

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 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, AUGUST 15, 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 8:40 p.m. by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am honored this evening to ask a friend of mine who is also the Assistant Pastor of the Union Baptist Church, the Rev. Charles Prince, to lead us in prayer.

INVOCATION: The Rev. Charles Prince, Assistant Pastor,
Union Baptist Church, 805 Newfield Avenue, Stamford, CT 06905.

"Let every heart pray. Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee this day for this meeting. Lord, we thank you for these thou people who have come. Bless the Lord in the name of Jesus. God, teach and direct them, Lord, that they may go in the right way, and when this meeting is over, Lord, we pray that they might be able to return to their several homes safe. All these blessings we ask in the name of Christ and for His sake. Amen." May God bless you.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Rev. Prince.

SPECIAL FEATURE: Showing of a 17-minute film entitled, "Stamford - Gateway to the Future" - produced by F. D. Rich Company.

ROLL CALL: Clerk Annie M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 36 members present and 4 absent. Absent were Reps. Burtis Flounders, excused, on vacation, Ann Saxe, excused, on vacation, James Bonner, excused, on vacation, and Peter Blais.

The President declared a QUORUM.

MACHINE TEST VOTE: President Santy conducted a test on the voting machine, asking members to vote, in turn, yes, no, and abstain. The machine was declared to be in good working condition.

PAGE: Miss Krista Stork, 4th grade at Newfield School, and daughter of Rep. Philip Stork.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Welcome, Krista.

AK

RECESS REQUEST

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I hate to ask for it, but I need about ten more minutes in caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Can you go right down to the Steering Committee Report, Mr. Boccuzzi, at which point you can have a recess?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

For the late E. J. O'BRIEN, who worked on the railroad - submitted
By Rep. David I. Blum.

For the late ANDREW POTCHIN, also a railroad worker - submitted by
Rep. David I. Blum.

For the late MR. HILLARY, another railroad worker - submitted by
Rep. David I. Blum.

For the late FRANK MENO, also a railroad worker - submitted by Rep.
David I. Blum.

For the late J. A. HARTMAN - submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville.
As chairman of the Democratic Town Committee of Greenwich, he led the party to its first victory in 72 years with the election of First Selectman Ruth Sims in 1977. He served on the Democratic State Central Committee and on the Executive Committee of the National Democratic Finance Committee. He was finance chairman for former Gov. Ella Grasso's 1978 campaign and served as a fund-raising adviser to many other State Democratic candidates. Mr. Hartman was born Feb. 8, 1920 in Hartford. In Greenwich, he was a member of the town's Chamber of Commerce, and served on the Board of the United Way.

For the late MRS. MOZELLE NELSON, lifelong resident of Stamford - submitted by Rep. Bobby Owens.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would like to say HAPPY BIRTHDAY this month to our two August birthday persons: David Jachimczyk and Betty Conti. Happy Birthday, Dave and Betty. We will enjoy their birthday cake later.

RECESS from 9:15 to 9:30 P.M. - requested by Rep. John Boccuzzi. It was
Seconded and approved unanimously.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE REPORT - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move that we accept the Steering Committee Report and waive the reading. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It has been Moved and Seconded to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? The Motion has carried unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on Monday, August 1, 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	Audrey Maihock
Barbara McInerney, Republican Leader	John Roos
John J. Boccuzzi, Democratic Leader	Donald Donahue
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca	Sandra Goldstein
Mary Jane Signore	Lathon Wider, Sr.
Marie Hawe	Handy Dixon
Anthony Conti	Betty Gershman
Philip Stork	John J. Hogan, Jr.
Paul Dziezyc	Len Gambino, Radio Station
Barbara DeGaetani	

(1) FISCAL MATTERS

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

(2) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were eight items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; the first item being re-submission of the Relocation/Demolition Ordinance by Reps. Boccuzzi and Rinaldi, and changed from "for publication" to "for final adoption", having been defeated at the 7/11/83 meeting of the Board. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were four items: (a) a proposed ordinance concerning hazardous materials and substances used or stored in Stamford; (b) request for waiver of building permit fee for St. Francis Episcopal Church's two projects; (c) proposal to amend prostitution Ord. #500; (d) proposed ordinance concerning commercial tree sprayers to be licensed to protect water supply. ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA was the re-submission of resolution to designate an agency to administer an accessory apartment loan program.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

None.

(4) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

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

(5) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

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

(6) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was one item being the proposed ordinance for publication (54 pages long) concerning retail markets, regulations, inspections, etc. Removed from the agenda was the last item on the Tentative Steering Agenda, concerning proposed ordinance on microwave transmitters, being on the same topic as the first item.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

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

(8) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first nine names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The last name, that of Richard Meno, was Held in Committee.

(9) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS

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

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(10) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

None.

(11) PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

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

(12) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

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

(13) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 3 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The other item was ordered Held in Committee being the buy-back pension time by nurses to change from annuity pension policy to classified pension fund.

(14) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

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

(15) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

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

(16) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA was Rep. Blum's request that City purchases be made from Stamford or U.S.A. manufacturers.

(17) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item relating to the trip to Washington, D.C. to commemorate the Historic March ^{by the late} Martin Luther King, Jr. and his followers.

(18) NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. And "New Business" was ordered to be moved up to the first page of the August 15, 1983 Regular Meeting Agenda.

There were no items for HOUSE COMMITTEE, COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE, PETITIONS, nor OLD BUSINESS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion duly made, Seconded, and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 P.M., with several members remaining until 8:30 P.M.

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman

Steering Committee

17th Board of Representatives

JLS:HMM

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." Two resolutions previously submitted, also subsequent communications referred to, etc. Submitted by Reps. John Hogan and Philip Stork. Held in Committee 6/6 and 7/11/83.

MR. STORK: In order to move this item, there are two resolutions that have been placed on everybody's desk tonight. The first one that I would move would be the resolution concerning the establishment of a Special Investigating Committee under provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford, to investigate the Public Works Department of Stamford, Connecticut, and I would so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded concerning the establishment of a Special Investigating Committee under Section 204.2 of the Charter. It's been made and seconded. Any speakers?

MR. STORK: Madam President and my Fellow Colleagues, on December 17, 1982, Ray Eagen lost his life while performing his duties as an employee of the Public Works Department. Mr. Eagen's surviving family members are constituents of mine, and that does give me an extra reason to be especially interested in this matter. There are other more important reasons: Why was this life lost? Which member or members of management were responsible? What steps have been taken to prevent future occurrences? Should Mr. Eagen have been where he was in the first place?

I could almost look at the Eagen matter and feel confident that it was an isolated situation. Perhaps, a case of law of averages is catching-up with the Public Works Department. That idea can no longer be given any consideration due to the fact that our City suffered the misfortune of losing another employee from the Public Works Department; Mr. Sam Williams, as you all know, drowned while attempting to clean a culvert last spring. The previous questions I asked in reference to Mr. Eagen, certainly, do apply here as well, but I also want to know why Mr. Williams was intentionally placed in a dangerous situation with only one other employee present? Why wasn't that employee helping? What does that employee really know about what happened?

There are, of course, other important issues that have been outlined in previous correspondence by Rep. Hogan and myself. Rep. Boccuzzi, at a previous monthly meeting of this Board, provided us with additional issues that should be examined. What is the bottom line? The bottom line is that the Board of Representatives is accountable to the people and the employees of the City of Stamford.

The last time we voted on this matter, Madam President, we had lost Mr. Eagen. This Board registered 24 votes in the affirmative for an investigation of the Public Works Department; a clear majority, but three votes short of the required two-thirds affirmative vote of the entire membership. Why wouldn't any member of this Board want to find out the truth about these various situations in Public Works? Was there an effort to protect the Mayor; his Administration? Was there fear of embarrassment for the Commissioner of Public Works? Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have lost another life in the meantime. What value do you place on an individual's life? How many more will have to die needlessly before you have the guts to do the right thing and vote in favor of this proposed investigation of the Public Works Department?

Thank you, Madam President, for this opportunity to speak. I would now like to yield the Floor to the co-sponsor of this investigative matter, Rep. Hogan.

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: You can't yield the Floor, but I am going to ask Mr. Hogan to be the next speaker, anyway as co-maker of the motion.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I would echo what my colleague Mr. Stork has just set down on the record, and I would bring to your attention that this can in no way be classified as I've heard it classified, "political." This request was submitted when the snow was on the ground in February of this year. It has been battered back and forth, held in Committee, out of Committee, voted down once, brought back again, and all of the questions that were asked in the communications sent in February; all of those questions still remain unanswered. The questions are numerous. They are questions that you all have records of. There are hiring issues. The qualifications of different employees hired without examinations. The possible use of political influence in the hiring of employees, unilateral termination of contracts; there are many, many, questions which have to deal with the taxpayers' dollar, and I think this is of primary importance.

In addition to this, as Mr. Stork has alluded too, is the two tragic deaths which still have not been explained as far as I can see, to the satisfaction of this Board or to the safety procedures that were in effect at the time that these accidents happened. So, in view of the foregoing, we feel that the taxpayer and the man in the street has a right to know, and this is the one way that we can find out whether or not the Public Works Department is being utilized to the fullest extent of its capabilities. This method is through the execution of that section of the Charter of the City of Stamford, and is the last resort in attempting to find the facts and to seek the truth. We urge you to vote in favor of this investigation of the Public Works Department.

I thank you, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MR. BLUM: I second the question as far as this investigation for there are other matters that have to be investigated. Mr. Spaulding or the head of the Department of Public Works, always spoke to us about productivity, and I wonder how this productivity went on when during the period of January to June, he had one of the highest, the highest as far as workmen comp cases. Let me just give you an example. The Bureau of Highways had 22 workmen comp cases; the Equipment and Maintenance Department had 16 cases; the Building and Grounds 17 cases; Engineering 5; Building Inspections 6. Let's keep on going and here in the incinerator where he claims he's got productivity, and this is where Mr. Eagen lost his life, 20 workmen compensation cases; Refuse collection 45 cases of workmen comp cases.

I would like to know through this investigation where this productivity, what happened, were these people being used unsafely? Were they given unsafe practices in order to get his productivity? I think a lot has to be desired, with this here that I have in my hands, in the number of workmen comp cases that are in the Public Works Department. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum. Any other speakers? Mr. Stork, your resolution that we are voting on basically tonight, gives two reasons for this investigation; one to investigate the Public Works Department. That's awful broad. Is it written down? Do you have anything written down other than that? And the other one to recommend change in the procedures of the Department; if changes are deemed to be warranted following said investigation?

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: I would just refer you to the letter that Mr. Hogan and I wrote that gave cause to this request.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Then what we could do, if this does pass, we could refer it to the Committee, and obviously, you might be called to testify.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I am not exactly sure how I should phrase this question, but there are some questions in my mind. One of the questions would be, would the Committee have enough time to do a thorough job. When you use language as "investigate the entire Public Works Department," we recognize that this Board will be going out of business sometime this current year, and I have seen other investigating committees start way before now and the task that they had before them was not as lengthy as this task. If this Board is going to investigate the entire Public Works Department, go through all of the compensation cases, and then, as I believe, there was even some mention of affirmative action, my primary concern would be the safety aspects of our Public Works Department. There most certainly are some questions that should be answered concerning the deaths of those two individuals.

If we are going to investigate the Public Works Department, I would like to see us target our investigation on some specific things and not leave this thing just wide-open to look into every potential closet of the Public Works Department. Right now, I feel a little uneasy to vote on such a broad investigation. I'd like to see this narrowed down to the safety factors, and I would like some comments from different representatives.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Livingston, what Mr. Stork and Mr. Hogan are referring to is the March 15, 1983 letter. They give details of the items they would like investigated. That brings up a good point. We are requesting that three members from each party comprise this Committee, and they would have to be dedicated individuals because they would have to report back to this Board before we go out of existence; so that is very well taken. Bear that in mind, also.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I certainly agree with Mr. Stork that the loss of life is very significant, and the other questions which have not been answered, should be answered. I must agree with Mr. Livingston, also, that we are dealing with a restrictive time factor here and I would question whether we could get the answers in time. I would, therefore, hesitate to spend taxpayers' money unless I was sure we would get some benefit.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MS. DeGAETANI: Thank you. Obviously, I, too, regret the loss of life that was involved in this. I agree with Mr. Livingston as far as the time that we have to do this in, and with Mrs. Maihock as to the cost. I also think that we ought to remember that there is an OSHA investigation in progress which, hopefully, will give us some answers as far as the safety is concerned. And I also think that, perhaps, we are forgetting that with a new mayor, and a possible Charter revision, we will either probably have a new Commissioner of Public Works or no Commissioner of Public Works, depending on how those two things go. So, I would not support Mr. Stork's resolution.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani.

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I'd like to direct one question to you as to the scheduled date of our November meeting; which is the date by which this Committee must report back to the Board of Representatives, exactly?

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is no date on the resolution, but I would expect it to be the October meeting. Our last meeting would be in November. We could extend it to then, but it would have to be the October meeting or the November meeting.

MRS. McINERNEY: We're talking a lifetime of two and a half months?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right. The last meeting of this Board is November 14, so we could extend it to the life of the Board which could be so that would give us three months, basically.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you. The other question that I would like to ask through you to either Mr. Hogan or Mr. Stork. At the present time, is there any pending litigation that would interfere with a special investigating committee?

MR. HOGAN: In reference to which item, Mrs. McInerney?

MRS. McINERNEY: It is my understanding that one of the items you want investigated are the tragic accidental deaths of two employees of the Public Works Department. Now, is there any pending litigation which would prohibit the committee from obtaining any information regarding the safety?

MR. HOGAN: I am unaware of any although that does not mean that there is not any pending legal action.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, you have a point of order.

MR. DONAHUE: Yes. I do believe by Charter that the life of this Board extends through December; at least into December when the new Board is appointed, and it would still be within our power to call a special meeting anytime in the month of November.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The new Board's first meeting is the first Monday in December, but our last regular meeting is November 14, and then, of course, when you get into special meetings, this is another thing you have to take into consideration.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. Mrs. Maihock made a very significant comment, and the comment that she made is, and this is not an exact quotation by the way, to the affect that I can't see having this investigation unless we can get a significant fact out of it, and something like that would be worth it. Well, that's just the point. The fact that time is short should not dissuade us if we feel that an investigation is necessary; if we can glean one fact, if one injury is prevented, if one death is prevented, then all the, "money" that we would spend on an investigation should be spent if we can derive one benefit for our City workers.

A few months ago when we discussed this investigation, the discussion on the Floor was, "It was politically motivated; we're out to get this one, we're out to get that one." Well, the air is cleared on the politics at this point. Nobody can be "gotten", so now the excuse seems to be we're short on time. Two months is not short. You have some very hard working people on this Board that

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing) can get their act together pretty doggone quick, and I think, and I give credit to my fellow Board members that if they want to get a job done, if they want to investigate and bring out facts, 60 days, 70 days is a lot of time. So, let's forget about the excuse because it is a lame excuse that time is short. 60 days is a lot of time, so, vote on whether you want an investigation; vote on whether you want to bring out the facts as they are. Don't use a lame excuse that time is short. Stand up and be counted.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight. Any other discussion? No further speakers, Mr. Stork, do you want to read the resolution and I think that's what you better do now, we all have it on our desks. It's dated March 15, 1983. I think we should fill-in the blanks right now; it's findings, and why don't we put at the October regular meeting and all extensions be limited of one additional month. That would give us through November. Is that in agreement with you, Mr. Stork?

MR. STORK: October and then one additional?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. STORK: Fine.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Which would take us through November 14. That would give us plenty of time if this does pass. Do you want to read the resolution so everyone knows what they are voting on?

MR. STORK: Certainly. This is a resolution, "Concerning the establishment of a special investigating committee under provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford to investigate the Public Works Department of Stamford, Connecticut.

"BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that a Special Investigating Committee be established under the provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford, such Committee to be composed of eight (8) members to be appointed by the President so that the recommendations of the Republican Leader and the Democratic Leader be taken into consideration, for the following purposes:

"1. To investigate the Public Works Department.

"2. To recommend changes in the procedures of the Department, if changes are deemed to be warranted following said investigation.

"BE AND IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that said Special Investigating Committee make a final report on its findings at the October regular meeting of the Board of Representatives following the establishment of said Committee and than any and all extensions be limited to a maximum of one (1) additional month."

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion was made before and it was seconded. That was just for clarification.

MR. STORK: I'd like to go for a Roll call vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made for a Roll call vote. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Sufficient for a Roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Tellers to come forward for their sheet. Per Section 204.2 of the Charter, 27 votes are needed. Does anybody want a voting sheet? We'll continue with the Roll. We do have a Page here this evening, Mr. Blum, Mrs. McEvoy, anyone who would like it, just ask our Page. We will proceed with a Roll call vote. It is ten o'clock. We have a long evening ahead of us. You are voting on the resolution as proposed by Reps. Stork and Hogan. If you vote yes, you are for an investigation of the Public Works Department. If you vote no, you are against the investigation.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Tellers please come forward when they complete their count. 27 votes are required per the Charter.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Livingston.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I want to change mine to yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston is a yes vote. The vote has not been called. He has the right to change that. Mr. Livingston is a yes vote. Will the Tellers please change their tally? Mr. Livingston, were you a no vote? Mr. Livingston is now a yes vote. Teller, please come forward. The motion has LOST 26 yes, 8 no, and 2 abstaining. The motion has lost so Mr. Stork, we will not go along with the other resolution for the funds.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork and Mr. Hogan.

(2) DATE OF THE NEXT BOARD MEETING TO BE CHANGED FROM MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1983 (which is Labor Day) TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1983. (Tuesday, 9/13/83 is Primary Election Day.) STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING TO BE MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1983.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Steering Committee voted that the new meeting date for September would be Wednesday, September 14, bringing Steering to Monday, August 29.

MRS. McINERNEY: I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has been moved. Seconded. Discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. I would be against changing the date to Wednesday, September 14, and I would remind my colleagues two things; 1. In the past when this has come up, we've usually met on a Monday, the schedule that we are all accustomed to meeting; Steering is on Monday, the Board of Representatives on Monday. Some of us are working in the evenings and we have other scheduled activities, obligations to attend too, and I think we should be consistent and keep it on Mondays. 2. Being that particular week, the week of September 12, being it is primary days for both the Democrats and the Republicans, it's going to be a very busy week Monday and Tuesday. I really don't think it would be fair to have another activity such as our Board of Representatives that same week. So, I would hope that, I don't know what the proper procedure is, would we have to defeat this before I could recommend another date of

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) September 8, accept the following Monday, September 19, is that it?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Zelinski. We have a motion on the Floor to change it.

MR. ZELINSKI: O.K., thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sure the members will take into consideration your comments when they vote. Any other comments? We will now vote by machine to change the Monday, September 5th meeting to Wednesday, September 14th. If you approve, vote yes. If you don't, vote no. Just a simple majority. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 19 affirmative, 12 negative, and 5 not-voting.

MR. DeLUCA: Madam President, I'd like to bring up an item under Suspension of the Rules.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, will you tell us what the item is before we move for Suspension of the Rules?

MR. DeLUCA: To quote one of Phil Stork's earlier comments, "The Board of Representatives is responsible to the people of Stamford," therefore, I feel it's mandatory that this Board start an inquiry or at least have our Fiscal Committee met with the Finance Department to find out how \$2.2 million could be lost for approximately eight (8) years?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca has explained why he wants to Suspend the Rules. There's a second to Suspending the Rules. We need two-thirds; we need 24 votes. We'll move right to a machine vote. If you are in favor of Suspending the Rules to put this item on the Agenda so it can be referred to Committee, please vote yes. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? We need 24 votes to Suspend the Rules. The motion CARRIED 30 affirmative, 4 negative, and 2 not-voting.

Mr. DeLuca, the Rules are Suspended. Now you can put the item on the Agenda.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a motion to place on the Agenda, an item on this Agenda, right, so this way here, possibly our Fiscal Committee can meet. The motion would be:

TO HOLD AN INQUIRY AS TO HOW THE CITY CAN POSSIBLY OVERLOOK A \$2.2 MILLION SURPLUS FOR APPROXIMATELY EIGHT (8) YEARS?

I feel that answers should be given because the taxpayers have been strapped for the 2 mill tax burden for the past eight (8) years, and just to lose money like this here, I would recommend that our Fiscal Committee start meeting with the Finance Committee immediately.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That is the motion; that it not be discussed tonight because it certainly needs research, but Mr. DeLuca has Suspended the Rules. He's made a motion now to put this into the Fiscal Committee so that between now and even the Steering Committee, they can do some work on this motion. Is there a second to that? Seconded.

MR. BLUM: It has always been our past practice as far as the Board of Representatives is concerned, to have it in writing.

NEW BUSINESS: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, it is in writing.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to see it in writing.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I have to agree with Mr. DeLuca. I am appalled at what happened in this past week. I think there is a certain amount of fiscal responsibility and credibility involved here. I, personally, have to question the credibility of the Finance Department and where this money came from, and until this matter is cleared up in my mind, I'm going to have problems taking the word of the Finance Commissioner as to what comes down to this full Board. It is just beyond my comprehension at this point, where suddenly \$2.2 million pops-up out of the blue sky, whether it be records and so forth and so on, going back eight (8) years is a long time. I would have thought somebody would have found it along the line, and it's just beyond my comprehension. I have to support Mr. DeLuca. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is to ask the Fiscal Committee to make an inquiry into the motion as stated regarding this \$2 million surplus that was found by the Finance Department. That would mean that the Fiscal Committee would be meeting right away and not wait until the Steering Committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd like to speak in favor of the motion. I can't for the life of me believe that \$2.2 million has been laying in some bank and nobody knew about it. I can't for the life of me believe that if it was drawing interest, and that interest was going into the general fund, how did the Finance Department justify putting interest into the general fund that was given to them by the bank, if they didn't know they had \$2.2 million? It would seem to me that somewhere along the line, someplace, somebody knew it and it was just carried over until the opportune time to use it, and I firmly think that we have to look into it; how it happened; when it happened and why it happened?

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I agree with what Mr. Boccuzzi has just said. I would like to ask through you to Mr. DeLuca, if he is aware whether or not the Board of Finance is at this time looking into this matter?

MR. DeLUCA: I have no idea if they are aware or whether they are looking into the matter or not. Like I mentioned in our Caucus Room, someone suggested that the Board of Finance make an inquiry. That is just like asking someone who embezzles the bank to do the investigation. The Board of Finance, they approve the audit report; they hire the auditors. I feel that the proper place is our Fiscal Committee to do an inquiry, not the Board of Finance.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would agree with Mr. DeLuca on that especially since I believe one of the members of Finance was Chairman of the Audit Committee and it would create problems later.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is to refer this to the Fiscal Committee for immediate inquiry. That is the motion. No further speakers, let's move right to a machine vote. If you are in favor of putting this into Fiscal, an inquiry, vote yes. We are now voting on Mr. DeLuca's motion. If you are in favor, vote yes. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 33 affirmative, 1 negative, and 2 not-voting. I would ask the Co-Chairpersons of Fiscal, Mrs. Hawe and Mr. Hogan, to take note and call your Committee meeting as soon as possible.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I would like to make a motion that we Suspend our Rules and take item #2 up under Fiscal, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, it's the second item. It's the next thing on the Agenda. We only have item 1 and then item 2. You want to Suspend the Rules to take that up now?

MR. ZELINSKI: Well, I didn't know if anybody else was going to make any other motions and get involved in another discussion. I wasn't aware.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is no other New Business.

MR. ZELINSKI: I wasn't aware, if not, then I would withdraw.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Withdraw your motion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Sure.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John Hogan and Marie Hawe

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Fiscal Committee met on the 10th of this month, and the following actions were taken on the items referred to on the Agenda.

- (1) \$ 6,650.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET #687 DIVISION STREET STREET TOT LOT - Board of Finance approved 4/21/83.
Returned to Committee 7/11/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. HOGAN: This was voted by 6 in favor, 1 against, none abstaining to notify the Mayor that if he would send a letter to the Board, signed by himself, Mr. Cook from the Parks Department, and the Park Commission that the Committee would then recommend appropriating the \$6,650.00 for the Connecticut Newspapers, once he had reassured us that he would go along with the intent of the two Representatives from that District, assuring them that that would be turned into a Tot Lot.

PRESIDENT SANTY: So, you are holding that in Committee, Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: We are holding that pending a receipt of a letter from the Mayor. If I may go on, I received word from the Mayor's office today that Mr. Cook has just returned from sick leave, that the Mayor will contact Mr. Cook, and also the Commission, and forward said letter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Public Housing and Community Development Committee.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. We did meet with Fiscal on that item, and we concur with holding it until we get a commitment from the Mayor's office.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan and Mr. Wider.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

(2) \$1,590,132.00 - VARIOUS PAY INCREASES - MEA LABOR CONTRACT AND NON-UNION PERSONNEL - RETRO AND CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. Board of Finance approved 6/23/83. Mayor's request 6/22/83. Returned to Committee 7/11/83.

\$ 32,864. Attach. I - Retro FY '81/82 Regular and Part-time pay for employees in jobs similar to MEA.

\$ 76,142. Attach. II - Retro FY '82/83 Regular and Part-time pay for employees in jobs similar to MEA; 8%+8%.

\$1,277,368. Attach. III - 1983-84 FY MEA Labor Contract Appropriation - Union Employees - current fiscal year.

\$ 150,262. Attach. IV - 1983-84 FY for employees in jobs similar to MEA - Perm. Part-Time, Part-Time, Over-Time, Stand-by, Differential.

\$ 53,496. Attach. V - Stamford Museum & Nature Center employees - Fiscal Years: 1981/82, 1982/83, 1983/84 - Retroactive with raises ranging 7% to 9%/yr.

\$1,590,132.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: Item #2, Madam Chairman, is being held. It's on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #2 is on the Consent Agenda?

MR. HOGAN: It's held.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's held.

MR. HOGAN: It's not on Consent. I'm sorry. It's held.

MRS. HAWE: Excuse me. If I might, it's 7 in favor and none opposed to defeat this appropriation.

MR. HOGAN: We defeated the appropriation with the understanding, if I may?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Continue, Mr. Hogan. First of all, would you give me the date that your Committee met and who was there and what the vote was, and then you can go into that. Let's have the Committee report first.

MR. HOGAN: We met on the 10th. Co-Chairperson Hawe was there. Mr. Roos, Mr. Franchina, Mrs. Conti, Mrs. Goldstein, and myself, and Mr. Rybnick. This was a unanimous vote to defeat this appropriation of \$1,590,132.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Unanimous to defeat this item on the Agenda.

MR. HOGAN: With provisions and the provision is that the Mayor resubmit this to the Board of Representatives with a more detailed breakdown as to how he intends on funding this appropriation. We had the Commissioner of Finance in that evening, and he announced that we had found additional monies, additional monies were going to be returned by the Board of Education, and the Committee felt that in view of this, and in view of the Commissioner's recommendations that it only be partially

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: (continuing) funded. In order to clear up that confusion, it was unanimously voted to defeat that appropriation, and request that information for the next meeting.

PRESIDENT SANTY: When you defeat an item, Mr. Hogan, it can come back through the Mayor's office again, if he so wishes. The Committee voted to ask the Mayor to resubmit it?

MR. HOGAN: That's right.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I'd like the record to show that I'm going to abstain from item #2, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right. Mrs. McInerney is abstaining and Ms. Summerville is abstaining from this item. This item is not held. There is no Committee report. The item was defeated.

MR. BLUM: At the last meeting, it was held here; the July meeting, it was voted 19 to 12, whatever it was, to reinstate a cut that was made by the Fiscal Committee and then the vote came to return it back to Committee, and is this now the vote that this Committee takes now to knock it out altogether? I don't understand it. It was the wishes of this Board to return it to Committee to act on it. Now, the way they act on it is they defeat it altogether. I'd like to make a motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just a moment. We're going to ask for the Secondary Committee report, and then we will ask the Co-Chairperson of Fiscal to bring this motion out in a favorable motion so we can act upon it as we do all other motions. But I want to hear from the Personnel Committee first.

MR. STORK: I do have a Secondary Committee report, Madam President, but I am a little confused where we lie on this item right now. Is this item now back in Committee?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No. The item was defeated in Committee and after your report, I will ask Mr. Hogan to bring this forth in a favorable vote so we can act upon it tonight. Mr. Stork, I'm waiting for your Personnel Committee report. What was your vote in the Personnel Committee? Who was there and what was the vote?

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee reconvened tonight to take up this item. In attendance were Reps. Gaipa, Gershman, Dixon, and myself. We took two votes tonight, Madam President. One was taken because we were under the impression this item was being held in Fiscal, and a motion was made that we would move to take it out of Committee. I don't see any reason for moving forward with that motion at this time.

Assuming that we were able to get it out of Committee, our second vote would be appropriate, and the Committee voted 3 in favor and 1 opposed to approve 60% funding of this item. I could give you those numbers if you would like?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Not at this time. We're interested in your Committee report. We're going to move forward with a positive motion on this. Mr. Hogan, I would ask you to make a motion to approve this funding bearing in mind that the Fiscal Committee denied it unanimously.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: I, therefore, move, Madam Chairman, that the \$1,590,132.00 for various pay increases, MEA labor contract, non-union personnel, retro and current fiscal year be approved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? There is a second. We are now discussing this amount bearing in mind that Fiscal defeated it.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information first. What happens with Mr. Stork's Committee? Is he going to amend it for 60%?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes. We got to have a second. That's the next thing. Mr. Stork, I will accept your amendment to the motion and I would like the figures.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. As I said, Personnel voted 3 in favor, 1 opposed to fund 60% of this appropriation. The numbers would be a reduction of \$636,053.60, leaving a balance of \$954,079.20.

PRESIDENT SANTY: \$954,079.20, you're making that amendment to the motion. Is there a second to that amendment? There is a second to that amendment. We are now discussing the amendment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to understand the rationale behind the 60% funding, the 40% cut.

MR. STORK: The basic rationale in the Committee tonight was the recommendation of the Commissioner of Finance.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Stork, could you just elucidate further? Perhaps you mentioned it already and I wasn't here.

MR. STORK: Certainly. At the Fiscal Committee meeting last week, Commissioner Marra recommended that Fiscal appropriate only 60% of this amount at this time. Because of the money that was just discovered and for other reasons, we took his advise and that was the recommendation tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: But, did he tell you why he thought it should be funded at 60%?

MR. STORK: Not to our Committee, no.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Do you mind, Madam Chairman?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, Mrs. Goldstein, go ahead.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I don't understand it. If you don't understand the rationale behind the Commissioner's thinking or you don't know the rationale, I don't understand why the Committee voted to accept his recommendation. I would be very willing to accept the Commissioner's recommendation if I understood why he wanted to fund it at 60%.

MR. STORK: Mrs. Goldstein, I would have to yield for an answer on that to one of my Committee members who were in attendance at the Fiscal Committee meeting. I was not present.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, can you answer that question? Mrs. Hawe may be able to clarify that.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: It is my understanding that when the Commissioner of Finance recommended to the Committee, that we fund 60% of it, and it was for the reason that he had enumerated to us various aspects of the fiscal year that has just passed, in which he felt that the balance would be in a more positive than had originally been thought. For instance, this \$2 million that we have been talking about; also some money that was returned from the Board of Education, that they had savings in their fuel account, and building permit fees that were higher than expected in the month of June. For these reasons, he felt that until the final figures were in of the last fiscal year, he suggested that we fund it at 60, in fact, I think he had said 65% or 62½%, and in a couple of months, see what would happen and then if more money was needed around January or a couple of months into the fiscal year, they could come in for an additional appropriation.

The Fiscal Committee felt that this was not the way that we wanted to do it. We didn't think, first of all, that a new administration no matter which party would be in power next time, should be left with something like this hanging. We felt that we wanted to plan for the whole fiscal year. We wanted this additional money that found taken into account. We wanted the Administration to come before us with a plan as to how we're going to fund this for the whole year, all the way up to next June, and for that reason, we voted to defeat this; not because we didn't want to pay this money to the people who deserve their raises, but because we wanted the Administration to send us this plan.

We asked the Commissioner what would happen if we approved a lesser amount than the \$1.5 million tonight? He said, "Well, the people are getting their raises, and a plan would be worked up but the plan for coping with the cut probably wouldn't be put into effect for a couple of months anyway." Since the people are being paid and since we felt that it was more fiscally prudent to see a whole plan for the entire year, we voted to defeat this and ask for such from the Mayor.

While I have the Floor, could I ask Mr. Stork a question in case this amendment should pass? I was wondering of these attachments, where he is taking this money out of? There's five different attachments here, and we would have to know, for instance, does he want to take any out of the Stamford Museum and Nature Center? Where is this \$636,000 going to come out of? Which of these five attachments?

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's a good question.

MR. STORK: Mrs. Hawe, since we were talking 60% of the total amount, we just took the total amount. We didn't break it down into the five various brackets.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. We are now addressing the amendment only; reduction of \$636,053.60 to the MEA contract and non-union personnel pay increases.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I still have another question and that question in relation to funding it at 60% or defeating, why didn't either Committee decide to hold pending this plan as opposed to lowering the funding or defeating?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does anyone want to answer that question?

MRS. HAWE: I think the same thing could probably be accomplished by holding it, but the motion that was made in Committee was to defeat it. I think the same thing would be accomplished by both as long as we get the information we want from the Mayor, but that was the motion made and passed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I would like to go a little further on that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are discussing the amendment.

MRS. CONTI: The reason that the 60% was...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Franchina had to leave. They took his mother to the hospital and there is a car blocking his car. He has to get out. It's an emergency.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The number is 7A1ATC. It looks like a Mustang.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please move that car immediately. Mr. Franchina is on the way to the hospital. They just took his mother there as an emergency. Anyone here own that car?

MRS. CONTI: We were a little concerned in Fiscal when the Commissioner told us that the City could only afford 60%, and then he mentioned this \$2 million that they had discovered that they did not have. Now, while that may take care of the problem for this fiscal year, many of us felt, what is going to happen in the next fiscal year? If there is going to be only 60% funding which we are told this is what the City can afford, we felt then this appropriation should be sent back to the Mayor and if it is the Administration's feeling that only 60% should be funded, then only 60% should be submitted to us. Thank you.

MR. BLUM: I am going to vote against this because I have another amendment to it. I intend to vote against this amendment because I feel that 60% of what? There is no rationale behind it. It doesn't cut down the attachments of 1, 2, 3, or 4. He doesn't know where the 60% will be taken from. Therefore, I'm voting against this.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'm going to vote against the 60% also. The reason is very simple; I think that what we are being asked to do here is play Russian roulette, and sooner or later, we pull that trigger; the bullet is going to be in the chamber. I really don't think that we should partially fund a contract so that it goes into the fiscal year and then if something happens, we don't fund the rest of it, then you will really have a big problem with the personnel. If we only fund 60% now, and later refuse, four or five months down the road, refuse the other 40%, you are going to be so far into the fiscal year that there will be a drastic lay-off. There will be no money left. I think that what we should do is go along with Fiscal, and ask the Mayor to actually make some sort of a statement to us, tell us what the Administration thinks will happen if we continue only to fund 60%; whether we fund no part of it.

I can see the next fiscal year coming up where we don't find \$2 million, we don't get \$600,000, we don't get \$300,000 from the Building Department for permits. All these items that they said they are picking up now to pay for, and it's not going to be enough to pay for all 11 or 12 unions. We're still going to need another \$4 million, even though, according to the Commissioner of Finance. I think we have to make a definite stand. Do we want to pay the full amount for the contracts? If so, then I think the Mayor should say, "I want to fund the contracts 100%, everything that was in the paper that I said about not being able to afford it, is not true, and we should fund it." That is one thing you can do.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing) Or, he could say, "We can't afford 8%, we can only afford 5, 6," whatever he decides or whatever the Commissioner of Finance decides, send it down to us with all the back up material as to what will happen if we do or do not fund a contract. At least then this Board is going to know when they vote, exactly what's going to happen five months from today and next July 1st, the next fiscal year. I don't think that we should just say just because we found money, we should start putting it toward the contracts. We're not going to find that money next year unless somewhere in the mattress there is another lump with \$2 million in it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi. I want to bring to the members attention that we are now voting on Mr. Stork's amendment; a reduction of 60%.

MR. DIXON: Madam President, as Mr. Stork reported, the Personnel Committee voted on this matter this evening. We voted on it without the benefit of the full input that the Finance Commissioner made to the Fiscal Committee. So, we are lacking some of the knowledge that the Fiscal Committee has. I think our vote was based, primarily, on the practicality of passing 60% as recommended by the Commissioner of Finance, and I think maybe if we had been a little more informed as to just what was happening and just what the impact of the whole situation was, we probably would not, let me say that I would not voted in favor of this.

I am inclined now after hearing the input and various members of this Board, I am inclined now to go along with the Fiscal Committee and vote to deny this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dixon.

MS. RINALDI: I think that since there are so many unanswered questions, I think we should return this to Committee and allow the Fiscal Committee to look at it a little bit further and allow the Administration some time to come up with some more complete answers.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to return this to Committee. We now have that item to discuss. Any discussion on returning it to Committee?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to agree with Ms. Rinaldi's motion to put it back into Committee. We need some long range planning. If we cut 60%, if we cut 40%, 10%, we are then, in essence, marching to the tune of a disorganized drummer. The same tune that these labor negotiations have been marching too, quite frankly. There's got to be some long range planning. Not what is going to happen six months down the road, but what is going to happen two, three, four and five years down the road.

We saw a film a short while ago about Stamford and the future that we have. Well, we have to make the future. That's our job as legislators, and for us to sit here and talk about a union contract and the money for next year and not know that we've got three, four, five other unions to contend with, not know that we've got to fund this thing ad infinitum. We've got to have some long range planning and I think it has to start with this Board of Representatives, the Labor Liaison Committee, the Finance Committee, the Personnel Committee, and obviously, if the 5th Floor is not giving any direction to this situation, then, maybe, we've got to give some direction to the 5th Floor. I have to support to put this back in Committee and see where we are going to go over the next couple of years; not the next six months or nine months.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is to return to Committee.

MR. BLUM: Madam Chairman, the Committee Chairman came here with the intent of putting this back into Committee. You asked for a vote one way or another, and I agree with you. Now, we have another motion on the Floor to put it back in Committee. I would like to speak against this and refresh the memories of the people here tonight. When we talk about attachments 1, 2, 4 and 5, this money does not belong to any union contract. This is not a union contract. It's an equal to a union contract. There is only one union contract out there for monies. That is the 1983/84 fiscal year MEA labor contract appropriation, and it calls for \$1,277,368.00. That is the only one we are obligated to pay. We have no obligation to pay the Stamford Museum & Nature Center. We have no obligation to pay other part-time employees 8%, and, therefore, I would ask my colleagues to vote against putting this back into Committee and let's get on with this vote and vote against this 60%. The only obligation we have is to the MEA contract, and that is all; \$1,277,368.00, and that's all I'm going to vote for.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other speakers on returning this to Committee? Mr. Zelinski, do you want to speak on returning this to Committee. Then we can proceed to a vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. I think Rep. Blum put a very good point out, and I'd like to make an amendment to Rep. Rinaldi's motion if that would be acceptable, Madam President, and it would be to return item 2, attachments 1, 2, 4 and 5, and thereby giving us the opportunity this evening to vote on attachment 3 which is the actual MEA labor contract. My amendment would be to send back all but the appropriation for \$1,277,368.00 which is the amount of money to fund the MEA labor contract appropriation for the year 1983/84 and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Chair recognizes that as a valid and proper amendment, but that's about it. We have enough amendments to the motion now. Your amendment is to just return attachments 1, 2, 4, and 5 back to Committee?

MR. ZELINSKI: That's correct which would leave us with attachment 3 which is the MEA contract.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Seconded. We are now discussing that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to vote against this amendment for the simple reason from my little remarks a few minutes ago. That's simply short-sighted for many reasons. First of all, are we to say that the people that work for the Stamford Museum and Nature Center because they are not union employees, are any less important to us than people that are in the union? Secondly, we got to look at this thing as a whole. We can't be piecemealing labor negotiations and money that is going to be given out to our workers. It has to be a big picture. We've got to see the big picture over a period of time. I have to vote against Mr. Zelinski's amendment and I hope that my colleagues will also. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the members, if someone has said remarks that you agree with, just agree with the previous speaker. It is getting late and we have many, many more items on the Agenda.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. I agree with Mr. Wiederlight. I really feel that this would be an unwise move. We're trying to really get a handle on what the City can afford, and a plan for the future here, and given facts that have come to light in the past week or so, and we want to try to put those altogether and whether we defeat it or return it to Committee, the same thing will be accomplished. We'll find out. I really would urge you to vote against this amendment.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I, too, would like to agree with Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I don't see holding items 1, 2, 4, and 5 out as making our employees feel any less, and I do understand why labor, and I'm a part of labor, wants to fund the contract for the people that are paying their dues. We have people out there that are paying their dues and we have to consider those people. I feel that we shouldn't ask them to continue to carry out their duties as employees and pay their dues without acting on their contract, and they have a contract funding before us. I would like to support the amendment to pull this and send the rest of it back to Committee. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I have to speak against the amendment, also. I have to agree with Mrs. Hawe. This appropriation will steer this Board for all the other unions. This appropriation will be the ground work. What you do with this appropriation will almost be an approval for all the appropriations that will come down. There is no way that you can give to one and not give to another. We have to make our minds up that we're going to give it to everyone or what we are going to do. I don't think we can rip this thing apart and start fooling around with one part of it. The only way to do it is send it back to the Fiscal Committee. They don't have to wait for Steering. They can start working on it right now; get all our facts together so that when we come back next month and vote, we know that this vote will also be a vote that will carry us through the rest of the unions.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. Thank you. Just a couple of comments; one, as was mentioned, I did not make this motion to make an assumption that the employees who work for the Museum or the other part-timers are not adequate employees. Also, to the fact of piecemeal and voting separately, should have an affect on this. We're talking about that a motion was made earlier by Personnel to fund 60%. We're talking about funds here. Now, the MEA membership did vote and did negotiate. The non-MEA employees, I don't see why in good conscience, that they should be entitled to the same benefits as the MEA employees themselves.

I know that we have been doing this in the past; now just because we have, I don't know if that makes it right or that means we have to continue to do so in future. I have been hearing at lot of things this evening as far as cost and money and so forth. If we are concerned with them, then somebody has to suffer. Now we have an alternative, three of them: 1. We can fund the whole thing and see what the tax consequences are going to be for the taxpayer which, I believe it has been said that a lot of my colleagues did mention they were very concerned about this, and what is the end result going to be? 2. We can attack it from a piece-meal standpoint which would be to fund the main contract as I see it, the MEA contract or 3, we can defeat it. I feel in all honesty that the MEA employees should not be the scapegoats in this, and have to be left without their increase because of negotiations of the labor negotiator and so forth, and I really feel

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) that whatever has been done in the past as far as including other than MEA employees or any other contracts that do include people that are not in the union, that they have to by precedent that has been set in the past, have to get the same type of increase.

I think if we are concerned with the taxpayer, we have to be concerned and then maybe it's time we don't consider all the employees. I really feel tonight that we should vote. We did send it back to Committee; I remind my colleagues last month. I made the motion to send it back to get some of this information clarified. Here we are, tonight, the same thing. We have members of this particular union that came last month and they came this month, and I'm sick and tired of having them or any other unions be scapegoats for some negotiations that were not done in good faith by the City. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you to Mrs. Hawe. I think Mr. Zelinski made a statement that depriving them of their increases, are the people in the union getting paid their increase at the present time?

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MR. BOCCUZZI: So, therefore, actually, we are not holding any money back from them.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we are going right to a machine vote on Mr. Zelinski's motion to just return items 1, 2, 4, and 5 attachments back to Committee. Has everyone vote? A simple majority is necessary. The motion has LOST 5 affirmative, 28 negative and 3 not-voting.

We are now going back to the next motion made by Ms. Rinaldi to return the entire item \$1,590,132.00 back to Committee. Any other discussion on that?

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. 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. We're going to use the machine. This is the item to return the entire item back to Committee bearing in mind that the Committee's recommendation was to defeat it. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 25 affirmative, 8 negative and 3 not-voting. This item 2 under Fiscal is returned to Committee.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION SETTING MAXIMUM FIGURE FOR WHICH PURCHASES CAN BE MADE WITHOUT GOING THROUGH THE BID PROCEDURE. BOARD OF FINANCE AND BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES SET THIS FIGURE ANNUALLY, PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 484.1.
Board of Finance approved resolution for \$3,000.00 on 6/23/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) REQUEST FROM GRANTS DIRECTOR SANDRA GILBANE OF 7/1/83 FOR APPROVAL OF A \$584.00 TRANSFER FOR SYPCA, approved by Board of Finance 6/23/83; \$384.00 of which is to go into 792.1110 Salary Account "to insure salaries are comparable to MEA contract increase for appropriate grade and step," per Mayor's letter 6/7/83, who refers to a new Acting Director and newly hired Secretary, for F/Y 82/83. Ord. 510 appears to apply to this request.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

HELD IN COMMITTEE

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: We are holding item #4 by a vote of 5 in favor, 2 against, and no abstentions simply because it ties-in with item #2 which you have just returned to Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #4 is being held. Is there a Personnel Committee report?

MR. STORK: Through an oversight of it not appearing on our Committee meeting Agenda, Madam President, we didn't vote on this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It is being held anyway so next month you can pursue it.

- (5) \$105,131.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - E.S.L./Non-Public Schools - additional appropriation requested by B. R. Reed, Acting Supt. of Schools 6/29/83 to be reimbursed by State grant, pursuant to Section 10-217A of General Statutes for the fiscal year 1983/84 and to be reimbursed during fiscal 1983/84.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH REP. DONALD DONAHUE ABSTAINING

- (6) RE-SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTION #1451 (APPROVED BY THIS BOARD 8/2/82) AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE APPLICATION AND TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE STATE TO OBTAIN MATCHING FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STAMFORD CENTER FOR THE ARTS - Mayor Clapes' letter 7/19/83 and Grants Director Sandra Gilbane's letter 7/19/83. New resolution needed to fit closer time frame with June, 1983 State Agreement and July, 1983 Four-Party Agreement.

Above also Referred to COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: #6 carried by a vote of 5 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention. It's simply a resubmission for some correction of dates.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want it moved for the adoption of that resolution?

MR. HOGAN: I move for the adoption, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Seconded. Any discussion?

MRS. CONTI: Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would like to say that at the time we initially passed this resolution which we are being asked to re-pass, we did not have as much information as we have now. We now know that only the Mayor can submit a new finance plan or a revised finance plan on this matter. We know about a four-party contract; who can do what. We know now that if we re-pass this, this Board has absolutely no control at all over what happens with the building of this Cultural Center regardless of the fact that there is a \$1 million plus bonded interest loaded on to the local taxpayers of Stamford.

I am, therefore opposed re-passing this unless there could be some effort made to give some control to this Board because of the money of the local taxpayers that's involved. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I ask the Coliseum Liaison Committee Chairman for a report on this?

MRS. GERSHMAN: We did not have a meeting so I would move that we waive the Secondary Committee report.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We really didn't need a Secondary Committee report. This is just informational anyway, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. DeLUCA: Move the question please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question on #6 under Fiscal, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. The question is on the adoption of the resolution authorizing the Mayor to file application and to enter into a contract with the State to obtain matching funds for the development of the Stamford Center for the Arts. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The resolution is ADOPTED by a vote of 27 affirmative, 5 negative, 3 abstaining and 1 not-voting.

Mr. Hogan, do you want to move your Consent Agenda?

MR. HOGAN: On the Consent Agenda, #3 and #5, please, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #3 and #5. Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Those items are approved on the Consent Agenda. Anything further?

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. That completes the report of Fiscal.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MR. DONAHUE: I would like to abstain on #5. Let the record show that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The record will show that Mr. Donahue abstained on item #5.

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

MR. CONTI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Legislative and Rules Committee met on Monday, August 8th. Present at this meeting were A. T. Conti, Don Donahue, Ann King Saxe, Audrey Maihock, and John Zelinski. The meeting opened at 8:15 and we had as guests, Bill Hennessey, Carl Nehring, and Mr. Munce Brinkley.

- (1) RE-SUBMISSION - FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE "GOVERNING THE DEMOLITION OF HAZARDOUS BUILDINGS: CREATION OF DEMOLITION BOARD AND ESTABLISHMENT OF RELOCATION/DEMOLITION FUND - resubmitted by Reps. John Boccuzzi and Mary Lou Rinaldi. Also see Mayor Clapes' letter 4/12/83, or contact Robert Johnson, Asst. Community Development Director. Final Adoption motion defeated at 7/11/83 meeting.

MR. CONTI: The vote was 4 in favor, none against and one abstention, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're moving for the final adoption, proposed ordinance governing the demolition of hazardous building?

MR. CONTI: Yes, I am.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded. No discussion. We'll move right to a machine vote. It's an ordinance and it will need 21 votes. We are voting on #1 under L&R.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Has everyone voted? The ordinance is ADOPTED by a vote of 28 affirmative, 3 negative, and 5 not-voting.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - Letter 4/7/83 from Corporation Counsel concerning "HONOR BOXES" being placed on public streets and sidewalks by newspaper vendors and publishers. Held 5/2, 6/6, and 7/11. Rep. Zelinski's letter 5/18/83 requesting ordinance banning, or mandating permits.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: #2 is being held in Committee.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE MANDATING COMPLIANCE WITH RESOLUTION #1489 BY AUGUST 1, 1983, (DATE CHANGED TO SEPTEMBER 15, 1983) - CONCERNING REFUSE COLLECTION FOR CONDOMINIUM OWNERS - submitted by Rep. Donald Donahue 6/27/83. Approved for publication 7/11/83.

MR. CONTI: We changed this to read, September 15, 1983, concerning refuse collection for condominium owners.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, one moment. What did you change on that?

MR. CONTI: Instead of August 1, which has already passed, we have extended the time to September 15. The vote of the Committee was 4 in favor, none against, and one abstention, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for final adoption of the ordinance mandating compliance with Resolution #1489 concerning refuse collection. No speakers?

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a question. I have a note asking if this has been deemed by Corporation Counsel to be a legal ordinance because before, I believe, we had a discussion that there was a problem with an ordinance which was mandating a resolution? Was this deemed legal by Corporation Counsel?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, can you answer that?

MR. CONTI: No, I can't answer that because we're just waiting for information from the Mayor. Before we can get full information, we can't deem anything correct or incorrect.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are still asking for final adoption?

MR. CONTI: Yes, we are.

MR. DONAHUE: Throughout the Code of Ordinances, Madam President, various City officials are required to do certain things. It is not contradictory to require the Mayor as the Chief Executive Officer, to take this action. In many cases, the Mayor is required and the ordinances say, "The Mayor shall," do one thing or another throughout the Code, so that it is not contradictory in any way.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other speakers? No further speakers we are going to move right to a machine vote.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to vote on the proposed ordinance concerning refuse collection for condominiums and Resolution #1489. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The ordinance is ADOPTED 28 affirmative, 1 negative, 3 abstaining and 4 not-voting.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 10, SECTION 13 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, AND ORD. #246 concerning setting a maximum fine for persons who violate the provisions of Chapter 10. Text to be furnished by the Health Department. Submitted by Rep. Zelinski 2/22/83. Held in Committee 3/21, 5/2, 6/6 and 7/11/83.

MR. CONTI: The vote was 5 in favor and none against for publication, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Seconded. We are now voting on publication of this ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. Just a little bit of information to my colleagues because there has been some correspondence back and forth from the Corporation Counsel's office.

Back in February, I asked that this be placed on the Tentative Steering Agenda after the Health Department, Dr. Gofstein had sent copies of a proposed ordinance amending the existing ordinance, and I ask for a request from the Corporation Counsel's office. Now, I believe, my colleagues have received all this correspondence from Attorney William Hennessey.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, I think we all have the correspondence on this.

MR. ZELINSKI: Good, and the last one which he wrote to us was dated August 9th, which he mentioned that the way that it was drafted, it would be agreeable based on state statute and I would hope tonight that we do pass this. It is dearly needed because in the past, there have been violations of the Code by certain landlords in the City, and this is the only way to, hopefully, solve the problem with these particular habitual landlords who don't give the tenants their proper services which they are paying for. So, I hope that my colleagues will vote in favor of this this evening for publication, and then for final adoption later. We will be having a public hearing at our next L&R meeting on this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is just for publication. No further speakers, please use your machine if you approve of publication of this ordinance. Have everyone voted? We're voting on item #4 under L&R, proposed ordinance amending Chapter 10, Section 13 of the Code of Ordinances. The motion has been APPROVED for publication 25 affirmative, 4 negative, 1 abstaining and 6 not-voting.

I wanted to make note that Mr. Wiederlight has left the meeting. We now have 34 members present. (Note: Believe this should be Mr. Franchina)

MR. CONTI: Before we finish that, like Mr. Zelinski said, we are going to have a public hearing and that will be on September 6th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The public hearing on this ordinance is September 6.

- (5) REQUEST FROM REP. ZELINSKI 3/24/83 - "RE-CODIFICATION OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD". Held in Committee 5/2, 6/6, and 7/11/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. CONTI: We are holding that for more information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #5 is held.

- (6) REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FROM NEW NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. 6/10/83, and Mayor Clapes' letter 11/15/82 for Greenwich Avenue affordable Housing Development. Held from 12/27/82 through 6/27/83.

WITHDRAWN

MR. CONTI: We were informed by Barbara McInerney that they are going to withdraw the waiver.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I did receive a letter to that effect. I think we all did.

MR. CONTI: We did receive notification. It's off the Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's formally withdrawn. We'll take #6 off the Agenda.

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR AID TO THE RETARDED, INC. FOR PROPERTY RECENTLY PURCHASED AT CORNER OF WEED HILL AVENUE AND NEWFIELD AVENUE, FOR \$295,000; pursuant to Sec. 12-81(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes. Letter from Atty. Ed Kweskin of Wofsey, Rosen, Kweskin & Kuriansky, 777 Summer Street dated 7/26/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: We're going to hold this for re-wording.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #7 has been held?

MR. CONTI: #7 has been held.

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REPEALING ORD. #302 AND SEC. 11-9 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES and substituting new ordinance entitled "COMMISSION ON AGING - POWERS AND DUTIES" - to include all handicapped persons, as well as elderly and elderly/handicapped. June 27th letter from Anita Sanborn, Dir., Comm. on Aging. Held in Committee 6/27/83.

Also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. CONTI: This is being held and we're inviting Anita Sanborn to give us more information on this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #8 is being held. There is a Secondary Committee on that; Mr. Wider, do you have any report. It's being held by L&R.

MR. WIDER: We did not meet on that but we concur with that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. CONTI: That concludes our report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Conti.

MR. ROOS: I would like to ask for a Suspension of the Rules to present the Charter Revision Committee report. The reason I ask is that 21 votes are mandatory, and they'll be required to decide when the questions will go to the ballot. Put on the ballot.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has been made and seconded to Suspend the Rules to take the Charter Revision Committee out of order. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? We'll have to use our machine because we need two-thirds. Please use your machine if you are in favor of Suspending the Rules to take the Charter Revision Committee report now. We are now voting to Suspend the Rules. We need two-thirds. Has everyone voted? We need 24 votes. The motion to Suspend the Rules has PASSED 26 affirmative, 8 negative and 2 not-voting.

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

MR. ROOS: The Charter Revision Committee met August 10th. Present were Co-Chairman Livingston, myself, Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Hogan, and Ms. Summerville. We met and then we adjourned to August 15th. Again, present were Mr. Livingston, Mr. Roos, Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Hogan and Ms. Summerville.

- (1) DETERMINATION OF WHEN PROPOSED CHARTER IS TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE ELECTORATE (DATE OF REFERENDUM); CATEGORIZING CHARTER SECTIONS INTO QUESTIONS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT; PROPOSED CHARTER WILL BE PUBLISHED BEFORE AUGUST 12, 1983; AND ANY OTHER PERTINENT MATTERS RELATING TO PROPOSED CHARTER REVISION.

MR. ROOS: The motion was made to put the proposed Charter Revision changes on the November 8th ballot. Two approved, two rejected and one abstained. So, therefore, the Committee has no recommendation to present.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's no Committee recommendation. Mr. Roos, you are going to make a motion?

MR. ROOS: Mr. Livingston has the motion.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I believe you would be looking for a motion. I make a motion that the Charter Revision proposals be approved for the November 8th election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has been made and seconded to approved the Charter Commission's revised Charter on the November 8, 1983 election. It was seconded.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: Thank you, Madam President. I believe that the people of Stamford are an intelligent group of people or just look at the assembled group here that they have voted into office. I believe that those citizens who are really concerned about the Charter will take the necessary time to familiarize themselves with the Charter revisions in time for the November 8th general election. These are the same concerned citizens who will vote in a special election, therefore, I really do not believe that it would be fair to subject these citizens to the unnecessary and wasteful burden of a special election.

Furthermore, by November 8th, the Charter Revision process will have been in effect for over one year; more than sufficient time for most people to be familiar with the issues at hand. Let the citizens of Stamford decide for themselves this November 8th whether or not they want a change. The citizens are smart enough to know how they will vote by November 8th. They are also smart enough to know that those who are in favor of a special election want to frustrate any possible change with the long and repetitive debate over the Charter to completely alienate the

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. JACHIMCZYK: (continuing) citizens of Stamford to the point where they won't care what happens to the Charter. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Jachimczyk. The motion on the Floor is to consider the Charter revised at the November 8, 1983 election, bearing in mind that there is no Committee report.

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. I would urge support of this motion. I believe that the question of the Charter changes should be put on the ballot for November 8th. I think that we all, hopefully, want to see here is the truest reflection of the will of the electorate, and I firmly believe that the reflection of that will, we will get that by having it brought to a vote in November. If we have a special election, it would be easier for special interests on both sides of the issue to get people out and it might not necessarily show what the people of Stamford want; less people will be coming out to vote.

I don't go with the argument that, "Well, in November everyone will be voting and they might not know what they are voting on, and they might just vote yes or no." I think we have to have more faith in the citizens of Stamford. I think that having it on the ballot in November will foster debate among the candidates; I think that can be nothing but good.

I don't think that changes or amendments to the City Charter have ever been voted on at other than a November election. I really can think of no compelling reason to put this off. I think we've had enough debate on it. It has been going on, as Mr. Jachimczyk said, for a year or more. I think that in the next two months we will have plenty of debate on the issue and the people will be appraised of the pros and cons, and I urge passage of this motion which would put it on the ballot on November 8th. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. CONTI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm opposed to putting it on the November 8th election because we have presented here before us, a copy tonight that was printed in the Weekly Mail. It's a 16 page format of six-point type. It has taken the Charter Revision Commission almost a year to work on this, and we're expecting the electorate to just peruse this casually, if I may use those words, and come up with an answer before November 8th.

We have a very important election coming up where we have the mayoralty and every other office within the City of Stamford, and is going to be quite a battle. I believe that this Charter Revision is necessary enough to let the people come out and work on it by itself; not to be mixed up with anything else that may come up on November 8th. Monetarily, it will not cost anything extra because we do have monies return to us by the Charter Revision Commission, and this money can be used to conduct the special election. I have been made aware this evening, that the last time we had a referendum, 35,000 people came out to vote. 13,000 voted on the questions and it was almost split-down in half. So, you are not going to get the attention that this needs in the November election where we have quite a few other important issues to be resolved. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will ask for a special election on this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Conti.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GUROIAN: I would like to see the Charter Revision put on the November election. I listened to all the arguments for several weeks now, and I don't feel that anything has been said to dissuade me from believing that it should be on the November election.

One of the argument presented is special attention will be given to it in April. The people are accustomed to voting in November, and when the November elections come, they accustom themselves to appraising themselves of the issues, and deciding on what to vote. In April, it will get very little attention except by the special interest groups who will lobby for their particular interest in Charter Revision, and I don't think you get a realistic vote in a special election at all. You get, as in a primary, only those with a special interest coming out to vote. I think you get a more realistic approach if you have it in a general election when people are geared for voting and not in April when they don't expect an election; it gets thrust upon them. They will pay far less attention as far as I'm concerned in April than they will in November.

My second point is; right from the beginning when the Committee appointed the Charter Revision Commission, the time table was set so that it could appear on the November election, and the Commission was appraised this fact that they should be ready in time for the November election. If, in fact, it was the intention of this Board to have it six months after the November election, they should have afforded the Charter Revision Commission more time to do their work.

The second argument at the time that we set the dates for the Commission to meet and have their report in was that it was the feeling of the Committee members, and if I remember correctly, of the Board members, that it not be extended into the tenure of another Board; that the Charter Revision be completed by this Board, and it will only do that if we have it on the November election, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the November election so that all the people who are going to the polls will have an opportunity to vote on it while they are voting for the municipal nominees, and not subject them to another election in April.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I must support the November election also, for all of the arguments which have eloquently been given before. I feel that the citizenry is interested and wants to vote and wants to learn about it, they will learn about it by November and keeping it until April is not going to change the number of people who want to vote, who are interested in finding out about Charter Revision, who care. I think that if we get it over in November, then we know where we are heading.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Madam President. I feel that the faith in the people who live in the City of Stamford is very strong as far as their ability to judge, understand, comprehend, and know the issues facing the City in the 1980's as well as the issues which make up the complexity of the proposals for the Charter Revision. Don't under-estimate the voting public. They are not naive. It does not take them long to understand and digest 16 pages of written material.

Stamford, as you saw by the film early this evening, as a community, made up of very intelligent, bright, people. People who can understand and size up a situation very quickly. They don't have to read between the lines.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: (continuing) People of this Community have taken part for years in the process of Charter Revision. To assume that they can't understand and make a vote based on merit by November is foolhardy. I certainly agree with the remarks that were made by Mr. Jachimczyk, Mrs. Howe, Mrs. Gershman, and Mrs. Guroian. The time to have this item placed before the public is November. The time to generate any kind of publicity and debate is prior to November, and then we must put faith and trust in the people of this Community to know what they want of their government for the future; not us.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'd like to move the question, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are three speakers left. A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. It's not debatable.

MR. LIVINGSTON: If there are only three speakers left, and they haven't spoken for the first time, I withdraw it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You withdraw the motion. Does the second withdraw? (yes) There are four speakers, Mr. Livingston.

MR. DeLUCA: I wish to thank Jerry Livingston for withdrawing his motion. I am definitely in favor of placing this item on the November 8th election. Comments that the public cannot digest and understand a 16 page document; I forget what the size of the printing is or was stated as, is ludicrous and ridiculous. We have an intelligent public out there. To delay this for a special election would only dilute our credibility as members of the Board of Representatives. We established a time table to get this ready for November 8. The Charter Revision Commission dedicated themselves to meet this date. They have met the date. They have complied with every request possible. Now, we say, "No, let's go for a special election."

To listen to the arguments of SACIA, a prime special interest group, to scrape this whole document and to begin from scratch is ludicrous. To listen to one of the prime members of SACIA who commented that it was the Mayor that appointed the Charter Revision Commission; this person has been around for years in politics and she seems to forget that it was our Board that appointed the Charter Revision Commission and not the Mayor. All we would be doing is giving the special interest groups more time to organize. To have a special election would be contrary to our belief and to our time table that we set up.

I think it's our obligation to the people to place this on the November 8th ballot. The people know what they are voting for. I have received many calls requesting that this go on the November 8th election; not to delay it any further because to do so would be an injustice to the public. Therefore, I would urge the people this evening to support a November 8th date. Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. I believe that the proposed revisions that will be before the populace, either at a special election or in November, are the most complex that have ever; I would say the most comprehensive is the word I really mean, that has every come before our City, and to me the issue is whether there is ample time between and the November 8th election for there to be a complete and serious discuss of the issues, and a complete and comprehensive airing all the questions that will be before the electorate.

Someone said that long debate would be negative in relation to this matter. I believe that long debate is precisely what should occur. Debate is healthy; debate educates. We're talking about the very essence of our City government; really profound change; much of which I think is positive, but very profound, and I think these issues should be debated, and I think there should be ample time for it.

When there is a primary going on now within the next month, and following on the heels of the primary, a general election for all the city offices, I think there will not be time for that debate. Quite frankly to me, it demeans the electorate to say, "They will not show up for a special election." That they won't pay attention to an election that occurs in April or occurs in May. To me, democracy is not for spectators; it's for participators. The people in Stamford are participators. They are voters who will come out in special elections. They are voters who will care enough to come out, and it has distressed me to listen to people say that who's going to come out in a special election; well, the people who care. The people who care in democracy, people who care in their government will come out, and those are the people in Stamford. This matter is so important that a separate and special election should be undertaken by us as Representatives, for those people that we represent, and I will be supporting a special election.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein. Mrs. Conti is not on the Floor.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I think postponing the Charter Revision issue would destroy the momentum that has been generated. It has been published now. It is ready for voter consideration in the November 8th election. Having watched the dismal returns in many primary elections, I can only say that I feel that the November 8th election is the proper election which this should be submitted.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you. Until this past week, I was leaning towards supporting a special election for the Charter Revisions. I was afraid that the recommendations that would be put before the public might be lost in the rush of the general election rhetoric, and I felt it was much too important for that. I still feel it is too important to be lost. I only hope, at this point, that the Charter Revision, parts that will be put before the public to be voted on, will get the kind of coverage and the kind of attention that they need. In view of the arguments put forth here this evening by my colleagues, and the surprising number of calls that I have had in my District by voters who are concerned, I will be going in support of the November 8th election. Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: I have to agree with Mrs. Goldstein. I think that the issue of Charter Revision should be separate. We're not talking about say, putting together the Parks and Recreation Department or the Golf Authority and Hubbard Heights only, we're talking about a drastic change within the government. You're talking about possibly not having a Board of Finance; you're talking about 25 members on the Board of Representatives; you're talking about a Commissioner of Public Works who will have a five-year contract; you're talking about a Public Works Commission. There are all important issues and I think that the public really has to know what the issues are and what the ramifications are. I don't doubt that by November a lot of them will know, and I also say that a lot of them will not know. Not because of their intelligence but because of their time; the amount of time.

I also feel that if you are going to change the government as much as this Charter Revision Commission wants to change it, and I'm not saying I'm for or against it, I think that the public better come out on a special election and vote. I don't think we should change this government if only 5,000 vote on particular items and you get 2,700 in favor and 2,300 against. That's not representing the whole city. If you have a special election, then everybody has the opportunity to come out and vote specifically for Charter Revision, then we will know if the electorate in this City, really wants the changes or don't want the changes. So, therefore, I'm going to vote for a special election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. This being an election year, I see where we are putting our laws that govern our City in the hands of people that can use it for any political platform they want to use it on. I think it is unfair to give them that to run on. I feel that we need to be really studying this and doing something with it ourselves and be prepared to have a special election so that we can invite the people to come out and express their concerns. I think there is going to be overly concern expressed even without having it on the ballot by the political candidates. I don't think we need to have our Charter that is really going to govern our City for the next ten years before our candidates to run on. I don't think we need that. I would be in favor of a special election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor now is to consider the revised Charter on the November 8th election.

MR. TARZIA: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I, too, do not favor placing the Charter Revision before the public at the November election. I think this is too important an issue to mix it in with the regular general election. Grant you, the public can be informed in 60 days or 90 days; a lot can be done. However, if you look at the statistics at the last general election, the number of voters that voted for the referendum, you find that only 35 to 40%. Now, what bothers me is how many of those voters really knew what they were voting on? Maybe most of them did, I don't know. Maybe only those that remember to look up at the top, those were the ones that voted. I don't know. The point is that if you have a special election regardless of the cost; some figures have been brought out, 25, 40, 50,000. I can say that is 1/100th of a mill. Some people say that all the time; they always bring out percentages. What's the difference? This is democracy, and if you're talking about the framework of our way of life in this City, the cost is irrelevant as far as I'm concerned.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. TARZIA: (continuing) The point is that if people want to go out there and vote, they will go out at a special election. It's our responsibility. It's a responsibility of the media. It's a responsibility of every concerned citizen to see to it that the public is informed of what's going on. So let's have a special election whether it's in April or whenever it is. What's the big rush? We've been running under type of Charter since the late '40's so I am sure we can wait a few extra months. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other speakers? We will go right to a machine vote. Before we go into that, the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 7-19e states that we must approve by a majority of our entire membership, which is 21, when the revised Charter is to be put before the electorate for approval or disapproval. That means that we must have 21 votes. Does everyone understand? We have to have 21 votes. Mrs. Hawe has made a motion for a Roll call vote. Is there a second. Seconded. All in favor of a Roll call vote, please raise your hands so I can see. There's sufficient. We'll have a Roll call vote. I'll ask the Tellers to come forward, Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Stork. Would anyone like a tally sheet?

The motion on the Floor is to approve the revised Charter to be placed on the November 8, 1983 ballot for election by the electorate. We are now voting to put the revised Charter on the ballot on November 8, 1983. We'll proceed to a Roll call vote. If you vote yes, you are in favor of the November 8th election. If you are opposed to the November 8, 1983 election, vote no. Is it clear on what we are voting for? Bear in mind, Ladies and Gentlemen, we need 21 votes.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and Gentlemen, we haven't done anything. We have 18 no votes. We have 17 yes votes and we are obligated to either approve or disapprove by 21 votes here this evening.

MR. STORK: Madam President, does that have to be accomplished tonight?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, it does, Mr. Stork.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Part of the answer to that question is have until September 8th, in order to place this on the ballot for November. I received that information from Corporation Counsel. If we do not pass it tonight, we would have to call a special meeting ourselves to act on it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let me explain a little bit of what's going on here. For this to be on the November 8th ballot, we have to approve the questions by our September 14th meeting because it has to be sent from the Town Clerk's office on September 23rd to the Secretary of State. We had planned on the Charter Revision Committee, bearing in mind that we were planning on a November 8th ballot, because that was the date closest to this meeting, that they were going work weekly with the Corporation Counsel and set up the questions with the office, approve them at our September 14th meeting, get them to the Town Clerk's office giving her at least 4 or 5 days to prepare them and get them to the Secretary of State.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) That's the action that's taken place. Of course, that's the November election. For a special election, we have within 15 months, but bearing in mind to go on the November 8th ballot, we do have until September 8, I also know that. But that would mean calling a special meeting of this Board. Is this Board ready to have a special meeting called Labor Day week? Or we going to get a quorum? Are people going to approve? Is that just another way of not even showing up? This is what we are faced with, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm bringing the facts before you.

MR. STORK: Thank you for that explanation. Now I am ready to make a motion. I would like to make a motion for a special election to be held on the same date in 1984, that is used for the election for the Democratic City Committee and the Republican Town Committee for their election. I believe it's in March.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have to have a date, Mr. Stork. Mr. Stork, your motion is to ...

MR. STORK: The same date that is used for the election of the Democratic City Committee and the Republican Town Committee

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? There is a second. We're speaking to the motion. The first one to speak to Mr. Stork's motion which is to have a special election on the same day as the Democratic and Republican Town Committee elections. Raise your hands, and our Clerk will recognize you to speak to this motion. Mr. Stork could speak to his motion.

MR. STORK: I would just offer that while the speakers are having their say, I can go make a phone call and try to come up with the date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We can accept that that day, at this point.

MRS. PERILLO: Madam President, point of information before we do any voting. I would like to ask whoever knows, that is a Republican and a Democratic voting. We have Independents in this City; where does that leave them to vote on the Charter?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Perillo, the motion has been made. It's been seconded; it's before us, but I'm sure we should take that into consideration. We are the ones who determine the special election. We have to remember that.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, speaking directly to this motion...

MR. CONTI: Point of order.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Conti.

MR. CONTI: If I may clarify something, this may help the whole situation. I believe, I don't know about the Democrats, but I do believe that the Republicans will not have a primary. It will be done by caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, Mr. Stork is looking into that. The motion is on the Floor. All these things have to be taken into consideration, but we do have a valid motion, and it is seconded, and on the Floor. Please, let's go to the speakers, and the point of order can be later because it really isn't a point of order. You can speak to the motion.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MCINERNEY: Thank you, Madam President. For all of the reasons that were stated earlier for having a special election to allow public debate in an area where people could learn and understand about the Charter Revision and the proposals because they were complex and so comprehending, it's ridiculous to even consider putting together on a ballot with something where you're electing people to Republican and Democratic City and Town Committees, and as Mrs. Perillo indicated, what happens to our unaffiliated voters in this Community? That's not a minority anymore. There's a huge number of them and they are very decisive in any election. I think this is ridiculous. I don't even think the Board should consider it.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. Two points: 1. I think that this motion is actually illegal and we could ask our Parliamentarian for a ruling. As Rep. Mildred Perillo mentioned, the fact that Independent voters would not be allowed to vote whether the Republicans have a City Committee election or not, where do the Independents go as far as the voting machine? Do they go in the Democratic voting machine or do they go in another type of machine? It just would not be legal.

Secondly, to address the point that you had mentioned about the previous vote which was that nothing was accomplished, the motion failed; so that means that it is not going to be on the November 8th election ballot. If this motion fails, it's also not going to be a special election and that's it. We don't need 21 votes the other way because it's obvious the motions have been defeated. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: ... it by law since we have already accepted the Commission's report that we have to put it before the electorate. We have to pick a date. We can be liable. It's not just clear-cut if we don't vote either one of them. We have to vote on something. Mr. Conti, do you want to speak?

MR. CONTI: No, I already spoke. Thank you for the opportunity.

MR. DZIEZYC: It's quite difficult to have an election with a primary going on, if there is a primary in the Republican Party. There may not be any in the Town Committee. I believe that we should have the special election. We could have another vote here because we have the 21...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, may I remind you though that the motion we are addressing is the special election that Mr. Stork has mentioned.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, I know but I don't think we could hold it that day. We should have another day set aside. Thank you.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam President. At first blush, I thought that Mr. Stork's motion to have it the day of the Town and City Committee elections would be good. I do think that logistically it might be incredibly difficult, so, therefore, I think that it is perfectly in order if this motion is defeated to come up with another date; perhaps in April when the weather is nice to hold a special election. I think because the Body defeated putting on the ballot for November 8th, does not mean that we can't find a suitable day to hold an election for this matter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, Mrs. Goldstein. The date we are voting on now is the date that Mr. Stork has. We can go on many other motions.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask Mr. Stork to withdraw his motion because after all, a Democratic primary or a Republican, if they do have a primary, is a party function. It has nothing to do with whether we have a Charter election or not. If you have to have a separate date, it should have a separate date, but should not be mixed with a party function. I would like that Mr. Stork should actually withdraw his motion because it's in bad taste.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It is quarter to twelve. We have a motion on the Floor and tomorrow is a very important time in this Board's history.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. The question is on Mr. Stork's motion. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? How many no votes? Not sufficient. We're going to move the question, and the question is on Mr. Stork's motion to hold a special election on the date of the Democratic and City Committee election. Please use your machine in one moment. Has everyone voted? We're voting on Mr. Stork's motion. The motion is LOST 4 affirmative, 27 negative, 1 abstaining and 4 not-voting.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'm sure you are aware that we were advised that when we present this to the Board, we handle all the motions separate; such as, first decide if we were going to hold the election in November. We decided that we wouldn't. The next motion as advised by Corporation Counsel should have been, are we going to have this on a special election, and at that point, we hold another motion on the proposed date, and in that spirit, I would like to offer a motion that we present the proposed Charter changes to the general public on the ballot at a special election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Mr. Livingston that's a motion before the Floor, but the other motion was proper too, a date for a special election. A motion on the Floor by Mr. Livingston is that we put the Charter changes on the ballot for the electorate at a special election, date to be decided later. That's the motion. Is there a second? Several seconds.

MRS. GUROIAN: Point of information. If this Board votes on a day for a special election, can the following Board change that date?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would assume so, Mrs. Guroian. The Chair is in doubt for that. We have up until October of 1984. That's a good question, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: I know it's a good question. I want to know the answer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't know, and maybe we could ask our Parliamentarians to do some research and come back with an answer. I do know we have until October of '84 to set a date.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It would seem to me that if we set a date, that date is set. It's our duty to set a date whether it will be a special election date or the general election day coming up in November. I don't think that if we set a date, the upcoming Board or any future Board can change that date. It makes no logical sense to me; perhaps I will be told differently.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll see if we can find the answer to this.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: My question to you, Madam Chairman, is it ample to vote on holding a special election? It seems to me that if we voted against having it on the general election, we are obligated to set a date for a special election. To me, I can't understand why we are voting to have a special election. We don't have a third alternative.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Goldstein, exactly, but we have to decide tonight by 21 votes, whether we have it on the November ballot which was already defeated, so our next option now is a special election.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Correct. So couldn't the vote be that a special election to be held on...Can I make an amendment to that that we hold it at a special election on April 10th, which is the second Tuesday in April and there is no holiday on that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would accept that as an amendment to the motion. A special election to be held April 10th, and that's what we are voting on now. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm a little confused. What happens if someone was to make a motion saying, "The heck, we want to scrape everything, and don't hold any election."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, this has been researched over and over again. Mr. Hennessey who is the sole authority on the Charter and Connecticut General Statutes state that we are mandated to decide by September 8th, what date we are going to give this to the electorate. We don't have a choice. We are mandated to put it before the public.

MR. DeLUCA: We still have a choice. We can just don't set a date, but we can call for a special meeting by September 8th. We have 5 people that are absent. Maybe four of these five people comes September 8th, might go for the 21.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We can call a special meeting before September 8th.

MR. DeLUCA: Let's get the record straight. We can't have to set a date this evening. We can vote to come back here before September 8th. I'd like to make the amendment that we hold a special meeting September 8th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, we have an amendment, and that amendment changes the intent.

MR. DeLUCA: You can't make two amendments?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, that changes the intent of the main motion which is a special election to be held April 10.

MR. DeLUCA: The whole trouble is that you and Rep. Goldstein are misleading to a certain point saying that we have to vote on something this evening for a special election. We don't have to vote on it. Not this evening. Let's come out with the true facts that we don't have to vote on it this evening. We can September 8th, and then vote on it.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, it was clearly stated by the Chair previously, that we had until September 8th, but I also mentioned the fact that we have to call a special meeting. I also mentioned it was Labor Day week; we have to get a quorum, but it is our responsibility to set a date. Also, if we're going to set a special election, that the Charter Revision Committee has already set up workshops.

It wasn't misleading. Mrs. Goldstein and the Chair did not mislead anyone. We have until September 8th.

MR. DeLUCA: To some point, you most certainly did. Let's get both facts over here.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is for a special election to be held April 10th. That's the motion.

MR. CONTI: I wasn't going to speak on the amendment, but all I can do at this point, is say, yes, I am in favor of it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, that's the whole motion. The amendment is that a special election be held April 10th.

MRS. CONTI: I see a possible conflict with that date of April 10th. That is very close to the annual budget hearings; the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives' Fiscal Committee. Yes, they meet at 7:30 and the polls are open until 8 in an election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, you're speaking against the date?

MRS. CONTI: ...because of the possible conflict in dates. The Board of Finance sets the date for the hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, why don't we go through the Chair here?

MRS. CONTI: Well, who sets the date for the meeting of...

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's a joint between the Fiscal Committee of this Board and the Board of Representatives' Fiscal Committee. It's a joint venture.

MRS. CONTI: But who sets the date?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's a joint date. It's a joint venture. Two people agree on it. The motion on the Floor is for a special election to be held April 10th.

MR. DeLUCA: Point of information. April 10th, is that anywhere around Easter? A lot of people may be on vacation. The 22nd, O.K.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other speakers? We're going to move right to a vote. A motion has been made for Roll call. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor of a Roll call, raise your hands. We have to have at least 8 people. We have a fifth. We will proceed with a Roll call vote.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: Has the question concerning the next Board's authority over changing this date been answered, Madam President?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, it hasn't. Mr. Donahue, do you have the answer to that question?

MR. DONAHUE: I just spoke to Mr. Fraser and because of the time constraints placed by the State on this Body, and because we are the appointing Body, it is our responsibility to set the special election and the next Board would be responsible to carry that out, and because of that, they could not change the date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mrs. Guroian, does that answer your question? Mrs. Guroian is not on the Floor, but I am sure that answers it.

MRS. CONTI: Point of information. Before we vote on this date, has anybody determined that it doesn't conflict with the Easter holidays?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, we did. It has already been mentioned. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a very important vote. It's a Roll call vote. I would ask everyone to come out of the caucus rooms and sit in your chairs. We are now voting on the special election to be held April 10th. If you approve the April 10th special election date, vote yes. If you are opposed, vote no, bearing in mind, we have until September 8th, to set a date. Is everybody clear on this?

MR. CONTI: I'd like to ask a question?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. CONTI: What happens if this is defeated? What other alternatives is there?

(inaudible)

MR. CONTI: Thank you.

MR. TARZIA: I hate to waste time, but I'm not sure if it is the week of school vacation, Spring vacation. The reason I bring that up as you well know, a lot of the families away that week in Spring. I think it's that week, but I could be wrong.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you for your information, but we are going to proceed with a vote anyway because we're moving with the vote. It's been moved.

MRS. GERSHMAN: May I have a point of information? I'm awfully sorry.

PRESIDENT SANTY: What is your point?

MRS. GERSHMAN: If we go through a couple of these dates, is there any way that you can go back to the November 8th date? Can that be recalled?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Not unless somebody could reconsider who voted on the prevailing side. A no vote could ask for another vote. We are going to proceed. The motion is for a special election to consider the proposed revised Charter on April 10, 1984.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. LIVINGSTON: Madam President, I believe we're voting on the amendment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's right. A special election to be held April 10th.

MR. LIVINGSTON: No, no, the amendment is the date. The main motion was for a special election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's for an election to be held April 10th. Mr. Livingston, basically, it's your motion. You voted for a special election. Mrs. Goldstein made an amendment. It's part of the motion; a special election to be held on April 10th. That's the motion.

MR. LIVINGSTON: The only reason I bring up the question, I thought our normal practice is to vote on all amendments first.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are. We're voting on an election to be held April 10th. If that is defeated, we can go back to your main motion for a special election. We're voting on an election date of April 10th. Proceed with the Roll call.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Tellers please come forward. The motion has LOST 19 negative, 16 affirmative and 5 not-voting.

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to make an amendment that we have this special election one week following the November 8th election. If this is seconded, I'd like to speak to this amendment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to that motion. That date is November 15th. The motion on the Floor is to have the special election November 15, 1983.

MRS. SIGNORE: The reason for this that I am thinking that the interest would still be high. The voting machine could still be left in the polling places. It makes more sense to do it one week following the general election.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I wish I could understand that. I would really beg your indulgence on that, Mrs. Signore. I hope that having the special election would allow for some time for the airing of the issues. Would a week allow that? Would a month not be better? I'm in favor of a special election. I just think that a week is not giving it enough time. Perhaps, the next month. I would certainly be in favor of that if we could work out some compromise like that. I don't think it's anybody's goal to thwart the process so, how do we work out a feasible time? I would be in favor of some reasonable time; 3 weeks time so that there could be ample time to air some issues, and I agree with you it is nice while everything is hot at that time. Could you change it in that manner; 3 weeks?

MRS. SIGNORE: I was thinking of the Thanksgiving holiday; that might be the problem.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor as made and seconded is to hold this election, a special election, to be held November 15, 1983.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. If there is a recount, the voting machines are tied-up for a week or even more than a week.

MRS. SIGNORE: May I withdraw that and make another motion if the seconder will withdraw her second?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The seconder is withdrawing. You want to make another motion then.

MRS. SIGNORE: Let's make it for the first Tuesday in December. I don't know what date that is.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second to that motion? There's a motion made and seconded for the first Tuesday in December. That's the amendment to Mr. Livingston's motion for a special election. Mrs. Signore, do you want to get me a date? There's a motion made and seconded for a special election to be held on December 6th.

MR. CONTI: Not on this question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, do you want to speak to this motion?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, I really can't think that we are addressing this question with the significance it deserves. A few of us have pointed-out how significant it is, yet, in trying to correct what we felt was the wrong date; some people felt at least, we have tried now to project dates that are increasingly more difficult. You are just not going to get people out in significant numbers on those dates that we're mentioning. I think we should reconsider actually, someone who has been on the proper side, should reconsider the November 8th election. It seems like that's where we're going.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're speaking against the motion to hold the election December 6th.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I agree with Mrs. Maihock. I think that this is a disservice to the voters of the City of Stamford to sit here and quibble back and forth if this date, if that date, and the next date; I don't think that's a proper way to proceed with the Charter revision provisions. Incidentally, many of the people in the Community who do vote are ranging from 55 up. In December, you can have rain, you can have snow, you can have many problems. Those people will not come out to vote. They will lose the opportunity to pass their judgement on this Charter for just as many reasons that they won't know anything by November, it would be foolhardy to try to cut them off because of the weather and other problems in December. I'm against it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. BLUM: I don't know if this is...but I'd like to make an amendment that we have a special meeting next week, next Tuesday just for the...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, that changes the intent of the amendment to the main motion. We can accept that motion following the vote. Right now we have a motion on the Floor to approve the special election date December 6th. That's what we're address now. No other speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote. Mrs. Conti, I didn't see your hand.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: I'm speaking against the December 6th vote. I think any date in November or December, you're getting very close to the holidays. Anything after Thanksgiving and before Christmas, you won't get people out there. They are too busy with other things.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other speakers, we will move right to a machine vote on the amendment for the election to be held December 6th. Please use your machine. One moment, the machine is having a little problem. Please revote. We're voting on the amendment to the December 6th election. Please use your machine. The machine is not registering. Now the machine is ready. Please vote again. I'm sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen. We will now vote on the amendment for a December 6th election. Please vote. Has everyone voted? The motion is LOST 25 negative, 8 affirmative and 3 not-voting.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to make a motion in regards to having a special meeting next Tuesday in order to come up with a date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, may I have the date?

MR. BLUM: Next Tuesday is the 14th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Today is the 14th.

MR. BLUM: The 23rd.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum has the Floor. He's making a motion that we have a special meeting next Tuesday to decide this question. That's August the 21st?

MR. BLUM: August 23rd.

PRESIDENT SANTY: August 23rd. Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to the motion. The motion on the Floor is for this Board to hold a special meeting to decide when we will put the vote before the electorate for the revised Charter. Mr. Blum's for a special meeting.

MR. ZELINSKI: 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? The no votes, please raise your hands. Not sufficient. Two-thirds is enough to move it. We're going to move the question. The question is on Mr. Blum's motion for this Board to hold a special meeting August 23rd to decide when we will put the revised Charter before the electorate. Has everyone voted? The motion is LOST 24 negative, 9 affirmative, and 3 not-voting.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I know we have to be frivolous at times, and I know we have to joke, but we are discussing something so vital to this Town; so vital to this Board. It's now ten after twelve. We have gone through three or four dates already. We've defeated a special election. We do have until September 8th, but the seriousness of it is that we have to decide a date. We have no choice; we have to decide a date.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: I'd like to make an amendment to Rep. Livingston's main motion, and call for a special election on the second Tuesday of May, that's May 10, 1984, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made by Mr. Stork for an election to be held May 10, 1984. Is there a second? There is a second.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm against this May 10th date because as Mr. Stork is aware, we have our budget proceedings prior to that. They take up every night. We have our budget meetings. They all are at night, but the electorate is going to be very concerned with what's happening to his taxes, and if he is concerned about what is going to happen to his taxes and the budget of the City, he may not pay the attention that the Charter revision warrants, and so far, I am against this and the best date that has come up is still November 8th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is May 10, 1984.

MR. OWENS: Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to make a motion to reconsider my vote on the November 8, 1983 election for this Charter Revision.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Owens, were you a no vote?

MR. OWENS: Yes, I was, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made, which is proper before this Board, to reconsider the November 8th election date. Is there a second? Several seconds. We are now discussing Mr. Owens' motion to reconsider. It is debatable. Any discussion to reconsider the November 8th election? No speakers, we will move right to a vote. A motion has been made for a Roll call vote. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor, please raise your hands for a Roll call vote. Sorry, if you want a Roll call vote, we have to go back to vote on the reconsideration. We have a reconsideration made and seconded. We'll now use the machine to reconsider. You want a Roll call vote to reconsider? Sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. Livingston.

A motion has been made and seconded for a Roll call vote on the reconsideration. All in favor of a Roll call vote, raise your hands. I see sufficient. We'll have a Roll call vote for the reconsideration. Teller, please come forward. Roll call vote on the reconsideration to reconsider the November 8th election. If you want to reconsider to vote on November 8th election for the Charter, please vote yes. If you disagree, vote no. We will proceed.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A majority is all that is necessary for reconsideration. Will the Tellers please come forward. Mr. Zelinski, do you have a question? We are in the middle of a vote now.

MR. ZELINSKI: May I be allowed to speak after the vote is announced?

PRESIDENT SANTY: certainly.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion to reconsider is LOST 18 no, 17 yes.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: Being that we seem to be not getting off base here, I make a motion that we ajourn.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn the meeting?

MR. ZELINSKI: That is correct. We'll be here going through every day of the months between now and the deadline and it seems we're not going to accomplish anything. We'll be here until 7 o'clock tomorrow.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to adjourn. It's not debatable. We'll use the machine. A majority is that is necessary to adjourn. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a motion on the Floor to adjourn. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion to adjourn is DEFEATED 7 affirmative, 25 negative, and 4 not-voting.

MR. STORK: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: Don't we return to my motion for May 10, 1984, now that the other motion has been defeated?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, but Mr. Stork, before we go on, many of our members are leaving. Mr. Gaipa has left. I would please ask the Representatives to please take their seats. Mr. Gaipa has left. We now have 33 present.

MR. DZIEZYC: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment, Mr. Dziezyc. We have a main motion on the Floor for a special election. That was amended. The last motion is for a May 10, 1984 election date. That is the motion that's on the Floor now. That's what we are discussing. Mr. DeLuca, do you want to speak to that motion?

MR. DZIEZYC: Point of information, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, thank you, Madam President. Do we have to vote for a special election date tonight or could we wait until October?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, if we vote for a special election, period (.), we could decide it at a later date if that motion for a special election passed by 21 votes. The only thing we are mandated by is we have until September 8th, to decide which is 60 days before the election, but if we decide on a November 8th election which is what was already defeated, we have to have it in the Town Clerk's office by the 23rd of September. That was our deadline.

If the motion for a special election passes, we could decide the date at our October meeting, but we have to decide the date before this Board goes out of existance. Right now, we have a motion on the Floor for a May 10, 1984 date. It's been made and seconded; May 10. No speakers, we are going to move right to a machine vote. Please use your machine for a May 10, 1984 special election date. 21 votes are still required. Has everyone voted? The motion has LOST 12 affirmative, 17 negative, 1 abstaining and 6 not-voting. I still recognize Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to make a motion that we return for a special meeting on September 8, to decide on a date.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, we already voted on that motion.

MR. DeLUCA: September 8th?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, we did.

MR. DeLUCA: November 8th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, we didn't. Mr. DeLuca, Mrs. McInerney, everyone, Mr. Blum made a motion for a September 8th special meeting.

MR. DeLUCA: No, he did not. He said August 23rd. Mr. Blum's motion was August 23rd. My motion is for November 8th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment, Mr. DeLuca, we have that motion but there is a motion on the Floor.

MR. DIXON: Point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Dixon.

MR. DIXON: Madam President, would it not be in order since the amendments have been defeated, wouldn't it be in order now to call for the main motion?

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's it exactly.

MR. DIXON: Then, I would move the question on the main motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and a second...several seconds to move the main question, the question being to hold a special election to consider the revised Charter. We still need 21 votes. A motion has been made for a Roll call. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor, please raise your hands. There is sufficient for a Roll call vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, if we vote for a special election, then we can come back at our next regular meeting in September and choose a date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right. If this passes by a vote of 21 votes, we can decide at our September 14th meeting, the date. We do have to decide a date before this Board goes out of existence, and I think it would be proper because they are going to need time to put the questions together.

The motion on the Floor is for a special election; a date to be decided at our next meeting. We're having a Roll call vote.

MR. TARZIA: Madam Chairman, thank you. As to the date to be decided, we have until what date?

PRESIDENT SANTY: October, 1984. And any day in between; 15 months. We'll now continue with a Roll call vote. May I ask, the Tellers have requested that you use your microphones because the Tellers find it difficult to hear.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Tellers please come forward. The motion is LOST 19 affirmative, 14 negative, and 1 absent.

MR. DeLUCA: I believe it is now proper for me to make a motion that we come back and meet on September 8th, to decide on a date.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, you're calling for a special meeting to decide when this will be put for the electorate on September 8th.

MR. DeLUCA: It is a Wednesday right after Labor Day. Everybody will be back from their vacations. They will have taken their children to school.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is that a religious holiday? Excuse me, before we get a second, you should understand it. Is that a holyday? I would like Mr. Wiederlight and Mrs. Goldstein to mention the fact. Rosh Hashanah is the 8th. Do you want to withdraw the motion?

MR. DeLUCA: I'll make it the 7th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think we should recognize the religious holidays.

MR. DeLUCA: Of course, by all means.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you want to make it September 7th? I'm sorry, that's the same holiday. Mr. DeLuca has the Floor. He is deciding on a special meeting date.

MR. DeLUCA: August 30th, which would be a Tuesday.

PRESIDENT SANTY: August 30th, which is one day after Steering. You could always make it the night of Steering.

MR. DeLUCA: The night of Steering, August 29th. Everybody will be here.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, we'll have Steering first and then we could have the meeting. A motion has been made by Mr. DeLuca to have a special meeting to decide when this will be put before the electorate on August 29th, following Steering. Is there a second. Seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Let's use the machine for a special meeting to decide this question on August 29. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 18 affirmative, 15 negative, and 3 not-voting. We will discuss this item August 29, following Steering Committee.

MR. CONTI: Thank you. I'd like to point-out that two dates can not even be discussed on the night of the special meeting. You cannot discuss November 8, and you cannot discuss April 10, because those have been voted on one has been reconsidered tonight, and if it isn't brought up for reconsideration tonight, it cannot be reconsidered the night of the special meeting.

MR. DeLUCA: Can we get a legal opinion? I cannot just go by on what Mr. Conti's says because he has been wrong in the past, and I'm sure he might be wrong in the future.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let's be kind to one another. We will get an opinion on that. Are there any other speakers?

Mrs. Signore: I'd just would like to ask if there is anyway that the volume level on these machines can be turned down? It is actually painful.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Signore, it certainly can be.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: Excuse me, you will get a legal opinion from Corporation Counsel?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Of course, Mr. DeLuca.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

MRS. MAIHOCK: We had no items on the Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Dixon is leaving. At this time, I would like to ask Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Guroian, I would like you to cut the cake but we just don't have any utensils. Mr. Owens went out and purchased forks. Mrs. Conti, and Mrs. Guroian, would you cut the cake, please.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, we don't have a quorum here.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and Gentlemen, please take your seats. It is now almost twenty to one; we need all our strength for the ballgame tomorrow; we still have many important items; we can be through this very quickly if you just take your seats. We do not have a quorum. It's obvious. Would the Leaders of both parties, please get the people get the people out on this Floor? Please get the people on this Floor. There is other City business to transact.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

(tape ?)

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RELATING TO PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF NORTH STATE STREET AND HILL STREET FROM CITY OF STAMFORD BY ELM STREET CORPORATION (GENERAL REINSURANCE COMPANY) FOR \$599,360, VIA QUIT CLAIM DEED. Resolution concerning "A Notice of Intention to Discontinue" these portions of streets approved at 5/2/83 meeting. 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. James Ford. Approved for Publication 7/13/83.

MR. DONAHUE: ... who spoke at the Public Hearing and I would also add that Mr. Wider at the Public Hearing, Mr. Blum was at the Public Hearing, Ms. Summerville was at the Public Hearing. Of those five that spoke, most of the discussion centered upon the closing of North State Street. The closing of North State Street has come as a surprise to a number of people, including myself. It has been a major connector for some time in that part of the City, however, after conducting much research into the manner in which State Street was closed, it has been found that the State of Connecticut under state law and with a perfect right, has denied access from State Street on to the Elm Street ramp. The City has not discontinued either Hill Street or a portion of North State Street. This is what we've been petitioned to do at this point in time.

Mr. Tobin of Cummings and Lockwood sent to me, and now to this Board, a letter which clarifies the authority of the state in this matter as part of the project to realign exits 7 and 8, which was a state project although it was requested and pursued by the City. They determined that for safety reasons and because

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) of the redesign of the Elm Street exit, it would be proper to cul-de-sac North State Street at that point. As a matter of courtesy, a letter was sent to the Mayor outlining the steps that the state was going to take, and asking for his opinion. You all received copies, I believe, of that letter where the Mayor indicated that he approved or would agree to the cul-de-sacing of North State Street. That dates back to sometime in 1976 or 1977.

In January of 1976, a Public Hearing was held in the City where it was outlined that North State Street would be cul-de-saced, and to the best of my knowledge, there was no opposition to it at the time.

The point was made by the Committee, and I think the Committee understands at this point, that the issue before us is the sale of the remaining property; the discontinuance and sale of Hill Street and a portion of North State Street, and whether or not that is in the best interest of the City of Stamford, considering the fact that North State Street has been terminated at the Elm Street ramp by the State of Connecticut. So that the issue before us tonight, is the final adoption of an ordinance which would discontinue North State Street and Hill Street and would sell it to General Reinsurance Incorporated for the sum of money I mentioned before. By a vote of 5 in favor and 1 opposed, the Committee recommends this sale...

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Excuse me, Mr. Zelinski, are you leaving? Good night.

MR. DONAHUE: The Committee recommends this sale due to the fact that it will allow General Reinsurance to maintain a piece of property which the City has no current plans for, which the state has cul-de-saced, and which would be our responsibility for many years to come, to maintain if we do not sell it to General Reinsurance. This will allow General Reinsurance to complete their plans for a delivery entrance in the rear of the building which will be there whether or not we approve the sale, and for an exit ramp from the garage. So, with that report in mind, I would move for the final adoption of this proposed ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Several seconds. We have 27 members present. We need 21 votes for adoption.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: First, let me say that I would like to go on record as voting against this in principal. I also would like to read into the record, three letters that were received from different people opposing this particular item.

The first letter comes from Suburban Cadillac Corporation, 11 Glenbrook Road, to Board of Representatives, Clerk of Board, Att: Annie Summerville.

Dated August 15, 1983.

"I would like to state my opposition to the sale and closing of North State Street to General Reinsurance.

"As it has in effect been closed during the construction phase, we have experienced much heavier traffic on Main Street, and we looked forward to the reopening of State Street as an alternate route both to Elm Street and the turnpike.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)

"General Reinsurance will contribute many cars to Stamford's already congested downtown area. Permanent closing of North State Street as an access road will create unnecessary additional traffic for the residents and merchants on Main Street.

"Very truly yours

"/s/ Robert W. Siegner, Jr.
Vice President"

The second letter comes from Karl's Auto Body Service, Inc., 20 Lafayette Street, Stamford, Conn. 06902, addressed to the Board of Representatives, City Hall, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, CT 06901, Attn: Ms. Annie Summerville.
Subject: Closing North State Street. Dated August 15, 1983.

"We have been in business in the city of Stamford since 1925. In 1969, we were forced to relocate from Grove Street to Lafayette Street by Urban Renewal. At that time we searched for an ideal location which we finally found at the corner of Lafayette and North State Street. The reason we chose this location was because of good accessibility for our customers and also for us. We operate tow trucks and respond to calls within the city and on I-95.

"With the closing of North State Street, south of Clark's Hill Avenue, in the last several months, we have been greatly inconvenienced and our business has suffered severely. We were under the impression that this was only going to be temporary during construction of the new General Reinsurance Building.

"Upon learning that this section of North State Street is being sold and will permanently be closed, we were shocked.

"We sincerely hope the City of Stamford will reconsider the sale and not to allow this vital street to be closed off.

"Sincerely

"/s/ Wayne F. Karl, Pres.
Karl's Auto Body Service Inc.
20 Lafayette Street
Stamford, CT 06902"

The third letter comes from Mr. Patrick J. McAuliffe, 8th District; resident of Stamford for 68 years; taxpayer for 27 years., 31 Grant Avenue, Stamford, Connecticut 06902, dated August 13, 1983.

"Ladies and Gentlemen:

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)

"This letter is to register my strong opposition to the sale or closing of North State Street at Exit 8 of the Connecticut Turnpike by the City of Stamford.

"North State Street was opened in 1958 for the purpose of eliminating traffic congestion, and it had been serving its purpose until approximately two years ago, when it was closed for reconstruction of ramps on the Connecticut Turnpike.

"Motorists and taxpayers from the East Side, Glenbrook, Springdale, and the Hope Street area used this roadway. Also, it can be used as a detour to alleviate traffic congestion, in the event it arises on East Main Street between the Railroad Bridge and Tresser Boulevard and Broad Street.

"Drivers coming out of Crystal Street to East Main Street are not allowed to make a left turn under the Railroad Bridge, and so had been using North Street for access to Elm Street to go to Cummings Park and the Shippan and Cove areas.

"I know of no speedier way for motorists to reach the West Side of Stamford or New York than to drive West on North State Street, through the traffic lights at Elm Street, Canal Street, and Atlantic Street, on to the Connecticut Turnpike.

"In closing, I might add that I think it was misleading to publish this proposal as Hill Street and North Hill Street. More properly, it should have been described with its present name (of twenty-five years), North State Street.

"Therefore, I urge you to give careful consideration to this proposal before voting in the affirmative at your August 15th meeting.

"Respectfully yours,

"/s/ Patrick J. McAuliffe - 8th District"

Also, I will not read, but I would like the letter that Mr. Donahue placed on our desks tonight, coming from Attorney Richard J. Tobin to be a part of the Minutes, Madam President. Thank you. (Letter attached to Minutes)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MR. DeLUCA: It seems that the phone call I got was a different person altogether from what Rep. Summerville just read the letter from Mr. McAuliffe. Basically, my question is going to be Chairman Donahue, has the City developed a traffic pattern? The reason I asked the question because this evening before I came here, I received a phone call from a concerned citizen regarding the closing and the sale of this property, and he came out with three different points; three points. The first point being, if you are coming in on Hope Street going passed St. Basil's, you go down Lafayette Street, come to East Main Street you can only go left or right, because Hill Street is closed.

If you are coming in from Glenbrook Road, you hit East Main Street and once again, you can only go left or right because Clark's Hill is a dead-end. It seems to present a problem over here, and likewise, to quote Ms. Summerville's

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) remarks, "coming in from Glenbrook or Culloden Road, you are going down Crystal Street, you can't make a left turn; you have to go right," and once again, you're blocked off or you have to make a gigantic detour in order to get to Tresser Boulevard. Yesterday, I was in favor of voting for this, now I seem to have second guesses on this here because of these concerns and the concerns of other people. I probably will end up voting no for this sale.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I have to echo the sentiments expressed thus far why this street was closed is still a question in my mind; how it was closed is a question in my mind? I don't think it should have been closed. I think the issue before us now is not whether it is going to be reopened because evidently, it is not going to be reopened, but whether to sell this property to General Reinsurance?

First, I'd like to make it clear that I was not in support of it being closed, and I will never be in support of it being closed. Secondly, do we sell it to General Reinsurance? I'm getting a little tired of the City selling portions of land here, and portions of land there, and forgetting about the little citizens and forgetting about the traffic patterns of this City. It is my understanding that there will also be a rear entrance to General Reinsurance in this area, which will be an extra traffic burden on the residents as well. That is something that will not be changed whether this is purchased or not. However, the extra burden is being put on the citizens of this town is unnecessary, and I cannot support this. Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I believe I asked Mr. Donahue a question through the Chair, is there a traffic pattern for Tresser Boulevard?

MR. DONAHUE: I tried to answer, but the Chair didn't recognize me. I can tell you this that there is a plan to take North State Street and make it two-ways from Clark's Hill Avenue in an easterly direction to North State Street where it will merge with South State Street, excuse me, South State Street will merge with, so that will provide some relief to that situation. I don't know if that answers your question.

MR. DeLUCA: ...it does. In otherwords, that would be the only traffic pattern right now is by making North State Street two-ways coming in from Clark's Hill, you say?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, Clark's Hill in an easterly direction. The Traffic Department has indicated that is part of the plan. I would also add that as Mr. Dudley has stated, the traffic plans for General Reinsurance have already been approved so that as part of their submission of their plans, so that the access to the rear, which is delivery entrance will be there one way or the other.

MR. BOCCUZZI: You finished, Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, thank you.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask through you, whether they will do anything with South State Street? If they are going to change it two-ways going back towards Main Street, will they change it two-ways back towards Elm Street. How are the people to get to Elm Street? I wonder if you can answer that question? Then, I would like to go on.

MR. DONAHUE: There are two ways really, they could use Main Street and come down to Tresser Boulevard and take a left on to Elm. They could also take a left on North State Street, merge with South State Street, take a right and go under the East Main Street railroad bridge and take a right into Myrtle Avenue.

MR. BLUM: I know that. That is right now. We're talking about what we are going to lose. I have many people who are against this, also; who come all the way from Glenbrook, Glenbrook Road, Coolidge Avenue, that come down this street to go to work with the railroad. This was their way of going to work to North State Street on to Elm Street, under the Elm Street bridge and to work. Now, they are cutting this off. They have been harassing the people there right along, the contractor. First, he put a fence up when he didn't have the right to put the fence. So, I complained to Mr. Spaulding about it and they had the fence taken down. Then they had a fence with two gates put on. That was torn down. Then they put a traffic cop there for a while. That was stopped for a while. Now they have blocks there of some kind now that we can't get through there.

I just would like to read to you this letter that you sent from Cummings and Lockwood. It comes from Mr. Tobin, and he says, "The first is that..."

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Blum, that letter is a part of the record.

MR. BLUM: He says that the State of Connecticut did not discontinue North State Street, and if the State of Connecticut did not discontinue North State Street, then why is it blocked-off? That's my first question to you, if you can answer that, Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: As I have stated before, Mr. Blum, and as stated in the letter, under state law, the State of Connecticut has the right to restrict access to any right-of-way under their jurisdiction. That is what was done with North State Street. That is why it has been cul-de-saced. The issue before you tonight is not only the sale of this property, it is also the discontinuance of this portion of North State Street.

MR. BLUM: Well, I will tell you, I am going to vote against this.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. President.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, there is no quorum on the Floor. I feel alone out here.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Will the Representatives in the caucus rooms, please come out. We need a quorum, please. I know you have to have a cigarette and whatnot, but I still need a quorum. Will the Board of Rep members in the caucus rooms, please come out.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. I'm against the sale of North State Street on grounds of general principal itself. The point is, it seems to me, Madam President, that what this whole thing represents is so symbolic of the problems going on here in Stamford, and how we are not really grabbing hold of what the problem is.

In my mind, it is not so much the rather arrogant closing-off of North State Street, however it was done; whether it was cul-de-saced; whether accession to it was denied; whatever access was denied; whatever the situation. That's not so much the problem. The problem here, it seems to me, Madam President, is the fact that we have here a development that should never have been allowed here. It's a development that I don't care what kind of a traffic plan has been filed, there is no traffic plan that, in fact, can be worked out to allow those street to take the massive amount of traffic that is going to be generated by this project unless you are willing to take the sort of traffic that Manhattan is developing; unless you are willing to bring Manhattan here to Stamford, and I don't think we are, but that's what's happening. We have a development here that should never have been allowed. We have a building going up that should have never been allowed. We have no architectural review board, therefore, they can throw any kind of building up. We have zoning here that allows this.

We saw a hilltop neighborhood, an in-town, close-to-town, hilltop, blue-collared, single-family, two-family neighborhood, just destroyed, and it is very difficult to found out who is responsible for it. There is no one person or no one group responsible for it. It is just a fact that we've been locked-stepped by a situation here in Stamford, and we don't seem to be able to get out of it. And, I am very sick and tired here in Stamford, of being faced with situations of, "Well, there is nothing we can do now, let's make the best of it, let's, therefore, sell the land and get some money for it, thus and so." I'm tired of that. I think as a protest vote, let the thing stand there in all its horror, so that, perhaps, we can, in fact, no, I am serious, I'm very serious, so that we can, in fact, maybe we'll get driven to do something about all of this.

After all, I live in Shippan. Now, I have to go by to and from Shippan from this massive traffic jam that is going to be there, and I don't care what Ford says. There is absolutely no way that the traffic here can be handled. I am going to have to go through this traffic jam. I am going to have to go through the Seaview situation, office building going up there; a very strange situation; built seaward of the seawall. I'm going to have to go through that now. That's going up very slowly by degrees.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. White, can we just stick to item #1 under P&Z?

MR. WHITE: Well, I think this is related, Madam President, and then I'm going to have to go through the Collins development. I mean, look, look, the point is that this all goes back to what I've been saying time after time after time, Madam President, we have not taken care of our land. We have badly zoned the situation and we had better get a hold of this situation now or we're going to be another Manhattan. The point is, Madam President, despite the little movie we saw here today at the beginning of the meeting, the other towns around Stamford aren't quite so happy with our development. We become a piranha. If you read the newspapers, Darien, New Canaan, and Greenwich are turning themselves inside out to try to deal with what we've been doing, and this General Reinsurance situation is all part of it. I'm going to vote against this as a protest vote as much as anything else, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: I believe that at this point in time, there is nothing much that I can add. We've been through this for a number of months now. No matter what we do here State Street will still be closed. That's the most I can say.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other speakers?

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I did attend the Public Hearing, and I listened to some things that never happened in the City of Stamford in any of the Hearings. I happen to have made all of the Hearings either in the name of the NAACP or in the name of Citizens for the Improvement of the South End, and all the exits 8 and 9 hearings I went to, at none, at none of them, was the closing of North State Street presented to the people who attended those hearings. Had there been, there would have been an uprising then because that street has served a tremendous need as a short-cut to come over to Elm Street, to take this privilege and have a Mayor that would sign a letter to take this privilege away from the citizens who are paying taxes, is absurd. I can't believe it, and I am just about at the point now of making a motion to demand that the City be informed to see that that street is reopened. There is no such thing as it can't be reopened. It can be reopened. And all we have to do is write them a letter, and ask them to see that that street is opened for the convenience of the citizen and they will reopen it.

Mr. Donahue is saying what he thinks and I'm saying what I have seen that has been done. They have had to open streets that they have closed, and they can be made to open that street. I think that we may have to demand that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor is for final adoption of the ordinance as presented by Mr. Donahue.

MR. DZIEZYC: Move the question. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. It's an ordinance...

MR. DONAHUE: Madam President, I'd like to raise one point of information, at this point in time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'll accept that.

MR. DONAHUE: It has been stated by Mr. Wider that certain things happened over the course of years, and it was stated that the cul-de-sac or the dead-ending of North State Street was never mentioned.

As I stated at the last meeting, and I state now when I will turn this in to the Clerk of the Board for the record, there was a public hearing conducted at the Cloonan Middle School on North Street, Stamford, January 6, 1977, where representatives of the Department of Transportation clearly outlined the affect of this being done. There is a map included here which shows that North State Street would be dead-ended. Mr. Wider testified at that public hearing. So, for anyone to say that it was never explained, and never mentioned in the City of Stamford, is absolutely wrong and it misleads this Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. We'll proceed with a vote. We'll use the machine. It's on final adoption on the proposed ordinance relating to the purchase of portions of North State Street and Hill Street from the City of Stamford by the General Reinsurance Company. Please use your machine. We need 21 votes.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Has everyone voted? The motion is LOST 12 affirmative, 12 negative and 4 not-voting. Continue with your report, Mr. Donahue.

- (2) 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, Toohar & 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. Held in Committee 5/2, 6/6 and 7/13/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: Item #2 is held pending information that was requested by the Board of Finance concerning reassessment of this property.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #2 is held.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DISCONTINUE A PORTION OF RELAY PLACE, with maps and related correspondence. Submitted by Mayor Clapes 7/13/83. Chapter 64 provisions apply. Site for a proposed new GTE Realty Corp. Bldg. Street consists of approx. 4,634 sq. ft. to be sold at \$32.00 per sq. ft. = \$149,300. Ordinance to follow if resolution approved.

MR. DONAHUE: The request was made by GTE and it has to do with the construction of their new corporate operation center that will be constructed at Tresser Boulevard and Washington Boulevard. This, as you know, starts a process that if we pass this intention here tonight, the Mayor is asked to provide a report and recommend to this Board, what we should do concerning this discontinuance.

The Planning and Zoning Committee voted by a vote of 6 in favor and 0 opposed to recommend that we pass this resolution this evening.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. We are now discussing the proposed resolution concerning the notice of intention to discontinue a portion of Relay Place. Any discussion. No discussion. We'll move right to a machine vote.

MR. BLUM: This is another thing where you buy the property; same thing as with what happened with Pitney Bowes or Beckley Avenue, right here in front of us. Beckley Avenue was sold to GTE because they bought all the property around it. It's time to stop; no.

MR. DeLUCA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's no other speakers. We'll move right to a machine vote on the proposed resolution. We're voting on #3 under Planning and Zoning. It's just a resolution. We need a majority of those present and voting. There are 26 people present. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 18 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining and 3 not-voting.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rybnick is leaving. We have 25 members present. While Mrs. Goldstein is getting her notes together, I would ask all the members to please clear your desks and help clean up the caucus rooms before you leave.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Transportation Committee met on July 6. Present were Mrs. Maihock, Mr. Livingston and myself.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE LIMITATION OF TRUCK TRAFFIC ON CITY STREETS - submitted by Rep. Guroian and Betty Conti 5/6/83. Has been reviewed and approved by Corporation Counsel. Held in Committee 6/6 and 7/13/83.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We voted 3 to 0 for publication with the following change, and that is: We would like to make certain that it's residential streets that are protected, in this ordinance. At the 6th WHEREAS, it says, "The presence of heavily commercial traffic on certain streets." We would like that "certain" changed to "residential."

PRESIDENT SANTY: I found it, Mrs. Goldstein, the presence of heavy commercial traffic on residential streets?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. We are taking the "certain" out. We discussed it with Mr. Ford. He felt it was a good change. We think it's a good change, and it really intensifies what it is we ...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is that the only change you've made?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is the only change.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want to move for publication?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to move for publication.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? O.K. Discussion?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: What is Mr. Ford's definition of "residential?" What was his definition?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Ms. Summerville, the fact is that we really don't have a definition for residential. The Traffic Commission that will be meeting on this question will have to impose that standard because we do not really have that.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The reason I asked the question, I think it is crucial that we understand Mr. Ford's interpretation because I would hate to see discrimination because on one street there are only two or three homes, that that is not described as a residential area as opposed to 25 homes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That's why we didn't change "residential" in all the other cases. If you notice the prior two "WHEREAS," we kept "certain streets" in and "certain streets" in because there are other cases where streets may not be suitable for heavy truck traffic, but where it clearly spoke about the neighborhood, we changed it to "residential," but you see the presence of large

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: (continuing) commercial vehicles on certain streets may endanger or otherwise conflict with orderly traffic flows. We didn't change that to residential because there are plenty of streets that would not be of a residential nature that perhaps are industrial, but one or two houses. You can't call that a residential area but they may clearly not be suited to heavy trucks. So, the Traffic Commission will be able to make that determination.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I have problems with that because I consider Tresser Boulevard, Washington Boulevard as a heavy residential area, also, as Betts Avenue and Durant Street. It's not really clear. I'd hate to see the Traffic Department discriminating as to what streets they would consider. I consider where St. John's Towers and New Hope Towers and Clinton Avenue and all of those places where there are large apartment buildings, plus the small homeowners; I take Betts Avenue and Durant Street; it's so broad. I'd like to know his interpretation of it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The thing is that in order for any street to be so limited from truck traffic, there's really a very complicated process; it can't just happen.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is for publication anyway, and Ms. Summerville could go to the public hearing and bring this item up.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: At our next meeting, we'll hold a public hearing on that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now discussion for publication.

MR. CONTI: Thank you. I'd like to follow-up on Ann Summerville's statement just a little bit as to the definition of "residential." Just a short time ago on Fifth Street, this Body refused a change for three houses that are adjacent to Summer Street and considered that area residential. I live on Fifth Street, and starting at the corner of Fifth and Bedford, it is also a deed restricted area which is part of Revonah neighborhood. Does that mean that Fifth Street which is a main artery through, can now be considered "residential" and you can refuse to let trucks to through there? I'm asking the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think these are questions, Mr. Conti, that you have to bring up at the public hearing. Is that right, Mrs. Goldstein?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: They are certainly welcome to bring it up at the public hearing, but quite frankly, any street that is capable of holding truck traffic and is a throughway street probably would not be considered a street to limit that traffic on like Washington Boulevard. It is clearly a street that will have trucks. There are small streets; that's really the intent of this ordinance. There are streets that are too small for trucks. It would really be detrimental to both the topography of the street and everything else that would surround it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to remind you it is quarter after one. This is for publication only. If you have anything to contribute to the publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Also, before trucks can be prohibited from going on any street, you need an engineering study, you need a public hearing, and the Traffic Authority has to agree.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: To clarify some of the questions that have been raised here, this ordinance would not bar trucks from any street where they had to be. It would only bar them from a street where if they have another access way, a better access way that's better suited to heavy trucks, they would have to use that access rather than use a small residential street. That's the intent of the ordinance, but if they have legitimate business on any residential street, they can't be kept from it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. BLUM: I sent a letter here some time ago, and I don't see it even on the Agenda, in regards to tandem trucks. Tandem trucks are now being fought by the state, and it seems like they are not winning any fight in the courts at all. The question is, if they're going to be allowed on state highways, namely, that means that High Ridge Road will be seeing tandam trucks and you'll see Courtland Avenue with tandem trucks. I feel that something should be done about the tandem trucks on local streets.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, that has nothing to do with what we're discussing.

MR. BLUM: Yes, it does.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your item on the Steering Committee Agenda was not put on by the Committee. That's why. It just died at Steering.

MR. BLUM: It died at Steering. Don't you think it should be a part of this ordinance?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, the Steering Committee chose otherwise.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. We'll use the machine for publication of the proposed ordinance concerning the limitation of truck traffic on city streets. Has everyone voted? The motion to approve for publication has PASSED 21 affirmative, 1 negative, and 6 not-voting.

- (2) PARKING AT CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL VS. RICE SCHOOL, ETC. - submitted by Rep. Gabe DeLuca 6/20/83. Held in Committee 7/13/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE:

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We're waiting for a report from Paul Disario. He did speak before our Committee, but we would like to have a written report from him regarding the parking at Champion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're holding #2?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

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

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. We didn't have a quorum so there is no Committee report. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is no Committee report. Everything is being held?

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - NEW PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING POSSIBLE HAZARDS IN SATELLITE TRANSMISSION FACILITIES - submitted 4/19/82 by Reps. Guroian, Betty Conti, and Dennis White. Held in Committee from May 3, 1982 through July 11, 1983. Approved for publication 7/12/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) REQUEST FOR DISCOURSE ON ORD. #206 REGARDING THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS - from Communications Director Hawley Oefinger 4/25/83 - also Ord. 504. Have turned into the General Fund substantial sums collected from delinquent accounts. Held 7/11/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (3) THE MATTER OF PEOPLE WHO RIDE ON MOTORCYCLES BEING COMPELLED TO WEAR PROTECTIVE HELMETS - submitted by Rep. Gershman 7/21/83. Law Department is researching this and will prepare ordinance for publication if their findings so dictate.

HELD IN COMMITTEEPARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday, August 8, 1983, at 7:30 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Attendees were Committee members Gaipa, Franchina, myself, Gabe DeLuca, Recreation Superintendent Bruno Giordano, Dan Bellantonio, President of the Stamford Bocce League, as well as several members of the Stamford Bocce League.

Our Committee voted 3 in favor and none opposed to place the following items on the Consent Agenda. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10.

MR. DeLUCA: On item 9, our Committee voted 3 in favor and none to hold this in Committee and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are going to hold that in Committee? Do you want to move your Consent Agenda?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes. I'd like to move the Consent Agenda, please. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (1) PETITION TO HOLD AN ALL-NIGHT CONDLIGHT VIGIL AT VETERANS' PARK ON AUGUST 26 AND 27, 1983 TO COMMEMORATE THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC MARCH ON WASHINGTON LED BY THE LATE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. -
requested by Bill Macklin, South End Community Center, 7/13/83 letter.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (2) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER AND BEDFORD STREETS TO PUBLICIZE ST. LEO CATHOLIC CHURCH'S BAZAAR TO BE HELD AUGUST 31ST, AND SEPT. 1, 2, 3, 1983.
Wish to hang banner(s) Aug. 25 to Sept. 3rd. Requested by Ms. M. A. Carpenter of St. Leo's Parish, 214 Roxbury Road. Home phone 322-1192; office phone 348-7570.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (3) PETITION FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A FOUR-MILE OPEN ROAD RACE AND A ONE-MILE INVITATIONAL ROAD RACE ON SUNDAY, SEPT. 11, 1983 - requested by E. Arthur Morin, Jr., Stamford Running Club; also sponsored by Victor Technology. Letter 7/15/83.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER STREET AT RIDGEWAY - TO PUBLICIZE "HARVEST JAMPOREE" SCHOOL FAIR ON OCTOBER 1, 1983 - requested by The Stamford Catholic Regional School System, Fran Volpe, 33 Coventry Road, Stamford, 06903. Banners to be hung Sept. 25th thru Oct. 1, 1983.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (5) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER STREET TO PUBLICIZE "HOLIDAY POTPOURRI (BOUTIQUE)" - requested by Paula M. Johnston, Publicity Chairman, The Junior League of Stamford-Norwalk, Inc. (227-1446). Show is to be October 24-27, 1983. Wish to hang banner for two weeks beginning October 13, 1983.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (6) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER STREET AT RIDGEWAY TO PUBLICIZE THE 15TH ANNUAL ANTIQUES SHOW OF THE WOMEN OF ST. FRANCIS EPISCOPAL CHURCH (2810 Long Ridge Road) from October 30 until November 6, 1983 - requested by Suzi Wilkins, 73 Mill Road, (hone phone 322-7867; office 1-344-9867), letter 7/1/83.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (7) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ACROSS BEDFORD STREET TO PUBLICIZE UNITED WAY OF STAMFORD'S ANNUAL CAMPAIGN FOR 10 WEEKS FROM SEPTEMBER 29 - DECEMBER 7, 1983.

ALSO REQUEST TO HANG STREET DESIGNATION SIGNS ALONG ATLANTIC STREET WHICH READ "UNITED WAY" (A former practice.) - 6/30/83 letter from Deirdre C. Berzok, Director of Communications (both requests).

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (8) PETITION TO CLOSE OFF STRAWBERRY HILL AVENUE FROM 10:00 A.M. TO 11:30 A.M. SO THE CHILDREN MAY HOLD A "LAG B'OMER PARADE" ON MAY 20, 1984 (SUNDAY) - requested by Rabbi Israel Stock, Director of the Bridgeport Hebrew Day School, Yeshiva Achei Tmimim Lubevitch, 77 Mount Pleasant Drive, Trumbull, CT 06611. Phone 1-268-7700; letter 5/31/83.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (9) REQUEST FROM STAMFORD BOCCE LEAGUE, INC., DAN BELLANTONIO, PRESIDENT, (received 7/8/83) for more parking spaces for Bocce players at Scalzi Park. Enclosed sketch of proposed new parking area to accommodate about 100 more cars.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (10) PETITION TO CLOSE HALLIWELL DRIVE BETWEEN STILLWATER ROAD AND SYCAMORE TERRACE FOR THE HYCLIFF ASSOCIATION TO HOLD THEIR ANNUAL "HYCLIFF DAY" ON AUGUST 27, 1983 (8/28/83 RAIN DATE) FROM 8:30 A.M. TO 9:00 P.M. - from Susan Garthwaite, General Co-Chair., "Hycliff Day", letter 7/27/83.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to Suspend the Rules to take up an item that is not on the Agenda. It's a resolution to honor the Stamford American Little League who has just won the District and State Championships.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to Suspend the Rules to consider this resolution honoring the Little League. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? The Rules are SUSPENDED. Mr. DeLuca, do you want to read the resolution?

- (11) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING THE STAMFORD AMERICAN LITTLE LEAGUE, WINNERS OF THE DISTRICT AND STATE CHAMPIONSHIPS - submitted by Rep. James Dudley, 8/15/83.

MR. DeLUCA: I now make a motion to place the following Resolution:

"WHEREAS, the Stamford American Little League has won the District and State Championships, and

"WHEREAS, they now represent both the City of Stamford and the State of Connecticut in their bid for the World Championships, and

"WHEREAS, they have demonstrated sportsmanship and ability both on and off the field.

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 17th Board of Representatives, City of Stamford, wish them success in their attempt to go all the way to the World Series and Championship of Little League Baseball," and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Mr. Dudley, is it correct that you are going to that game?

MR. DUDLEY: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: And, you are going to take this resolution with you and we can instruct the staff tomorrow to type that and have it framed so you can take it and present it at the game. Thank you, very much.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: That concludes your report, Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: Just one other announcement that tonight is our big game, and unfortunately, we will have a handicap; the fact that we are still here. I hope we will all be rested. We do have a couple of sleepers that showed up yesterday. One of them bats lefty and bats righty and she really hit the ball super. I feel she will be our secret weapon for this evening.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I remind you, Members, even if you don't play, please come for the support. We're going to have plenty to play. We're going to have a lot of fun. So, please come out even if you don't play, just come out to cheer us on.

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

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. The Appointments Committee met Thursday night, August 11, in the Democratic Caucus room. In attendance were Mr. Conti, Mrs. Perillo, Ms. DeGaetani, Ms. Summerville, Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. Dixon, and myself, Mrs. Signore.

I'd like to proceed with the Consent items first. On Consent, item #3, Mr. Richard Zeranski for Human Rights Commission. Item #4, Mr. Carmine Limone, Board of Recreation. There is a correction there. His address is 122 Hannah's Road rather than 56 Barmore Drive. On Consent, item #6, Mr. Richard Vaught for Fair Rent Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's off Consent.

MRS. SIGNORE: And item #9 on Consent, Mr. James Serafino, Planning Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: He's off. So we have just two on Consent, Mrs. Signore, #3 and #4?

MRS. SIGNORE: Correct, Madam President.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITYTERM EXPIRES

(1) <u>MR. CHARLES DeLUCA</u> (D) 30 DeBera Lane Held 5/23 and 7/11/83.	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
---	----------------	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEE

(2) <u>MS. KATIE JANNICKY</u> (D) 96 Alexandra Drive Held 6/6 and 7/11/83	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
---	----------------	--------------

HELD IN COMMITTEEHUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(3) <u>MR. RICHARD ZERANSKI</u> (R) 81 Crane Road North Held 7/11/83	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
--	----------------	--------------

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)BOARD OF RECREATIONTERM EXPIRES

(4) MR. CARMINE LIMONE (R) Replacing R. Callahan Dec. 1, 1984
122 Hannah's Road whose term expired

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDAPARK COMMISSION

(5) MR. FRANK VALLUZZO (R) Replacing W. Sheck whose Dec. 1, 1985
34 Prudence Drive term expired

HELD IN COMMITTEEFAIR RENT COMMISSION

(6) MR. RICHARD VAUGHT (R) Replacing W. Seely Dec. 1, 1986
77 Prospect Street whose term expired

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Vaught appeared before us as a candidate for the Fair Rent Commission. The vote for Mr. Vaught was 8 in favor, none opposed. It was the opinion of the Committee that this man had a great, great background; a very strong background, not only as a renter which he presently is, but at one time as a manager of a 1,000 unit apartment complex. He also at another time, owned an apartment building himself. He seemed very knowledgeable in the area of rent control, and appeared to us to be a man who would deal with compassion and justness with any cases that came before him.

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

MR. BLUM: A question came up at our Caucus that this man was real estate man. Do you feel that in some way that would interfere with his being fair?

MRS. SIGNORE: It was not the opinion of the Committee that that would in any way be fair. He also gave us the impression that his area of business, at the present time, was with the banks rather than in real estate as such.

MR. BLUM: Alright, that's all I wanted to know.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further discussion, we'll use the machine for the approval of the appointment of Mr. Richard Vaught. Has everyone voted? The appointment has been APPROVED 22 affirmative and 6 not-voting.

COMMISSION ON AGING

(7) MS. KATHARINE ROEBUCK (R) Replacing E. Massie Dec. 1, 1984
18 Hazel Street who resigned

HELD IN COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

(8) MS. MARY F. CARVALHO (R) Replacing N. Raymond who August 7, 1983
39 Gaxton Road resigned

HELD IN COMMITTEEPLANNING BOARD

(9) MR. JAMES SERAFINO (D) Replacing Phyllis Sinrich Dec. 1, 1987
Skymeadow Drive whose term expired

MRS. SIGNORE: Our Committee affirmed him 8 in favor and none opposed. Mr. Serafino is an attorney who does business in White Plains. He, himself, stated that this is a land-use board as we know, and he felt that his law background would be an asset, and also the fact that he does not practice locally. He owns no real estate other than the house in which he is living at the present time. He has attended Planning Board meetings, and felt that overall growth is a major problem in Stamford for anyone going on the Planning Board to have to consider and be aware of. He's against over-development in this City, and this, of course, is not a reappointment. He would be new to this Board, and, as such, he certainly cannot be held responsible for what may have gone on in the Planning Board before. We were very impressed with him and felt that he would be an asset to this Board, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Is there a second to his confirmation? Several seconds. Discussion?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President, to our Chairman of the Appointments Committee, I would like to know how long has Mr. Serafino been a resident of the City of Stamford, please?

MRS. SIGNORE: He is 30 years old and he lived here 30 years.

MRS. MAIHOCK: O.K., thank you.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Through you, Madam Chairman, I have a couple of questions. It seems to me that on reading Mr. Serafino's resume, I don't think that he's very heavy, frankly, for a position on a board such as the Planning Board which is very, very, important, and I wonder what kind of planning experience particularly in land-use, has he had that doesn't seem to show up in the resume?

MRS. SIGNORE: I really don't think he's had a great deal of experience in land-use, but he's a very bright young man who for his age as you look through the resume at the things that he has done, he even has a patent. We just felt that he was very heavy as a person and would be an asset, but in terms of specific use or experience in that area, it doesn't appear that he has had that specific experience.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. I hear so often from Appointments, the idea that somebody has or has not had experience or that he seems very competent in the field and so on.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) Competence, of course, naturally counts; experience counts, too, but whereas I wouldn't underscore or wouldn't under-value competence, I wouldn't over-value experience either. The important thing to me, is attitude. In otherwords, what is the attitude that a person brings to his job? Now, I can be legitimately faulted. I will admit here publicly that I didn't attend this meeting to ask specific questions which I should have; so I'm wrong there. On the other hand, did the Committee ask any specific questions? In otherwords, what is his attitude toward, for example, the type of development we see here in Stamford?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sorry, Mr. White, we're lacking a quorum on the Floor.

MR. WHITE: Do I, therefore, cease talking?

PRESIDENT SANTY: You continue, Mr. White. We'll get the bodies back here.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. In otherwords, we have here in Stamford, still amazing as it may be, many frame houses, wooden houses in a very sore state, but for example, in any of the close to town, in-town neighborhoods, in order to be preserved, these areas will have to be upzoned, and the Planning Board and the Zoning Board are going to have to go through the town, I believe, and designate these streets, house by house, street by street, and have the guts to fight it out on a level, a very local and very nasty level, to upzone these areas, and the question is what is the approach of this young man to this sort of situation? In otherwords, what is his general approach to land use here in Stamford? That's what I'm curious about. Was the Committee able to discern this in any fashion?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White.

MRS. SIGNORE: May I answer?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Signore.

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. White focused on attitude and attitude is a non-specific. We can ask questions and get very stock answers to attitude, and I think attitude is something that you intrinsically sum up when you are interviewing somebody. You either get a feeling that somebody is sincere and cares or you don't and it is very hard to put a number on that; is he an 8 attitude or 10 attitude? It's just a gut-feeling that you get with somebody, and this man gave us the impression that he certainly cared about this City. He's lived here all his life. He said that he felt that the sprawling development was of great concern to him, and you had a feeling that he was sincere in trying, being willing to try to evaluate fairly and justly, not simply corporation that come in but people. The people who have lived here. The people who are living here and the people who want to stay here as expensive as this City has become to live in. That's the only answer I can give you, Mr. White. I wish you would have been there to delve deeper into this than perhaps we did. We did as much as we felt was necessary.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: In answer to Mr. White's question about wood frame homes in areas that might have to be updated or modified, a question similar to that was asked of Mr. Serafino, and his answer was like most people, they have to make an evaluation. They have to go out there and survey, look the area over, and make a value judgement. He couldn't just come out with an answer as to appease us, say, well, he probably wouldn't go along with it or he would go along with it. He would have to base everything by reviewing the facts, going out to the sites, and being a native of Stamford all his life, he is familiar with the area and I'm pretty sure he would make a terrific guy on the Planning Board and he would use common sense in judgement that would benefit everyone; wouldn't be a detriment to the people.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It is now going on to 2 o'clock. Is there anything anyone wants to add regarding Mr. Serafino before we move to a vote?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I wanted to be sure that I understood you correctly. Did you say he has lived here for 30 years meaning he is 30 years old? Is that correct? Well, I notice that his term expires in 1987. Frankly, that's a pretty prestigious board for someone just coming in the first time to have a term for five years, I think.

MRS. SIGNORE: It is that.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mr. Serafino, for those of you who do not know him, is more than deserving of this appointment. He didn't promise us any miracles as all other persons that come before us. He came to us open, honest; he convinced me that he was honest, and I don't think this Board is going to be embarrassed by Mr. Serafino in any way serving on the Board. He's going to do the best of his ability. His ability I think, will be something you will be proud of. I can go on and tell you of some of the fantastic things Mr. Serafino has done for his party, but I don't think that's the issue tonight, but for those of you who do not know him, I would be willing to stay even though it is after two, I'd be willing to sit here with you and I would not be able to say enough about Mr. Serafino even after the Board adjourned and until six o'clock if you wanted to. That's how much I think of him. Believe me, you are not going to be let down in Mr. Serafino. He probably is not going to vote the way you want him to vote all the time, but he's going to be open and honest and that is as much as I can speak for him as a person on the Appointments Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the appointment of Mr. James Serafino to the Planning Board. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Mr. Serafino is CONFIRMED by a vote of 19 affirmative, 3 abstaining and 6 not-voting.

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to move the Consent Agenda, please. Item #3, Mr. Richard Zeranski for Human Rights Commission and item #4, Mr. Carmine Limone, Board of Recreation and I so move. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of the two items on the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed? Mr. Zeranski and Mr. Limone are CONFIRMED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you. It was the decision of the Appointments Committee at the end of our meeting on Thursday night, to request a meeting with the entire membership of the Sterling Farms Golf Authority, to meet with us to discuss certain policies. A letter was sent out the following morning to each member of the Sterling Farms Golf Authority. The tentative meeting date to be September 1, 1983; that's on a Thursday night. We are hoping to hear from

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGMORE: (continuing) them by, I believe, August 25th as to whether they can make that meeting with the entire Appointments Committee. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, thank you, Mrs. Signore.

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

- (1) DETERMINATION OF WHEN PROPOSED CHARTER IS TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE ELECTORATE (DATE OF REFERENDUM); CATEGORIZING CHARTER SECTIONS INTO QUESTIONS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT; PROPOSED CHARTER WILL BE PUBLISHED BEFORE AUGUST 12, 1983; AND ANY OTHER PERTINENT MATTERS RELATING TO PROPOSED CHARTER REVISION.

SEE PAGE 29: (TAKEN UP UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES)

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

MR. PERILLO: Thank you, Madam President. The Public Works Committee did not meet because we had nothing to meet on so we have no report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Perillo.

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

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. At the request of the Grants Office of the City of Stamford, the Public Housing and Community Development Committee met on June 29, to act on the following:

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION APPROVING SUBMITTAL OF ATTACHED LIST OF PROGRAMS TO STATE COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE SERVICES PURSUANT TO PUBLIC ACT 82-469 CONCERNING CONNECTICUT NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE. Submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 7/19/83; also 7/19 letter of Grants Director Sandra Gilbane; also 7/8/83 letter from Grants Researcher Ann Sadowsky. (42 projects totalling approximately \$900,000.)

MR. WIDER: After our meeting, we set another date to meet and have a public hearing and receive proposals. On the 18th of July, we reviewed those proposals. We came up with 43 proposals.

Present at those meetings were Mr. Blum, Ms. Summerville, Mr. Roos, Mrs. Saxe, and yours truly, Lathon Wider. The Committee voted 4 to 0 and 1 abstention to authorize the Mayor to submit a list of 43 programs that were submitted to us with the resolution which Mr. Roos will read at this time.

MR. ROOS: "RESOLUTION APPROVING SUBMITTAL OF THE ATTACHED LIST OF PROGRAMS TO THE STATE COMMISSIONER..."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do we all have the resolution? We all received that. I think there is no point in reading it. It will be a matter of record anyway; it will be part of the Minutes. I don't think you have to read it, Mr. Roos, we all received it. Is there someone who did not receive this resolution? I think we can dispense with the reading of it, Mr. Roos.

MR. ROOS: Thank you.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: I would like to move the resolution as was mailed out to all the Board members.

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

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to ask the Co-Chairmen, what tax are we talking about giving these people credit against? I've read through this packet, no where to I see delineated what tax we're giving them a credit on.

MR. WIDER: What tax you are giving industry? You are giving industry a tax against their taxable net income after expense that they will contribute to the various programs to help the Community; the agencies.

MRS. CONTI: That's not the answer. I'm asking what specific tax are they being credited for?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does anyone on that Committee have...is it a property tax, Mr. Wider?

MR. WIDER: Income tax.

MRS. CONTI: We don't have a state income tax.

MR. WIDER: We're talking about industry will be given 70% towards their contribution that they would have to pay in tax; their income tax.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum would like to speak to that.

MR. BLUM: They are given tax credits on their state tax credits; there's corporate tax credits; there's other tax credits. It has to deal with state matters. It's not income tax. We don't have an income tax, but there's corporate credits, corporation taxes; there's some other taxes that they have to pay, too. That's where the credits are given; state, corporation tax, and there is another tax in the state. They are state credits.

MRS. CONTI: In otherwords, it's all state taxes of one kind or another.

MR. BLUM: It's only state. It has nothing to do with federal or anything. It's state tax credits.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's state tax credits. Does that answer your question, Mrs. Conti?

MR. DeLUCA: Let me ask the first question. Do we have to vote on this as a whole package or can we delete certain items?

MR. WIDER: It has to be voted on as a whole package because we have to get it in by the first day of September.

MR. DeLUCA: In that case, I have a definite vote against this package. There is one item that really...just doesn't sit right with me. I got to vote against the whole package.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, Ms. Summerville would like to answer that.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I beg to differ with the Chairman. Would the Co-Chairman come on the Floor so you can help carry this Committee report, Sir, Mr. Blum? I bet to differ with the Co-Chairman, Mr. Wider. We do not have to vote on all of those persons presented by the Committee. If this Body so chooses to just send one particular category to the state, we can do that. We do not have to vote on everybody presented by the Committee. That is incorrect.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, may I bring to light one thing? All of these have been checked out with the State Department of Revenue Service, and they are qualified.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, but Mr. Wider, but I think the question, I think it's proper. Mr. DeLuca, do you want to make a motion to delete an agency on list? Is that what you want to do? I cannot see why that wouldn't...you have every right to do that. Why wouldn't that be proper?

MR. DeLUCA: Otherwise, I have to vote against the whole package. Not that my vote is going to knock....

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion on the Floor to approve the resolution, this whole package with the resolution, but you certainly can make an amendment to delete anything that you would like. Do you want to make that motion now?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I would like to make a motion on page 6, to delete the second to the last item. It's the West Side Information/Education/Action Center.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Immigration Assistance Service?

MR. DeLUCA: Right. It reads to assist immigrants residing in the City illegally. That turns me right off. I have to make a motion to amend this to delete this item for \$1,500.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded to delete the second from the last page on 6, the West Side Information/Education Center, the amount requested is \$1,500.00; to delete this from this package. It's on page 6. It's the West Side Information/Education Immigrant Assistance Service to assist immigrants residing in the City illegally, to prepare applications for amnesty should the Simpson Mazolli bill granting general amnesty become law. A motion is made and seconded.

MR. BLUM: Let me put it this way to you, Mr. DeLuca. If this went up, if some organization, some corporation wants to give it towards that, are you going to deny it?

MR. DeLUCA: I most certainly am because maybe this corporation is hiring these people below the minimum wage, and they are depriving someone else out of a job. I'm surprised at you, a big union official going...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let's not have any cross-debate.

MR. BLUM: A lot of our parents came here illegally, too, you know.

MR. DeLUCA: Let's speak for ourselves.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to move the question. Is there a second to moving the question? Seconded. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. The question is on deletion of the second organization from the bottom on page 6, the West Side Information/Education Center. All in favor, please use your machine. Has everyone voted. We're going to delete that to assist immigrants residing the the City illegally. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 19 affirmative, 1 negative, 1 abstaining and 7 not-voting. We will delete that from this package. We will now go back to the main...

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. Correct me if I am wrong, through you, Madam President, to anyone who knows anything about it. As I read the back up material, it might very well be a situation of where corporations here in Stamford, of businesses here in Stamford, could designate other such organizations O.K.'d by the state that are not operative here in Stamford.

MR. BLUM: That's correct.

MR. WHITE: Well, there is nothing wrong with it specifically, except that it's not really the boom to Stamford that one would think; tax-wise. That's all.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We now are going to act upon the resolution as presented.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, on page 3, the last item: Organization SNPP, Inc. As I understand it, that that's also a part of the Community Development Program. I forget what the initials stand for, but their request is \$75,000.00 to build sidewalks and other site improvements. Basically, what they are asking for is a very good project that has merit. However, they are also receiving federal funds through Community Development to my knowledge, and I think that it would probably become over-powering on this particular project when you have other community services like Meals-on-Wheels and Stamford Police Watch, Long Island Task Force, and giving scholarships and things of that nature, so I would like to make a motion to reject that one particular item. It would be the last one: SNPP, Inc.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second? Seconded to delete that item from this total resolution. Discussion? On page 3, the last item.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, through you to Mrs. McInerney, I know where she is coming from because we fund this program through Community Development, but in the meantime, there are industries who will not contribute unless you are going to do something about the sidewalks and so forth, and this gives them an opportunity to get a tax write-down while helping Stamford Neighborhood Preservation to improve some of the sidewalks and in time, it stretches their dollars further to help meet the needs of some of the sidewalks in Stamford, and God knows, we need it. Thank you.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I was really going to say just about what Mr. Wider said. At some point, these sidewalks and side improvements are going to help improve the total City, and they're going to come up and we're going to have to fund them, and if the corporations want to contribute toward that, I don't see why we would particularly want to cut them out.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, no one is stopping the corporations from contributing to them if they want to. The only thing that would exclude them is if they wanted a tax write-off. If they felt it was an important project, and truly important to them, they would do it, regardless whether they had it or not. As I indicated, there are items on here that can't get money from other areas except private donations, and I think that if you have projects on here which are presently supported through Community Development projects and federal funding and city funding, I don't think it's proper to keep on bunching them with everything else. There has to come a time when they stop coming to the well because it's dry.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. No further speakers, we'll use the machine for a vote on the deletion of SNPP \$75,000.00 from the total resolution. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 11 affirmative, 8 negative, 1 abstaining and 8 not-voting.

MR. DeLUCA: Just a question on page 4, to one of the Co-Chairpeople; the last item, Stamford Community Development Program; A Resident Services Supervisor. It looks like they're seem to be creating a position over here now. Is this going to become Civil Service, unclassified or once the money runs out, this person is no longer going to be there or is this something that we're going to be picking up the tab for later on?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're on page 4, Resident Services Supervisor to the Stamford Community Development, \$20,000.00.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, none of our employees are Civil Service, so this will not be a Civil Service job. It will only last as long as the money we can get, and we may not get a quarter to do that with. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. You want to make a motion, Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: In otherwords, this here will be funded through Community Development next year, then?

MR. WIDER: No, it will be funded through any contribution that's made by an industry that feels this is important. If it isn't funded, it won't be.

MRS. CONTI: Is someone serving in this position now?

MR. WIDER: No.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is no motion on the Floor. We'll move right to the adoption of the entire resolution with the two deletions. There is a second. We'll use the machine for a vote. We're voting on the adoption of the entire resolution as presented with the two deletions that we voted on. Has everyone voted? The resolution is ADOPTED 15 affirmative, 2 negative, 5 abstaining, and 6 not-voting. Does that conclude your report, Mr. Wider?

MR. WIDER: Yes, thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

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

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mr. Roos will give the report.

MR. ROOS: The Committee didn't meet but I do have a brief report in answer to Rep. Blum's question.

- (1) QUESTION: "WHEN ARE THE 200 UNITS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOING TO BE FULFILLED BY THE URBAN RENEWAL COMMISSION?" - submitted by Rep. David I. Blum 6/23/83.

MR. ROOS: The contract between the City of Stamford, the URC, and the Stamford New Urban Corporation reads that the redeveloper shall construct at least 200 high rise units, and that is in the contractor's section .5. No mention is made of affordable housing.

The plans for redevelopment of parcels 2 and 38 were approved last night. Construction must start within 90 days and completion must be within 24 to 30 months. There will be a minimum of 350 housing units constructed. The total square footage of the project will be approximately 480,000 square feet. Subsidization was requested for the housing units but it was denied as the contract called for market value housing.

MR. BLUM: What is market value going to be?

MR. ROOS: Market value housing; whatever the market will be at that time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That concludes your report, Mr. Roos?

MR. ROOS: That concludes the report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. BLUM: According to the URC when the URC promised or Mr. Rich promised the developer, promised that it would be moderate income housing; moderate income housing at that time. Don't you fulfill the obligation when you sign an agreement at that time? If it is moderate then, it is moderate now.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, Mr. Roos has just given the report from the Committee.

MR. WHITE: This is going to high rise, Mr. Roos? How high? Well, it's an important question as far as I'm concerned. The place is beginning to look like Manhattan, and you know high rise housing for moderate income has been shown to be an absolute failure in terms of being able to work. You guys are just allowing these people to turn us into Manhattan.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't think Mr. Roos is allowing anything, Mr. White. He's just giving a report on the question that was on the Agenda.

MR. ROOS: To answer Mr. Blum's question, for these 200 units, no agreement was ever made for it to be moderate income. The other units were moderate income and were subsidized, and they were accepted as being moderate income, but for these 200 last units, it was decided that they wanted to keep them at the market value housing to get a cross-section of people into the URC development area. But, at no time did they make an agreement to make this moderate income housing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Roos. I would ask the members to please leave the caucus rooms and come back on the Floor. We do not have a quorum.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to add that the availability of public telephones...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, that was inadvertently left off the Agenda. It should have been on the Agenda. It will be on next month. You can give an update.

MR. DUDLEY: Since we last met, we were due to meet with Sam Khodary of the Public Works Department, but being it was not on the Agenda, we did not meet. However, I've inspected some of the areas and they have started installing some telephones after two years of procrastination on their behalf. A telephone has been installed near the old Sarner's building. There also has been one installed in front of Karp's on Atlantic Street as well, and the post is up but the phone is not up in the area of the Ferguson Library.

While it is a start, it is not anywhere near where we want it to be. There are some areas which really have to be addressed such as Washington Boulevard where there is a bus station, and they have not come back to us one way or another with an answer. I received some correspondence from the telephone company, and the correspondence did not say, one way or another, whether they had made a decision or not; just that they were looking into the matter. These questions do have to be answered and until such time as all the questions are answered either pro or con, we will stay with this matter. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday, August 10th, at 8:00 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Members of the Committee present were Reps. Dziezyc, Gaipa, Gershman, Dixon, Dudley, and myself. Rep. Jachimczyk was excused. Also present were Rep. Blum, Risk Manager Ingrid Center, Staff Counsel Bill Hennessey, and Labor Negotiator Tom Barrett.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO CREATE POSITION OF "SAFETY AND TRAINING OFFICER" - submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding 3/21 and 7/6/83. Also 5/5 Rep. Wiederlight's letter to Risk Manager Center. Held in Committee 6/6/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: This item was held 6 in favor, none opposed in order to review an alternate proposed ordinance from the Law Department.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE "SEC. 16-14 ANNUITY PENSION PLAN" - Replacing request from Rep. 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 5/23, 6/6 and 7/11/83. This ordinance submitted by Personnel Committee Chairman Philip Stork 6/6/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: We have yet to receive Corporation Counsel's opinion so the Committee voted 6 in favor, none opposed to hold.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (3) RATIFICATION OF REPORT OF FACT FINDER BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND THE STAMFORD POLICE ASSOCIATION, INC. (Fact Finder Harry B. Purcell) - Recommending 7½% wage increase effective 7/1/82, and 7½% wage increase effective 7/1/83; the collective bargaining agreement be of two years' duration from 7/1/82 through 6/30/84; and all other proposals of Union and City be rejected and current language, where applicable, be continued unchanged to 6/30/84. Submitted by Mayor Clapes' letter 7/14/83. If neither the Union nor the City rejects this recommendation by September 8, 1983, the Report becomes the new contract and is binding on both parties.

MR. STORK: This is a two year contract running from July 1, 1982, to June 30, 1984. A 7½% pay increase has been awarded in each year of the contract, resulting in a total cost of \$2,197,421.00 over the life of the contract. This is the closest any fact finder or arbitrator has come in recent times to awarding a reasonable and fair contract for the taxpayers in Stamford. Therefore, the Personnel Committee voted unanimously in favor of approving ratification of the fact finder report by a vote of 6 in favor and none opposed, and I so move.

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

AK

HMM

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI: The Chairman said \$2.1 Million. Is that the cost of two years retroactive, one year retroactive, or what are we talking about here? In other words, how many years are we involved here with the total cost?

MR. STORK: That's over the life of the two-year contract, all costs involved.

MRS. CONTI: Then that would be three years; in other words, the three years are going to cost us \$2.1 Million, is that right?

MR. STORK: Two years, Mrs. Conti. This is from July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1984.

MRS. CONTI: All right, then it is only one year retroactive. And the \$2.1 Million is for the whole two years.

MR. STORK: The whole package, the full cost of this two-year package, the contract.

MR. DeLUCA: Just one question. This just settles, more or less, the issue of the increases. Was there any change in the contract whereby incoming police cannot retire until age 55, or they can put the 20-year, any change in the pension provision? Nothing was changed? I guess I can't vote for this one either.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, what is the vote necessary to have this passed?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just a majority of those present and voting for ratification. But we have to have 21 on the floor, so will the Leadership please get the members out on the floor.

MR. BLUM: I would like to say something on the FactFinder's Report. The FactFinder's Report has come out with a statement that our City, as well as the Union, didn't really show facts to prove their point, so they allowed the old contract, as far as the work agreement, to stay. All they are voting upon is the money part. Otherwise, the old contract stays as is, the work rules, because the City didn't prove their point and neither did the Union prove their point.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are no further speakers. We will move right to a vote on the ratification of the FactFinder's Report between the City of Stamford and the Stamford Police Assn. Please use your machines. Just a majority of those present and voting. Has everyone voted? APPROVED with 13 Affirmative, 8 Negative, 7 Non-Voting.

MR. STORK: That completes the report of the Personnel Committee.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

- (1) THE MATTER OF OCCUPANCY OF RICE SCHOOL BY PRIVATE CONTRACTORS.
Submitted by Rep. David Blum 7/21/83.

MS. DeGAETANI: EW&G Committee met on Tuesday, August 9, 1983. Present were Co-Chairwoman Rinaldi, myself, and Betty Gershman. Also present was David Blum. Commissioner Spaulding was not able to be with us. The only item on our item was the matter of the occupancy of Rice School which was submitted by Rep. Blum. He said that he was concerned about the cost of the operation of the school without a lease, and the fact that he did not want to see City-owned buildings in the future occupied without a prior lease, and agreed that if the Committee would notify Mr. Spaulding to that effect, he would be satisfied, and the Committee did so, and I believe you all have a copy of the letter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani, does that conclude your report?

MR. BLUM: I was just hoping that when the Committee sent a letter to Mr. Spaulding - you know, he has come out with the fact that, in his letter, that he gets along with this Board very well, but you know, the least he could do, if he couldn't attend that meeting, he should have notified you in advance that he could not be there. I mean that is just like a slap in the face to your Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Labor Liaison Committee?

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairman Gerald Rybnick

No items - no report.

COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Elizabeth Gershman

No items - no report.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons McInerney & Boccuzzi

MR. BOCCUZZI: No report.

- (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 Rep. Gabe DeLuca 3/15 and 5/19/83. Held in Committee 4/4, 6/6, and 7/13/83. Interim Report made 5/2/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) REQUEST FROM REP. DeLUCA 6/21/83 THAT LABOR NEGOTIATOR BARRETT ADVISE THIS COMMITTEE WHAT ARE THE CITY'S OFFERS ON AT LEAST TWO OF THE CURRENT LABOR CONTRACTS IN THE FACTFINDING STAGE and each Union's counter-offers to promote a better understanding between this Board's intentions and what is coming from the Mayor/Negotiator side, in order to achieve some unanimity. Held in Committee 7/13/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PETITIONS - None.

RESOLUTIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have one set of Minutes on our desk. One set that is being printed, to be mailed on Wednesday; and the next set will be mailed on Monday; but there is nothing to be accepted at this time.

May 10, 1983 Special Budget Meeting (Corp. Counsel has tapes)
 May 11, 1983 Adj. Special Budget Mtg. " " " "
 June 6, 1983 Regular Board Meeting
 June 14, 1983 Special Charter Revision Meeting
 June 17, 1983 Adj. Special Charter Mtg.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

- (1) The Council of Churches and Synagogues are taking reservations for bus seats on a trip to Washington, D.C., on August 27, 1983, for a 20th Anniversary Mobilization commemorating the Historic March on Washington by the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.; \$20.00 round trip as per data - submitted by Rep. Annie Summerville 7/21/83.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to say that all reservations are closed at this point. We have been more than successful. We had to turn people away. I would like to thank my fellow Board members who will be travelling with me, and we all know this is for a very worthy cause. We will be thinking about all of you in our prayers. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville, and our prayers and best wishes go with you and the group. Before we adjourn, Mr. Dudley, I hope you take our best wishes to Little League with you. Don't forget our ball game tomorrow night, well, actually tonight. Mr. DeLuca is accepting money at this point; \$5.00 to pay for our light refreshments. Mr. DeLuca is chairman and treasurer.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to be taken up by the Board, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 2:12 a.m., upon Motion made, Seconded, and Carried unanimously. The clean-up squad left at 2:30 A.M.

Helen M. McEvoy

Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Assistant
(and Recording Secretary)
Board of Representatives

APPROVED:

Jeanne Lois Santy

Jeanne-Lois Santy, President
17th Board of Representatives

JLS:AK:HM
Encs.