is suppose to

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) take on the burden here although now they are being a little afraid of us because we're growing in such a way that we're actually becoming a piranha here to these other towns. So, I, in fact, would really urge us to vote this program down at this time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I concur with Mr. White and I also am not in favor of this. I would also like to remind everybody that a taxpayer at the State level is the same taxpayer at the City level, and if you want to control taxes, the thing is to say no to these things. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm also opposed to the proposed ordinance. It is not as though the Zoning Board has not entertained this idea when they were revising their zoning regulations. The same arguments were raised at that time, and the same counter-arguments were proposed at that time, and the Zoning Board in its professional wisdom chose not to address the regulations to accessory apartments for some of the objections made tonight. 1. That it would virtually impossible to limit this to the elderly and in fact, in the material that we have received, it says in several places that it would not be limited to only the elderly and that it would be extended to other than the elderly in order to provide homes. I agree with Mrs. Maihock in that it is a form of down zoning since it is an introduction of two family use in one family neighborhoods. As such, it should be completely regulated by zoning regulations. To propose to pass an ordinance when there are not any zoning regulation governing the construction that that ordinance mandates, would be unwise to say the least because contrary to what Ms. Summerville quoted from the letter that was read, there is nothing to prevent them from adding additional rooms, adding anything in order to qualify for the grants offers by this ordinance. I would urge all of you to think twice before you do this especially since the Zoning Board has itself not addressed itself to governing such an ordinance and until such time as they include accessory use of structures in their ordinances, it would highly unwise for us to pass an ordinance which would over-ride their jurisdiction.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, point of clarification. This is a resolution, not an ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It is a resolution, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: I accept the clarification, a resolution.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I sit here tonight having voted for some condominiums on the West Side and I'm against accessory housing, okay. It seems to be a contradictory position, however, I think there's major difference. In our Master Plan, we've set aside areas for multiple housing and therefore, hopefully controlling the growth, and controlling the densification of the City of Stamford. Should we pass this accessory housing, we will increase the densification of the City of Stamford greatly and rapidly because the economic incentives are there. This in turn would raise havoc with other City services; for instance, how are you going to have a fail melting out of the sewer assessments? In multiple units it's easy to distinguish a two and a half unit, a two and a half bathroom unit. In accessory housing it may not be as easy to distinguish.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLAIS: (continuing) Services such as traffic, garbage collection, police protection, and fire protection would all have a lot greater demand put on them. Therefore, I would urge all of you to consider very carefully whether you want the type of explosion that would come with accessory housing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais. There's no further speakers so we are going to move right to a machine vote. The motion is to adopt the resolution to designate the Southwestern Connecticut Agency on Aging to administer accessory apartment loan program in Stamford bearing in mind that the Committee came out with a favorable recommendation although their vote was to deny. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 4 affirmative, 23 negative, and 8 not-voting.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON HALLOWEEN BOULEVARD TO MARIO ORGERA (Lots 73 and 74 - 3,600 sq. ft. zoned R-5, A District) - submitted by Mayor Clapes 4/26/83.

MR. DONAHUE: Item #2 concerns the sale of City-owned property on Halloween Boulevard to Mario Orgera who is an adjacent property owner for \$25,000.00. At our meeting which was attended by Mr. Orgera and his attorney Mr. McCabe, a second offer was produced for the same property by another adjacent property owner. We could have picked up \$2,000 the other night if we had the authority. For this reason, the Committee recommends denial of this publication until both parties can have an opportunity to bid on this parcel and the successful bidder can come back to this Board for a public hearing and a final adoption and sale of this property.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're holding #2 in Committee?

MR. DONAHUE: No, we are recommending that we do not publish this by a vote of 0 in favor and 4 opposed. Excuse me, I will make a motion to publish this item and the Committee recommendation is against it; 0 in favor of publication, 4 opposed, so we are asking the Board to deny publication at this time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion on the Floor to publish this proposed ordinance concerning the sale of City-owned property on Halloween Boulevard to Mario Orgera. It's been seconded bearing in mind that the Committee voted to deny publication; to refuse publication. Any discussion?

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to ask through you to Mr. Donahue, if Mr. Orgera has started any work on developing this parcel of land?

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Orgera owns a warehouse and office on adjacent property. The parcels in question were apparently open to dumping and they were a mess. The City was not maintaining them and, I believe, that Mr. Orgera has from time to time, cleared the property to make his own property more attractive.

MR. BLAIS: Has he merely cleared the property, Don, or has he prepared the site for work?

MR. DONAHUE: To tell you the truth, I don't believe the question is in order at this time. I haven't been to the site. Now that we have two buyers in question, I'm sure that that would be an issue at a later date. I do not know that he's begun any construction. We were told by both he and Mr. McCabe that he has cleared the property to make his property more attractive. I think that meant clearing debris and such. I don't know about any development.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. However, I maintain that the fact that he has potentially done some development work. First of all, he has over-stepped his bounds. I don't know where he got the permission but it may prejudice our case from trying to sell it to another bidder in the future. It seems that it's another case where it helps to have friends on the 5th floor. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote on the publication of the proposed ordinance #2 under Planning and Zoning bearing in mind that the Committee voted no. Has everyone voted? Mr. Gaipa has left. I'm under the impression there are 27 members present. May I ask the Assistant Tellers to take a head count. Mr. Stork, will you take the head count. You are a Teller. The motion to publish has been denied 0 affirmative, 25 negative, 2 abstaining and 8 not-voting.

MR. STORK: 27 is correct.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RELATING TO PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF NORTH STATE STREET AND HILL ST. FROM CITY OF STAMFORD BY ELM STREET CORPORATION (GENERAL REINSURANCE COMPANY) FOR \$599,362, via QUIT CLAIM DEED. Resolution concerning "A Notice of Intention to discontinue" these portions of streets approved at 5/2/83 meeting of this Board. Public Hearing to be held. Chapter 64 provisions apply.

Letter 3/8/83 from Richard Tobin, Atty., Cummings & Lockwood; also 2/4/83 letter from Traffic Dir. Jas. Ford stating "General Reinsurance has agreed to undertake substantial off-site traffic control improvement work which is estimated to cost in excess of \$500,000.00.

MR. DONAHUE: Item #3 is an ordinance which will permit the sale of Hill Street and a portion of North State Street and other minor parcels to General Reinsurance for \$599,362. It should also be noted that the Company will be required to spend in excess of \$500,000 in off-site traffic improvements. A number of questions have been raised concerning the appropriateness of closing North State Street between Clarks Hill Road and Elm Street and since the portion in question is already closed, and while the Committee is attempting to find answers to the agreement which was made between the State and the City on this matter, and it was part of the realignment of exits 7 and 8, it was further felt that however, if the Board of Representatives did not act in a timely fashion, the City might wind up with a piece of property that we will have to maintain, and for this reason, the Committee has voted 4 in favor and none opposed to recommend approval of publication of this ordinance at this time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made to publish the ordinance relating to the purchase of portions of North State Street and Hill Street from the City of Stamford by Elm Street Corporation for \$599,362.00. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Any discussion?

MR. DUDLEY: At this time, I'd like to make a motion to return this to Committee. There's some questions that I have as well as a lot of other people. There are questions that have gone unanswered. We do not know where the order came from to close North State Street. It is currently being used only by construction vehicles for General Reinsurance. The people in my district are upset; reasonably so, and I just feel that at this time, until we find out where the order came from to close the road, and why the road was indeed closed and maybe it should be open at this point.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DUDLEY: (continuing) I just feel that until all these questions are answered, this should stay in Committee and we should not publish this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion made to return this item to Committee. Several seconds. We are now addressing returning this to Committee. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. We are voting on returning this item to Committee. Has everyone voted? We're voting on returning this item to Committee. A motion made by Mr. Dudley. Return to Committee has PASSED 20 affirmative, 6 negative, and 9 not-voting. That's returned to Committee, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: That concludes the report of the Planning and Zoning Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE: Chairman Gerald Rybnick.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rybnick has left. I would remind all the members to clean off our desks and help clean up the Caucus rooms before you leave.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Elizabeth Gershman

(1) REPORT. (ATTACHED TO BACK OF MINUTES)

MRS. GERSHMAN: You have a report on your desks.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We did get the report. Thank you very much.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John Boccuzzi & Barbara McInerney

MRS. McINERNEY: The Labor Liaison Committee is meeting on June 14, next Tuesday at 6:30 and we will be meeting with the Mayor and the Labor Negotiator Thomas Barrett to discuss both item 1 and item 2 which are being held in Committee until such time as we meet with them.

(1) THE MATTER OF UNLIMITED SICK LEAVE FOR NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS AND ANY OTHER EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE THIS BENEFIT: and the matter of necessary adjustments to the Civil Service Regulations and labor contracts where applicable, to be examined, considered and remedial action taken - submitted by Robert "Gabe" DeLuca 3/15/83 and 5/19/83. Held in Committee 4/4/83. Report made 5/2/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

(2) EXPLANATION OF MAYOR CLAPES' POSITION OF ZERO OFFER TO THE CITY'S EMPLOYEES LABOR UNIONS.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. McINERNEY: That concludes my report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

PETITIONS - NONE

RESOLUTIONS - NONE

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

March 7, 1983 Regular Board Meeting

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a motion to accept the Minutes of March 7th Regular Board Meeting? A motion made and seconded to accept the March 7th Regular Board meeting. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Minutes are ACCEPTED.

April 4, 1983 Regular Board Meeting

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to accept the April 4th Minutes...

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, I would like to make a motion we hold these. I was reading them over and there seems to be missing the report of part of the Legislative and Rules Committee so until that is clarified, I'd like to hold these until next month.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The April 4th?

MR. ZELINSKI: The April 4th Minutes, yes, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a second to hold the April 4th Minutes. All in favor of holding these Minutes, please say aye. Opposed? We'll hold them.

May 2, 1983 Regular Board Meeting - NOT READY.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - NONE

NEW BUSINESS

- (1) THIRD SUBMISSION OF REQUEST TO PLACE ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA THE MATTER OF "INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT UNDER SECTION 204.2 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD". Submitted by Reps. John J. Hogan, Jr. and Philip Stork. Resolutions previously submitted, also subsequent communications referred to, etc.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I have conferred with the co-sponsor of this item, Mr. Hogan, about an hour ago, and we would appreciate holding this on the Agenda for one more month due to the severe depletion of the members of the Board from tonight's meeting.

I would also further request, Madam President, that this could be moved up to the front of the Agenda so that we could begin this at our next month's meeting.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, I'll take that into consideration but New Business is at the end of the Agenda. We only have 27. We rotate some of the Committees; maybe we can work it up a little bit further.

OLD BUSINESS - NONE

ADJOURNMENT -

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn. So moved. Is there a second? Excuse me, that's the point. We have to thank you before we adjourn; before I accept that, thank you, Mr. Hogan. We have to change our July meeting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, I make a motion that we meet on Monday, July 11, if that is appropriate?

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's appropriate and that's what we were planning on. Thank you so much. Is there a second for the resolution to change our July meeting since it's Fourth of July to July 11? All in favor of changing our July meeting to July 11th, please say aye. Opposed? I will now entertain a motion to adjourn. Seconded. All in favor of adjourning, please say aye. Opposed? Motion is CARRIED. The meeting is adjourned.

Adjourned at 1:20 a.m. Clean-up squad left 1:35 A.M.

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

APPROVED:

Jeane - Lois Santy
Jeane - Lois Santy, President
17th Board of Representatives

AK(73 pages)

HM Steering Report and attachments
and voting record.

The Coliseum Authority Liaison Committee met on May 17 at 7:30 in the Democratic Caucus Room to review the "4-Part" contract at the request of Commissioner Patrick Marra. The Commissioner had indicated that he wished input from the Committee and the Board before it came before the Board for courtesy approval and while it was still in negotiation. As indicated in the call of the meeting, a quorum was not necessary because no consensus vote was to be taken. Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Gershman were the only members present. Several recommendations were made and forwarded to the Commissioner. (See attached sheets.) The Committee invites all Board members to forward suggestions to Mrs. Gershman, Chairman, at this time, to be forwarded to Commissioner Marra and the Coliseum Authority Advisory Panel.

Commissioner Marra has also requested that the Liaison Committee review the Coliseum Authority (Ordinance #480 Supplemental) with a view to its renewal sometime within the next year. The Committee invites all Board members to participate in a review at this time. This is on the agenda for the next Committee meeting.

The Coliseum Authority Advisory Panel met on May 16, at which time reports were given by the Contract Committee and the Architecture Committee. The Contract Committee reported that they were meeting on the "4-Part" contract and hoped that this contract would be forwarded to the Board of Representatives for courtesy approval in time for the Board's July meeting. The Architecture Committee is meeting with various architects who have been invited to submit bids and will soon have a proposal to present to the Stamford Center for the Arts and the Coliseum Authority.

Note: To understand the attached notes, they must be read in conjunction with the "4-Part" contract, on file in the Board Office.

Elizabeth Gershman
By: ELIZABETH GERSHMAN, CHAIRWOMAN