

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. BLUM: I, too, am against returning this to Committee at this time for the simple reason that we all know that we need an emergency housing shelter for the homeless. If you have been there and I have been there numerous times as a volunteer, you will see that if you would rather have the people sleeping in railroad cars and not surviving the next day, then don't pass this money and you will put them back in the railroad cars, and we'll put them in the hallways, and we'll put them in front of Town Hall, maybe. Then we shall not have an emergency home for the homeless and that's all I can say. They need the money now.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mrs. Santy.

MRS. SANTY: As you well know, in the two years that I've been President of this Board, I have never left to speak to any appropriation or any motion or anything that was before the Floor, but I feel very strongly about this. Last winter, my husband and I volunteered in this shelter. The need is so great, and it's so important and whether it's the West Main Street Community Center, whether it's in a church or whether it is in a building or whether it is in someone's home, the need is so great and it is there. I am talking of teenagers from 14 years; the oldest being 95 years old. You have no idea how it is to send someone out at 6 o'clock in the morning with a hard boiled egg and an orange, and all they do is wander the streets and wait until they can get back into the building. Specifically, the church opened at 10 o'clock at night, or all night long in the warm church hall, have them walk out to you and ask for a clean shirt or is there a place to take a shower? There were no shower facilities. The embarrassment that these people must go through. There is all walks of life. There is all colors. There is all religions. There is all ages. Believe me, it would tear your heart apart. This is where we have to take a position. This is where the need is in Stamford, believe me. I am pretty conservative in my thinking, but I would go ten times that amount because these are Stamford people. This is our town and they need to be taken care of. I only wish that all of you could have given 15 minutes; not even a whole night as we did, just to see what is there. It is so important and to return it to Committee at this time even with the possibility that we lose 5¢ is a disaster. It is a tragedy unless we vote this money.

Believe me, it would tear your heart apart. They are proud individuals. They are not necessarily all alcoholics or drug addicts and so forth. They are probably all mixed in there, but they are people crying out for help. Let's show that we can help them. Thank you.

MS. DeGAETANI: I'd like to agree with what you just said, Madam President. I, too, worked at the shelter and it is a heart-wrenching experience, and in regard to Mrs. McInerney's comments about the proper lease, it seems to me that this contract, I've just looked through it again, I see nothing in here that specifically ties it to that address, and so I really see no reason not to appropriate this money now. If we want to quibble about leases and where it's going to be housed, that's fine. We can do that in the future but I think we do need the money, and I think we need to appropriate it now.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to only echo your very eloquent remarks on this subject. I remember last year in the deal of winter, discussing this with you in depth. I've discussed it with Dr. Gofstein; I've discussed it with many, many people. We have an obligation as thinking, caring people in this City, and again I would echo your statements. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'll pass.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a vote. The vote is on returning this to Committee. Please use your machine. If you are in favor of returning this to Committee, vote yes. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has been DEFEATED 2 affirmative, 32 negative, and 3 not-voting. We are now returning to the main motion.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. The question is on the approval of \$41,240.00 Community Services emergency shelter. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted. The motion has PASSED 32 affirmative, 2 negative, and 3 not-voting.

- (17) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL SERVICE BLOCK GRANT -
Pending approval of the Connecticut Legislature, State Human Resources will provide \$74,682 for each of next two years (not to exceed \$149,364.) To aid in funding conselling and outreach program of Commission on Aging and City's emergency shelter program. No match required of City funds.
Submitted by Mayor Clapes 9/2/83 letter.

(See Fiscal Item #16 above concerning Emergency Shelter Program)

MR. HOGAN: The Committee so moves by a vote of 4 in favor and 1 against, and no abstentions.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Any discussion.

MR. BOCCUZZI: 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 are now voting on the proposed resolution authorizing participation in the Social Service Block Grant. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? This is all part of #16. The motion has PASSED 30 affirmative, 2 negative, and 5 not-voting. The motion has PASSED.

- (18) \$ 47,000.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 557 (various) - additional
(Contingent on Board of Finance approval in October) appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 9/20/83 to be reimbursed by Federal Jobs Bill for services to pregnant and postpartum women and infants who do not get Medicaid but have inadequate health insurance due to low-level jobs or employment. Funds to go directly to Health Department.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: This is a one-shot deal. It is not matching by the City. The funds will go to the Health Department and the Health Department will disperse them. The Committee moved 5 in favor and none against and no abstentions.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second? Several seconds. Secondary Committee, Mr. Dziezyc.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a second to waiving the Secondary Committee report. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? Waiving the Secondary Committee report, we are now discussing \$47,000.00 Health Department. Any discussion?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. We were to wait to get the information from the Board of Finance, what they did? Does anybody have that report?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's obvious on the Agenda, that it is contingent upon their approval, and they have not met yet.

MRS. SAXE: They haven't? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It will be at their October meeting.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to move the question. Seconded. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We are moving the question the approval of \$47,000.00 Health Department, contingent on the Board of Finance approval as stated on your Agenda. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 30 affirmative, 2 negative, 1 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

MR. HOGAN: That concludes the regular Agenda, Madam Chairman. I will now with your permission, move the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MR. HOGAN: Under the Consent Agenda, items #5...

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, not #5. We voted on #5. How about starting on #10?

MR. HOGAN: #10, Police Department in the amount of \$3,500.00. #11, Board of Education in the amount of \$72,227.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment, Mr. Hogan. Let's go back to #10. Health and Protection Committee, do you have a report on that appropriation on the Consent Agenda?

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Fine, #10 is on Consent.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: #11 is on Consent, Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: #11 is on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: E, W, & G, Ms. Rinaldi.

MS. RINALDI: It's not my report. I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report. We 10 on the Consent Agenda and 11 on Consent.

MR. HOGAN: That's it, Madam Chairman, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Any abstentions? Both of those PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Madam President. Item #1, for publication, Madam President, as per a conversation that we had earlier concerning a Legislative and Rules item, and pursuant to the opinion submitted by Corporation Counsel, I believe that that should read for final adoption.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's correct, Mr. Donahue.

FINAL ADOPTION

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - resubmitted by Traffic Director James Ford - (This Board defeated 8/15/83) - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RELATING TO PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF NORTH STATE STREET AND HILL STREET FROM CITY BY ELM STREET CORP. (GENERAL REINSURANCE CO.) for \$599,360, via quit claim deed. Returned to Committee 9/14/83 and letter to Gov. Wm. O'Neill to be hand-delivered with petitions.

MR. DONAHUE: The Planning and Zoning Committee held a public hearing and meeting on October 6, and a second meeting at 6:15 this evening with Mr. White, Mrs. Guroian, Ms. Rinaldi, Mr. Stork, Mrs. Signore, and Mr. Donahue in attendance. This item concerns the sale of a portion of North State Street and the sale of Hill Street to General Re. This discontinuance and sale of Hill Street and a portion of North State Street comes to us as a result of an agreement between the City of Stamford and the State of Connecticut which dates back to 1976 and '77.

The approval of this ordinance #1, will allow the development of a traffic plan which will provide for the efficient dispersal of afternoon traffic from the General Reinsurance complex thus keeping 40 to 60% of homebound cars off the East Main Street, Myrtle Avenue and Elm Street area, etc. It will also remove the City's responsibility for maintenance of the affected property. It will place the property under consideration on the tax rolls. It will cause almost \$600,000 to be placed in the General Fund of the City.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) The question of whether or not traffic will be allowed to enter on a regular basis on to the state-controlled Elm Street exit ramp, has been answered to the Committee's satisfaction for the past three months.

But, as you remember, last month this Board placed this item back in Committee with the hope that a conclusive response will be forthcoming from the State Department of Transportation. I believe we received such a reply, and you all received copies of it this evening. I would quote one paragraph from that reply. It's the last paragraph, addressed to Mayor Clapes as the Chairman of the Traffic Commission and it is from William Burns, Commissioner of the Department of Transportation. Its says, "that this Department's position on the subject was set forth in a September 7, 1983 letter to your Traffic Director, James Ford. The traffic flow and safety at the off-ramp demands a denial direct access from North State Street." I believe this is the question that the Committee was charged to answer. We received it and with this in mind, the Committee recommends the final adoption of this ordinance by a vote of 4 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention, I therefore move that this ordinance be adopted.

PRESIDENT SANTY: ... proposed ordinance relating to purchase of portions of North State Street and Hill Street from the City by the Elm Street Corporation which is the General Reinsurance Co.

At this time, I would like to announce that Mr. Tarzia has left the meeting. We have 36 members present.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I've been opposed to this from the very beginning; first of all, because I don't think North State Street should have been closed. The original reason that North State Street was closed was due to a supposedly safety hazard of the merging traffic. The proposal before us tonight of this appropriation, I believe, would also be a safety hazard with the merging traffic. I see no difference between the two. I've been called unreasonable for my stand on this. If listening to the people of the City and listening to my constituents is unreasonable, then so be it, but I have to stay opposed to this because I don't believe that North State Street should have been closed to begin with, and I ask my fellow Board members to support me in this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Of course, this never came before the public at any time, the closing of North State Street. That's a fallacy. I resent the Mayor writing the Commissioner in relation to a petition that this Board of Representatives sends to anyone. That is a complete insult to us, and the response was much too swift. It was done today and was delivered to us today. We've had no chance to check it out and see whether it's authentic or not. I would ask this Board, in the face of the fact that we had 300 people opposed to closing of State Street, and State Street can be opened. There's no such thing. I took a good look at it. There is a whole lot of space there to open State Street. So, I would ask this Board to deny this sale of property because of the use to the citizens of the City of Stamford. And I think that is what it is all about. We were elected to protect the rights of these citizens, and the citizens have the right to use that street if they want to, and I'm here to tell you right now that I can't vote to sell the rights of any citizen in this town, and I hope that you can't either. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: I'm reading this letter, a letter that was sent by Mr. Ford to Commissioner J. William Burns, and he speaks of the petitions submitted by City Representative Annie Summerville to Governor William O'Neill, and I sometimes wonder the return letter that goes to our Honorable Mayor Louis A. Clapes that why Mr. Burns does not address Rep. Ann Summerville inasmuch as the petitions were given to the Governor William O'Neill. To this date, I don't know what happened to the petitions; whether William Burns saw those petitions, I don't know. The only thing I do know if I read the letter, that the Governor must have seen those petitions, but I feel that there has to be in a sense a compromise to this whole thing. If, in a sense, the newspaper articles that were in the Advocate is true, that if North State Street is closed and with that, they will put an extension ramp to I-95 and that is exactly what was stated in the paper, not once, not twice, maybe three or four times.

Now, if in a sense, the newspaper is making a mistake, then I'm sure they must of checked it out two or three times. Somebody must of called them; well, it's not exactly going to the I-95. They say it's going on to the ramp. Why is it between the hours of 4 and 6 that we're going to allow, we'll say in the neighborhood of 700 and maybe a 1000 cars to come on to the ramp at that particular time, to go straight ahead, and not make the right turn at Elm Street? They would go straight ahead. Why can you not give the 300 citizens and I finally signed one of them, but there are more people that I know who go to different parts, and North State Street was put when the I-95 was built through the center of Town, they had to have connecting roads coming from Glenbrook and coming from the East Side to go down North State Street so as they can go on to the ramp to I-95.

Now, you are going to deny, in a sense, the people coming from Glenbrook, the people coming from the East Side of Main Street; namely, Noroton Hill and so on in that area to go on a faster route to the I-95 westbound ramp. I don't feel this is right for the City, those who have used this, to take away, a City should take away this land and sell it to a private corporation who is going to allow for a two-hour period, others to go on to I-95 in the fastest possible method that can be given to them. We're going out from the second floor on to that I-95, and let me state here, I would like to say to you, as far as I'm concerned, Hill Street does not exist. In fact, part of the foundation of the General Reinsurance is now occupying Hill Street. We we might as well sell they Hill Street. The matter is North State Street and I think that some compromise can come about if the second floor is going directly to I-95, then why don't you allow the few citizens, to take the blocks away, and allow them to do straight ahead? No left turn on to Elm Street or no right turn, but to go straight ahead on to I-95. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. OWENS: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to say first that I oppose this sale of city property, North State Street, and some of my reasoning is: 1. I have been totally confused on the exit ramp from the building to the top of the Elm Street exit going westbound. Now, I was told tonight, I know that once upon a time, I was under the impression that this particular ramp that was coming from General Re's building, the ramp was going to be built to the ramp on Elm Street, and was supposedly exiting right on to the traffic flow, but now I've gotten straightened-out over that tonight, and they tell me that now, this ramp they should be exiting to the bottom of the ramp at Elm Street, and that means that if the traffic is going westbound, they would have to come up to Atlantic Street in order to go westbound. As far as I'm concerned, if that is true, and if I'm incorrect, I want someone to straighten me out, if that is true, then there is no

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. OWENS: (continuing) reason why General Reinsurance can't let their people or build their ramp on the first level whereby they can exit right off into North State Street and go in the same direction? It doesn't make sense to me. If it makes sense to someone else, fine, but as far as hazards or whatever with traffic, why turn the traffic in both directions when it would work equally as safe in the direction that the traffic will be flowing now? It's totally backwards, and they say, "Okay, this thing has been negotiated five years ago." Nothing in Stamford that has been negotiated five years ago, has been mandated and stuck with. We've had five-year plans on zoning that have completely changed in the last five years, and I can't see why something of this magnitude that is especially being opposed by so many residential people, people in the City of Stamford, the users of the North State Street; I, myself, would like to use it on occasions coming from the Glenbrook area, and I can't; to get around some of the traffic that is on Tresser Boulevard, I don't see why we can't get this turned around the other way? I have spoken to the people representing General Reinsurance, and I'm quite sure that they could save that \$1,500,000 in building this ramp by just having that particular street open whereby their employes could turn right on North State Street and exit westbound going up to Atlantic Street, and going to New York, Greenwich, or wherever they would have to be.

If there is some confusion with the people turning left taking the Elm Street exit going eastbound, I don't see where it would be a big problem with the traffic flow there; because if people see that there is a big headache in trying to get out of there, then I'm quite sure they would find other means of exiting the General Reinsurance building. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Owens.

MS. SUMMERSVILLE: Everybody brace themselves. I totally agree with Rep. Owens has said so eloquently tonight. For the record, I know tonight that we will make a decision, and my position is as it has been in the beginning, I am totally against the sale of this property. I would like to clarify something for the Body's sake. What the Legislative Body voted on in the Board meeting, was carried out. We had our meeting on September 14th. We were charged according to the transcript of that meeting that a hand-delivered letter would be given to the Governor's office and we would ask the Governor to please reply for this particular Board meeting. That letter was hand-delivered to the Governor's office in Stamford. After speaking to Sanchia Spandow, who is the Governor's aide and asking her if by delivering it to the Governor's Southern office on that particular day, if there will be any delay in the Governor getting the letter if I were to hand-deliver it there or if I were to personally take it to Hartford? I was told by Mrs. Spandow that it wouldn't get in the Governor's hand or to his attention any faster than by me driving to Hartford on that particular day because I would not be able to see him and the proper persons to whom this particular item would be directed to, it would get to them just as fast if I delivered it to her office; which is the Governor's office on Bedford Street.

I left my office on my lunch-hour and delivered the letter along with the petitions and I have in my possession a receipt from Mrs. Spandow stating the time that I delivered the letter. I also have in my possession, a commitment from Mrs. Spandow that it would immediately get to the Governor's office and to the proper authority.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERSVILLE: (continuing) All of you got a copy of the letter that was sent to the Governor. I won't read the letter but I would ask through the President to the Board, that this letter be made an official record of this meeting.

In response to that, at 8:30 this morning, I received a call from the Governor's office on another matter. At 9:25, I called the Governor's office back. This is the Southern Governor's office, Mrs. Spandow who is the Governor's Aide, I then asked what response had that office received from the Governor in reference to the urgency of my letter dated September 19th to the Governor? I was told by Mrs. Spandow that the letter had gone immediately to the Governor's office as she said she would make sure that the proper person would get it. She had been informed by the Governor's office that the Governor's Aide in Hartford who is Lee Hawkins had received the correspondence and had been working with Commissioner Burns on it, there had been a directive from the Governor to Commissioner Burns to further study this matter and get back to him. As of 4:25 this afternoon, I was told by Lee Hawkins that the Governor's office, speaking of the Governor's office themselves and Commissioner Burns, a decision had not been made and that I was to respond to this Board tonight by saying that they had not made a decision but the Governor was very interested in the further study on this matter due to the petitions and the letter that he had received from me.

I say all of this and I'm taking your time to say it, because somewhere there is a conflict. Someone, I don't know in what department, if it's a local problem or a state problem as far as communications. This Board sent a letter to the Governor of the State of Connecticut with the signature of myself, Ann Summerville who presented the petitioners' petitions, my correspondence has been to the Governor's office. I have at no time spoken to Commissioner Burns' office. I have made attempt but could not get through. I think out of respect that this Board is due an answer from the Governor's office, I think the Governor is the Chief Executive over Comm. Burns. This is what we had said. We already have our reply from Comm. Burns. We had it a month ago.

I don't know where the Mayor, the Commissioners, the Traffic Director got their ideas that they can over-ride the Board. I think by the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee presenting a letter to the Democratic Caucus tonight at the Committee meeting saying that there had been a reply, says something for this Board. It says that the Mayor can get an answer from the State but the Board of Representatives who is the Legislative Body, cannot. I'm really offended by that. I know that there are pros and cons about the whole thing about North State Street being opened. We all have to search our conscience and vote the way we feel is going to be better for the overall citizens of this City. I think it is too often that departments on a local level and on a state level, somehow disrespect the authority of the Legislative Body of the City of Stamford. I think it is an insult, and I want to state again, as of tonight, I was told by the Governor's office that it had not been finalized, and that a reply had not been forwarded to me in any way and that there was no answer at this time because his directive to Comm. Burns was for further study. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MRS. McINERNEY: I was going to ask to move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. There are seven speakers left. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We'll have to use the machine.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) If you are in favor of moving the question, vote yes. If not, vote no. We need two-thirds. We need 24 votes to move the question. Has everyone voted? The motion to move the question has LOST 13 affirmative, 20 negative, 1 abstaining and 3 not-voting.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Madam President, it's quite evident there are at least three very important items concerning this matter. The first two that I think of are the matter of the petitions and the inconvenience to the people. I think these have been handled very well, and addressed very well. There is no question that the petitions, over 300 must deserve a great deal of attention.

I spent quite a bit of time looking over the plans of the building itself, going to the Traffic Department, and I looked at some of the petitions. Most of them seem to address the inconvenience of cutting off North State Street. I would agree that there is a great deal of inconvenience there. I want to accent, however, that there is a safety problem. The way that it has been developed right now, the traffic will come in as Mr. Owens suggested, it will come into the ramp, up the upper level of the ramp and it will give a good sight down over the I-95. It should be fairly safe the way that they've got it drawn up. The traffic will come down the ramp and cross Elm Street and then go down to Atlantic; again as Mr. Owens has suggested. The danger with the traffic coming in from North State Street instead of from the ramp, is that some of the people may decide to make a left turn and then cross four lanes of traffic. The present system is that they can go either straight ahead or get into the extreme right lane and turn right on to Elm Street into the City. It's fairly safe the way that it is outlined at present.

If North State Street is to be opened, it would seem to me that in a reasonable period of time especially in bad weather, there would be accidents caused by people crossing over to make a left turn on to Elm Street. I believe that in a period of time we have to consider this; that the traffic safety would require that whether we come on from North State Street or the ramp, that lights would have to be put up to the point where no one could cross over to make a left turn on to Elm. I'm not sure if this would make a difference for the people that signed the petitions if they knew that they could not go south on Elm Street, and I think this is something we have to consider. Who is responsible for safety? I'm sure that the Traffic Department is concerned about it and the state is concerned about it, and I'm sure that our citizens are concerned about it. It's a matter of how important is the safety versus the inconvenience. I think that's the thing we have to address tonight and we have to realize that if we vote to keep State Street open, then we have to be sure that in time the traffic will be limited to either to a right turn or straight ahead. I just wanted to pass that information on. I spent a great deal of time watching the traffic. I believe there is a traffic hazard there if we let people make a left turn. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I find myself increasing more confused as we discuss this issue further. I had a constituent who called me last night to say that he is presently using this route. Now, it was my original understanding that it was already closed. Now, is it closed or isn't it closed? It's closed but people are using it.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

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

MR. DUDLEY: It is closed. I did take a ride down there myself. It was on a Sunday afternoon and there were a lot of cars behind me. It was closed. They have put cinder blocks up but there is a way you can go around the cinder blocks, and that's what everybody is doing, but it is technically closed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: People are going around the cinder blocks?

MR. DUDLEY: Yes.

MRS. CONTI: We were originally told that it is already closed off, that was inaccurate? Legally, it's closed but people are using it?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Actually, they are using it illegally.

MRS. CONTI: Alright. Let me get on to what Ms. Summerville was saying before. With regard to this response that we have on our desk tonight from William Burns, it would appear to me that he's not answering our letter. He is answering a letter that was written by the Mayor, and it would appear then that our correspondence has not yet caught up with this. I find it very, very confusing. I just can't seem to get down to brass tacks with this. It's a very, very confusing issue.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti. I think the issue here is also that we wrote the letter, but we did not receive a reply. The Mayor wrote a letter and he received a reply.

MRS. CONTI: Exactly, but I would assume that our reply will be forthcoming also.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would hope so.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The Mayor wrote a letter to Commissioner Burns. We wrote a letter to the Governor; which is two different persons.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. First of all, Madam President, I'm annoyed that this is once again on the Agenda. It was voted down once; it should have stayed down. It seems to be the history of legislation around here whenever certain elements don't want legislation or want legislation, they just simply re-introduce it, and we handle these bills, these pieces of legislation two, three, four times. I find that annoying and somewhat degrading to this Board.

Secondly, it seems to me that when you took a look or when the plans for this hideous development were first put forth to the Traffic Commission, they should have immediately been rejected. This development won't work. I don't care what kind of traffic pattern is made. It's simply not going to work; my opinion, it simply is not going to work. There is going to be tons of traffic dumped out on our roads that cannot take such, and I don't care what the adjustment is, it's not going to work. It's perhaps 6 of one thing and maybe 7 or 8 of another. The think about this project is that it telescopes. It's a micro-cosmo of what's going wrong here in Stamford,

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) We have no architectural review board. We haven't got a proper zoning apparatus. We don't have proper zoning or planning so we are faced with a hideous development like this which frowns like a green wave over this neighborhood. It brutalizes this neighborhood. It, in fact, imposes on this neighborhood something that should have never been imposed. A building this large and of this architecture should never have been allowed, and I'm going to vote against it on the basis the fact that I simply think that, perhaps, if we vote this project down, that perhaps that might be the one thing to force this town to come to grips with what basically is going wrong here. We're not handling our land properly, and maybe we'll all have to sit down with the zoning apparatus, re-do the zoning apparatus, get a hold of URC, which is totally out of control, I mean that. I attended a Planning Board meeting some three or four weeks ago, and our Planning Board went like, well, not like, they went as supplicants to the URC. I really mean it, and we are in the process of Manhattanizing Stamford. We have been lock-stepped by previous actions of various parts of the government into a Manhattanizing situation here in Stamford. I don't like it, and I think it's about time that we started to break it, if indeed, we want to. And, I think we start here.

Perhaps, the traffic plan as put forth by the Traffic Commissioner and the Traffic Commission and so on, might be somewhat better; perhaps, not. My point is that the building isn't going to work so why sell them the land, why go through this whole business? Why not, in fact, sit down and begin to face what I think is a crisis here in Stamford, and the first thing we do is vote this down, and then sit down and start to grab hold of our destiny here in Stamford because we're in the process of losing control of it. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I must applaud what Mr. White said, and, in fact, I think that he said many other things that I was going to say. There is no compromise on this issue. Either the corporation's rights are violated through their contract; the rights they had through their contract are violated or the citizens' rights are violated. We're faced with a very bad situation.

We look with great knowledge at what we should have done five, six, seven years ago, but it never should of happened, but it did, and it's here now with us. We promised to make a decision tonight. We can't go back on that promise. We can't wait on Commissioner Burns and the Governor looking at it again because at our last meeting, we promised General Re that we would make a decision tonight. Maybe that's 20-20 hindsight; we shouldn't have made the promise but we did.

I think that I am going to support the ordinance because it's simply the lesser of two evils and it's evil. I would certainly, strongly urge that Mr. Ford who is the Director of Traffic and Parking, scrutinize very closely any further manipulation of our streets and our thoroghfares, and to consider first, the needs of the traveling citizens and not the needs of of a particular corporation or organization any longer, and I would certainly back Mr. White in re-doing the Zoning and putting some control on the URC.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: Thank you, Madam President. First of all, I've listened to this ordinance and this debate, I guess, it's three or four months. We keep asking for information and when we get it, we don't agree with it. Some people are still insisting there never was a public hearing. I've been reading the reply that we got from Burns, and the last paragraph on no uncertain terms says, denial of access from North State Street, but I think the biggest question that was asked, "Can we reopen it?" The answer is, "No, they are not going to do it." You can co "huh" all you want. You got to remember one thing. Burns says they are not going to open it. He is the head of traffic for the State of Connecticut. You have to realize that he is going to tell the Governor what's best; whether that letter was directed to the Board of Reps or Mayor Clapes or who, the body of the letter is still going to say, "We're not going to open North State Street."

Now looking at that point, and realizing that the sale's price is approximately \$600,000.00, we'll probably receive in taxes from that piece of property the first year, say 46 mills, around a \$117,000.00. So the first year, the City is going to receive approximately \$717,000.00, and each year after that if the mill rate stays 26 which it probably won't, the City will receive another \$117,000.00. If you decide that we are not going to sell the property, and we're going to teach the Zoning Board a lesson not to put these building up, and I don't think General Reinsurance had to come in for a variance or anything, I think they were zoned to do what they had to do, even though we may not like the size of the building, they didn't break any law by building the building. The building is there legally.

We wanted the ramps changed on I-95 to accomodate our downtown traffic to the Town Center. This was brought out that North State Street would be closed. The state spent a great deal of money closing North State Street and changing the contour of the exit ramps. They are not going to open then again. I believe that General Reinsurance tried to get North State Street reopened and they were refused by the state.

Going back to the money involved, I can say the first year, it is about \$717,000 into the General Fund. In every year after that, the rate of income will be about \$117,000 approximately if the mill rate stays the same. Now, if you don't sell it, the first year you lose \$717,000 and every year after that, you lose approximately \$117,000 plus the City is going to have to come up with some money to maintain this property. Theoretically what you are talking about is a loss of every year, costing the taxpayers approximately \$125,000. That the financial part, and I think that has to be taken into consideration when you discuss this ordinance.

The other part is, do you like the building? Whether you like it or not, it has no bearing. Do you want all the traffic to go out on East Main Street? I'd suggest Mr. Wider keep his remarks to himself while I am speaking. He is constantly doing this while I am talking and I did not do it to him or any one else.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please give the speaker your attention.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If you want all the traffic to go out on East Main Street, I think the people on East Main Street should know that that's what they are going to get.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing) That traffic will not only go on East Main Street towards Darien to get on the throughway, but they'll also come downtown trying to get on the throughway the other way and cause more problem.

I think all has been said that could possibly be said about this particular ordinance; about this particular sale of property. I think we have to make up our mind that we're not going to get it reopened. The sales price is there. It's going to be an income to the City, and the repercussions if it is not done will affect the other side of town which is East Main Street. Therefore, I'm going to vote in favor of this ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I cannot let go unchallenged once again the comments made by Rep. Wider saying that this matter has not been brought before the public. I cannot count how many times Chairman Donahue has told this Board and Mr. Wider that there was a public hearing. Mr. Wider appeared and testified at the public hearing, and Rep. Donahue has produced a copy of the testimony given at that public hearing. So, this has been brought before the public.

Next point I wish to emphasize is that City leadership in years past, made the major decision that this City was going to go corporate. Like that decision or not, it has happened. We will have to live with it. It's here. It isn't going to go away. Decisions will have to be made that will un-popular, not to everybody's liking, but they will have to be made. Any other comment I have to make with regards to this item I would share completely with the comments of Mr. Boccuzzi. He said it very eloquently. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have many speakers. It is going on to twenty minutes to one. I'm quite concerned about Mr. Conti sitting there. I hope Tony... You just had major surgery. I want you to remember that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. I shall try not to echo any of the remarks of my colleagues before me.

Firstly, I'd like to compliment Reps. Gershman, White, Boccuzzi and Bonner on their comments. They were all fine comments. I think, however, that Rep. Bonner sort of zeroed in on things in talking about one item; safety. If you have to choose between safety and inconvenience, at this point you got to choose safety. It is a matter of public safety to know that people coming off of that ramp on I-95 are not going to be looking for cars coming in on the right side off of State Street. Excuse me, Mr. Blum, would you like the Floor?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I ask you once again, to give the speaker your attention. One speaker at a time. Mr. Wiederlight, you have the Floor.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you. It is a matter of safety. The cars coming off the ramp will not be looking for the cars coming in off the right, and when the cars do come on to State Street from the General Re building and they are going to be looking to make a left turn on Elms Street, it is going to be havoc, and it's going to be havoc with peoples' lives. It is going to be an unmanageable traffic situation, and it will be just as bad if the access to the street is denied with the traffic going helter-skelter all over the City instead of getting out of here where it belongs because that should be the objective. Let them come in the easiest way and let them get out the easiest way.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing) That's it. If we vote the ordinance down, Dennis, unfortunately, the building is not going to go away tomorrow. I, for one, if I knew voting the ordinance down would make that building disappear and fall into the ground and never surface again, I would vote it down. Unfortunately, it's not going to happen, and we have to live with the consequences of our predecessors; not even with our actions tonight. We've got to deal with the future built upon somebody else's "tom foolery" if you will. I have to vote for the ordinance. I have to vote in favor of the ordinance in the interest of public safety and public safety only. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Widerlight.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. At the Planning and Zoning Committee meeting a few weeks ago, this issue seemed so clear. It was so well presented. I unhesitatingly voted in favor of it. I still feel it's the only solution to a bad traffic situation. A situation which never should have been allowed to happen, but it's here. We have to deal with what we have now; not what we wished we had. We have to deal with the problem that we have now; not with badly handled problems sometime ago. However, I'm really caught in the horns of a dilemma. I must take into consideration the names of the people that were on that petition. Many of them are in the 18th district.

In order to do as little damage as possible to this ordinance, which in my heart I support. I think it's the only way out of this situation. I will not participate in the vote, will remove myself from the Floor, and not be counted as present and voting. I don't like to do this. I feel it's the only alternative I have. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore. 21 votes are needed for passage. This is an ordinance.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to urge everyone here to please, think about what Mr. Bocuzzi said because I think he's the only one here tonight who has summed this whole issue up very logically and I think if we all listened and remembered what he said, I think we'll see that it is the best thing for us to do is to vote in favor of this ordinance. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Jachimczyk. All the first-time speakers have spoken. We're going into second-time speakers.

MR. DONAHUE: Everything that I intended to say has been summed up quite well by Mr. Bocuzzi, Mr. Bonner, Mr. Wiederlight, Mrs. Gershman. I think and I believe that we have received the final answer on the accessibility from North State Street on to that ramp. If we wait any longer, we are not going to get any changed situation. Once the state has deemed a situation unsafe, they cannot go back on that and say all of a sudden, "Tomorrow it's safe." They expose themselves and the City to a tremendous liability if that's done. In 1977, it was decided that an unsafe condition existed. All through these past years and up to the current day, that unsafe situation has been found to exist. The State of Connecticut will not change its mind at this point in time. Just for the expose to liability alone, and that's another consideration you should make. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. I'm sorry, there is another first-time speaker, Mrs. Perillo.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. PERILLO: Move the question, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? No, would you please raise your hand. One no vote. We're going to move the question. We're going to vote for final adoption on the proposed ordinance relating to the purchase of portions of North State Street and Hill Street.

Mr. Hogan has left the meeting. We have 35 members present. 21 votes are required for adoption of this ordinance. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The ordinance is ADOPTED 25 affirmative, 9 negative, 0 abstaining and 2 not-voting. The ordinance is ADOPTED.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF LeROY PLACE AS A CITY STREET - submitted by Rep. Donald Donahue 8/24/83. Pursuant to Chapter 64. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: This is being held pending receipt of further information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment. Mr. Conti is leaving. We have 34 members present. Mr. Franchinà is leaving. We have 33 members present. Mr. Wiederlight is leaving. We have 32 members present. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we go quickly, we have to maintain 21. We have a lot of business to transact. Mr. Donahue, as quickly as you can before we lose anymore.

MR. DONAHUE: Item #2 is held, Madam President.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING SALE OF RELAY PLACE for new GTE Realty Corp. Bldg., pursuant to Chapter 64. Resolution approved concerning Notice of Intention to Discontinue A Portion of Relay Place approved 8/15/83. Approved for publication 9/14/83.

MR. DONAHUE: This ordinance has received the approval of the Planning Board and the Board of Finance. The Committee held a public hearing and heard testimony concerning the sale and most of the testimony centered around our denying this sale in order to prevent the construction of the new GTE building. Another question was raised concerning the decreased amount of parking that would be available on that street; on the remaining portion of the street. This project has received the approval of the Planning Board, the Zoning Board and the Environmental Protection Board. So, the site plans have been approved.

It also appears that parking will still be available on Relay Place and because a number of the existing structures will be torn down. There will be a decrease in the need for parking spaces on Relay. I would also add that the Mayor has asked that we request that GTE aid in the relocation of displaced tenants, and allow for the construction of a manhole in the turnaround to allow for underground access to various lines; sewer lines and such. The manhole will allow the City's access and will be constructed to City specifications. GTE has agreed to both and a letter of intent has been sent to this Board, and should be made a part of the record. With these facts in mind, the Planning and Zoning Committee recommends final adoption of this ordinance by a vote of 6 in favor and none opposed, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? A motion has been made and seconded for final adoption of the proposed ordinance concerning the sale of Relay Place

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) for new GTE Realty Corporation building. First speaker, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I wouldn't want to prolong my conversation, but I would like to go on record as saying that I am opposed to the sale of Relay Place because, at the public hearing, we were shown a diagram of the new structure and from the way it looked to me, that there is a residential home there which is right against their window. Their garage is right against the bedroom window of the person that's living in the dwelling. Here again, it is one of those things. I think this Board has shown what they are going to do with it, but I would like to go on record as stating that I still think that we have to think about, not numbers but human beings. As I stated at the Planning and Zoning public hearing, as far as I'm concerned, one person is just as important to me as 100,000 persons. You can tell me all about the millions of dollars the City could make; that person is just as important as the 100,000 persons, so I stand to vote against this particular sale. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I have a question for Mr. Donahue, Chairman of the Committee. I realize that there are six families that have to be relocated and that it is indicated the maximum potential cost to the City could be as much as \$28,200.00. If my memory serves me correctly, when we did all the relocating of the families with the Urban Renewal project down here, the cost of relocating families was much higher than that. Could you tell me, do you have any more specifics about it as to whether we have to find them a house, whether we have to find them an apartment, what is the commitment from the City, and I see that GTE would assume the responsibility but in lieu of that, they can just pay an additional \$28,000 to the City. I want to know not what a potential is, I want a pretty realistic figure knowing that the past figures on URC have been extremely high.

MR. DONAHUE: The letter from the Mayor indicated that they would be willing to give GTE an option to actually get involved in the relocation to accomplish that or to give to the City an additional 28,000 some odd dollars. GTE has opted to actually help to relocate those individuals and they will pick up that cost. They have chosen not to give the City the money and will actually get involved in the relocation process itself.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, does that mean that they have a firm commitment to pay beyond the limit of \$28,200 if necessary?

MR. DONAHUE: I believe that the reason GTE has chosen not to give the City the \$28,000 and change is that they believe it can be accomplished. What has to be done can be accomplished for a lesser sum than that, but since they have stated and we have a letter of intent stating that they will do that relocation, it's really up to them to now perform.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One more question, Mrs. McInerney.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: One more question. Are these people being relocated from apartments or homes? Private homes.

MR. DONAHUE: I believe that the persons they are talking about relocating are tenants. The persons who are selling their homes to GTE are receiving \$30, 31.00 a square foot; some of the figures that we heard.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mrs. McInerney, are you finished?

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, but I think that the relocation cost for six families is going to be a lot higher than \$28,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. BLUM: Again, we are faced with this dilemma of a city street, and it goes from Beckley Avenue to North State Street to Relay Place and many other streets that we sold in the URC area. And, you know, we sold our soul to the company store.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. As Chairman of the Housing Committee, as long as I am Chairman for this Board, I would like to ask Mr. Donahue a question. Is GTE going to build some additional houses or do they plan to use our public housing to do their relocation, which we are very short of? I had ten calls today from people for one room to five. Are they going to build some housing to relocate those people? That is one of the first things I want to know.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, I can't know if you can answer that or not.

MR. DONAHUE: That's a little difficult to answer. There is a sum of money that is going to be paid to the City. I'm sure it could be recommended that that sum of money be placed in one of the housing funds or a like amount be placed in a local housing fund; Neighborhood Services or Neighborhood Preservation or one of those funds. New Neighborhoods, that's the one I was thinking was. However, in the past, GTE has contributed to housing in Stamford and I don't think that we can require them to build new housing, quite frankly. Just the fact that they are willing to purchase this at the going real estate price in the downtown area, is already asking quite a bit.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MR. WIDER: Yes, but I understand from Mr. Smith that there is a number of people coming here everyday willing to buy the property at the going rate downtown. There's no problem there, but where are the people going? You know we have people here right now doubling up. If we are going to further aggravate the situation, then what are we really doing to ourselves? That's the question I'm asking. We are trying to get some housing built all over Stamford but the fact is that if we are going to allow GTE to use that housing to relocate their people while they don't build any housing, then I think we are going further and further in trouble.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd just like to ask Mr. Donahue...

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Boccuzzi, is this a point of information?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I want to know if they are relocating families who are renting or families who own the building? I understand six families in two existing buildings. That's what I'm trying to find out.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Donahue, would you repeat the previous answer that you gave us?

MR. DONAHUE: It's my recollection at this point, that there are four families who are tenants in those buildings who will be relocated. It's not the owners of the property who will be relocated. They are being paid a substantial amount for the purchase of their property.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, like Rep. McInerney, I have a primary concern about voting on this item for the same reason regarding the relocation of families. As Rep. Donahue stated, in the Mayor's letter, he talks about that it should be necessary to request your Board to included two conditions in addition to GTE's payment to the City of Stamford, talking about the square footage, etc.

The second item was where the Mayor says that we should vote on it contingent that GTE will assume the responsibility for the relocation of the tenants or in lieu of that, they pay an additional \$28,200.00 to the City, which I think is also a low figure.

Then we go to a letter which we just received or at least, I got a copy of it today, dated October 5, 1983, and it's signed by Daniel E. Ryan, Jr. who I presume is the attorney, and the last paragraph of this letter states that there is presently a house located on the property under option to GTE. There are four tenants in the building. GTE has agreed with Union Trust Company to jointly relocate the tenants. They expect to do this at no cost to the City. My primary concern is asking a question, is it possible that we can vote for approval of this item contingent upon receipt of a letter from both GTE and Union Trust on their stationary, instead of saying they expect to do this at no cost, they will relocate all families involved at no cost to the City, and if I can get something more consistent or more concise, or more specific such as this here, I can see voting for this here without any hesitation. We have voted for other items saying, "we vote on approval contingent upon the Board of Finance approved," so why can't...I'd like to make an amendment or if it is possible, I'd like to word this that we are voting for approval of this here contingent upon receipt of a letter from both GTE and Union Trust Company that they will, not that they expect, because expect is a loophole. It isn't anything concrete, but if we can get something that they will relocate all families involved in this area, at no cost to the City of Stamford. I would vote for this here without any hesitation. The question is, is it possible that we can?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: It's possible to make a motion to amend, I believe, but I will refer to the Parliamentarian who is also the Planning and Zoning Chairman, Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: It would seem that a motion to that affect would be in order. However, if we get a moment or two, I can clear that up.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Donahue indicated that a motion of that nature would be in order at this time, and he asked for a minute to talk with, I believe, one of the representatives. But, I would accept a motion if you would put it in writing, I would appreciate it. You can make it verbally, Mr. DeLuca, and if you get a second, then you can put it in writing.

MRS. CONTI: Point of information, Madam Chairman. Would such an amendment be binding?

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm not a lawyer, Mrs. Conti, and I cannot give you a definite answer to that. However, that's not to say that we can't entertain a motion. Mr. Donahue would like to speak in response to the question of the motion.

MR. DONAHUE: I believe that we do place contingencies many time on items. There is already one contingency that's been placed on this by the Mayor in concurrence with the Board of Finance. It says, "final approval is contingent upon the City Engineer's acceptance of an adequate turnaround and sanitary sewer manhole to be constructed by the developer." That is already a contingency placed there. I have spoken just a few moment ago to Mr. Ryan who is representing GTE, and they have already accepted the responsibility and have said that they would relocate the families. They will send letters to that affect with the kind of wording that, I believe, Mr. DeLuca is referring to.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mr. DeLuca, are you ready with your amendment?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes. At this time, I would like to make a motion that we approve the sale of Relay Place to GTE contingent upon receipt of a letter from GTE and Union Trust that they will pay for all relocation costs for the families involved in the area being sold.

MRS. McINERNEY: Is there a second to Mr. DeLuca's motion? There is a second. Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. ROOS: I would vote for that motion but there are two parties involved here, and that is the tenant and GTE and Union Trust. We could have tenants that would be unreasonable in their request for housing, and we could also have a situation where they are not getting equal quarters to move to. There are two parties involved in this.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Roos.

MR. DIXON: Could I hear the amendment again, please, Mr. DeLuca?

MRS. McINERNEY: Certainly. Mr. DeLuca, would you read it?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: I make a motion that we approve the sale of Relay Place to GTE contingent upon receipt of a letter from GTE and Union Trust that they will pay for all relocation costs for the families involved with the sale of the Relay Place property.

MR. DIXON: I would just ask Mr. DeLuca if he would accept a minor change in the wording? I would like for that contingency to be, for the letter to be a guarantee, a guarantee that they will relocate the families.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. DeLuca, can you accept an amendment saying that a guarantee that they shall relocate the families?

MR. DIXON: A letter of intent guaranteeing that they will relocate.

MR. DeLUCA: In essence, what you are trying to say is really the same thing that I'm saying that they will pay for all relocation costs. The fact that they will or they shall. Let's use the word that they shall pay is a guarantee that they will.

MR. DIXON: Would you accept this change? That the relocation be in the City of Stamford and that they be relocated in housing that is at least equal to the housing that they are being deprived of.

MR. DeLUCA: I'll go along with that.

MRS. McINERNEY: Would you incorporate that within your motion?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes.

MR. BONNER: I just have a question. Thank you. Are we talking about people that are living on property that is now owned by GTE or property that is not owned by GTE and at this time, as far as we know, will not be owned by GTE? Or is this property which GTE has an option on and soon will purchase?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Donahue, can you give us an answer to those questions?

MR. DONAHUE: We're talking about properties that GTE and Fairfield Properties have options to purchase, currently. Those are the only properties that are affected. Before GTE can begin construction, the land has to be cleared. Before they can clear the land, the people must be relocated out of those apartments.

Secondly, I don't believe, as a point of order, that it is an appropriate amendment to require GTE to relocate people within the City of Stamford. People might not want to relocate within the City of Stamford. I believe that we are getting much too explicit. I think the Committee has been impressed by GTE's sincerity and the fact that they stated long ago that they would undertake the relocation of the affected tenants, and now they have agreed to make that wording stronger, and I don't know how much more specific that that should be made.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mr. Bonner, were you finished?

MR. BONNER: Yes, thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McINERNEY: Is there any other discussion?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam Chairperson to Mr. Donahue, please; a point of information. Mr. Donahue, I would like to know what is the relationship between the purchased price and the appraisal price? I don't think that has been brought out.

MR. DONAHUE: The price per square foot is the exact same price quoted to General Reinsurance. It is the suggested sale price by the Public Works Department of the City of Stamford and is based on the assessed and going sale price for square footage in the downtown.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like to ask further, have you had an appraiser look at it and do you have a definite appraisal on it?

MR. DONAHUE: It's based on current appraisals. It's based on information supplied to GTE from the City of Stamford itself. It's based on information that came from the City. They didn't come in and ask us to buy it for \$32.00 a square foot. We told them that if they wanted the right to that property, they would have to pay \$32.00 a square foot.

MRS. McINERNEY: Does that answer your question, Mrs. Maihock? Is there any other discussion? If not, Mr. DeLuca is going to bring his amendment forward and we're going to vote on it.

MR. DeLUCA: Here's how the amendment shall read. I'd just talked it over with Handy Dixon, and this shall be the final one. I make a motion that we approve the sale of Relay Place to GTE contingent upon receipt of a letter from GTE and Union Trust that they shall pay for all relocation costs for the families involved with the sale of the Relay Place property and that said housing shall be equal to their existing residence. This way, we are not limiting it to Stamford.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. Did everyone hear that or are you going to bring it up so I can re-read it, Mr. DeLuca? I will ask for a vote based on Mr. DeLuca's amendment and Mr. Dixon's addition to that amendment. All of those people in favor of approving the amendment, please indicate by using the machine.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Has everyone voted? The amendment has PASSED 29 affirmative, 2 negative, and 2 not-voting. We are now going to proceed to the main motion for final adoption of the proposed ordinance concerning the sale of Relay Place for new GTE Realty Corporation Building. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. We need 21 votes. Please use your machine. We are now voting for final adoption with the amendment as just voted and passed. Has everyone voted? The ordinance has been ADOPTED 26 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining, and 2 not-voting. It has been ADOPTED.

- (4) PETITION TO ACCEPT ELM COURT AS A CITY-ACCEPTED STREET - letter 9/7/83 from Norman Liu, City Engineer. (No Petition for Road Acceptance form received) Elm Court - extending easterly from Elm Street approximately 302 ft. to a dead end.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: This is being held pending inspection by myself and the final vote of the Committee.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (5) PETITION SIGNED BY 37 PEOPLE RESIDING ON BELLMERE AVENUE AND PETITION FOR ROAD ACCEPTANCE - to accept Bellmere Avenue from Belltown Road to dead end. The road is black-topped, has curbing, storm drains, and sanitary sewers. Contact Harry J. Bode 323-0163. 8/24/83.

MR. DONAHUE: You have this evening the resolution which begins the process under Chapter 64 which will hopefully lead to acceptance of this street. The Committee voted 6 in favor and none opposed to recommend passage of this resolution, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to petition for road acceptance Bellmere Avenue. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. Mr. Rybnick has left. We now have 32 members present.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. Bellmere Avenue is in the 15th district, the district I represent, and all you have to do is read the item as it is on the Agenda, but in addition to the black-topping, the curbing, the storm drains, the sanitary sewers, the City patches potholes. The City does pay quite a bit of attention to this street. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. No speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on approval of the acceptance of Bellmere Avenue. The computer can't keep up with us tonight; we're going so fast. Has everyone voted? We're voting on the petition from the people to accept Bellmere Avenue. The motion has been APPROVED 29 affirmative, 0 abstaining, 0 negative, and 3 not-voting. The motion PASSED.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE regarding Auction Sale of Property on Halloween Blvd. Planning Board has approved, per Mayor Clapes' letter 9/6/83. Located on east side of Halloween Blvd. Price not less than \$27,000.

MR. DONAHUE: Some of you may remember that a person was in before this Committee, I believe back in March and offered \$25,000.00 for this piece of property. A second person claimed interest in the property, and we, therefore, denied the ordinance that would have sold the property. Since then, this has gone a bit further and they have now drawn up an ordinance that will allow a sealed bid auction to take place with a minimum price for the property of \$27,000.00. This is for publication tonight. We'll hold a public hearing to hear to hear from any area residents that who may be interested in it, and we could come back in November for final adoption. By a vote of 5 in favor and 1 opposed, we recommend the publication of this ordinance. I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Several seconds. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. There is discussion.

MR. ROOS: Is there an appraisal available on this? Has it been appraised?

MR. DONAHUE: The figure of \$27,000.00 is the figure approved by the Planning Board and, I believe now the Board of Finance. It is the appraised value of that piece of property.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. The motion on the Floor is for publication, the proposed ordinance regarding the auction sale of the property on Halloween Blvd.

MRS. GERSHMAN: What's the zoning there, please?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, do you know the zoning?

MR. DONAHUE: I'm not exactly sure. It's not a question that came up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We don't have that answer. Mrs. Gershman, I think this will probably come up at the public hearing. This is just for publication.

MR. DONAHUE: We could have an answer between now and then.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. As far as I know, that is heavy industrial.

PRESIDENT SANTY: As long as the question arose, Mr. White, do you know exactly what the zoning regulations are?

MR. WHITE: I think, Madam President, that the property around is zoned industrial, and I think that property is zoned residential, if I'm not mistaken. That's what makes me suspicious.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I know that there is such a thing as someone taking precedent over others. I appreciate that. I would like to see a map of that property made available to the members of this Board so that they will know what they are talking about before the public hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, thank you, Mr. Wider. I'm sure at the public hearing there will be maps available from the Committee. No further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the publication of this ordinance. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 27 affirmative, 2 negative, and 3 not-voting.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

MRS. MAIHOCK: The Environmental Protection Committee met jointly with the Legislative and Rules Committee on October 3, 1983, in the Main meeting room. Present were Committee members Marie Hawe and Dennis White and myself as Chairman as well as members of the Legislative and Rules Committee mentioned previously by Mr. Zelinski.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING COMMERCIAL TREE SPRAYERS
TO BE LICENSED BY HEALTH DEPARTMENT FOR PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLY.

Submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock 7/21/83. Held in Committee 8/1 and 9/14/83.

Above also referred to LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The Committee voted unanimously for publication of this ordinance. The ordinance has been reviewed and reorganized in some places by Mr. Hennessey of the Corporation Counsel's office. The Health Department has sent us a letter dated October 3, 1983, stating that they feel the ordinance appears to be workable and comprehensive.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MAIHOCK: (continuing) We feel that this ordinance is very important to the protection of the public water supplies in our City from toxic contamination. I urge my fellow Board members to vote for publication.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock. A motion has been made. Is there a second for publication of this ordinance. Several seconds.

Mr. Owens has left. We have 31 members present. Legislative and Rules Committee, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. The Legislative and Rules met on this and we concur. Our vote was 6 in favor and none against.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. No speakers? Environmental Protection Committee moved for publication and L&R agrees unanimously. Please use your machine. It's for publication of this ordinance. #1 under Environmental Protection. The vote is 26 affirmative, 0 negative, 0 abstaining and 7 not-voting. Mr. Bocuzzi is recorded as a yes vote. Change it, Helen, on that. Okay? Mrs. Maihock, anything further?

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Transportation Committee met on Tuesday, October 4. We had a public hearing and, of course, we had a very heavy Agenda this month. Present were Audrey Maihock and myself.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE LIMITATION OF TRUCK TRAFFIC ON CITY STREETS - submitted by Reps. Guroian and Betty Conti 5/6/83. Approved for publication as amended 8/15/83. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There were several people present to speak on behalf of the ordinance as well as several members of the Board. The Committee voted 2 in favor of final adoption and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for final adoption of the ordinance concerning the limitation of truck traffic on city streets. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to machine vote on final adoption of this ordinance. Has everyone voted? The ordinance has been ADOPTED 26 affirmative, 0 negative, 0 abstaining and 5 not-voting. It PASSED.

- (2) REQUEST FROM REP. PAUL DZIEZYK, Chairman, Health and Protection that Fiscal Committee report on status and progress of collection agency handling parking citations and past-due tickets, since Feb. 9, 1983 approval of \$235,050 for six-month period, which expires August 8, 1983. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

Also REQUEST FOR A PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING OUTSTANDING PARKING TICKETS - submitted by Reps. Gershman and Wiederlight 9/19/83.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Regarding the request regarding the status and progress of the collection agency handling parking citations. Present for that part was Jim Ford and two people from Datacom which is the consulting firm that is doing this work for us. We really had an interesting conversation with them, and some very, very positive results regarding the status of the collection system.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: (continuing) The contract first was implemented the second week of April and this was really three months later than they had expected it to be implemented, so the results can't be as complete as we would like it to be right now, but they're very good.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment, are you finished with the report on that item because Mr. Wider has a question?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I haven't even begun.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, can you wait until Mrs. Goldstein is finished?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It's been two years and I haven't had anything on the Agenda. The first general mailing went out in July and August for the collection of tickets and it generated \$84,000.00 in collections which compared to \$24,000.00 from the previous year before we had the agency. The bottom line is that this is virtually four times as much as we have been collecting in the past, and if this kind of tracking continues, we should stabilize at collecting \$1.3 million in both current and past due bills through this system. O.K., Lathon.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Lathon, do you have a question?

MR. WIDER: What are you recommending on this? I don't see any recommendation at all.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There really isn't any recommendations.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Lathon, she's giving a report.

MR. WIDER: I'm upset because I had to worry the Traffic Department to death with people carrying around a handful of communications and no one to explain to them what it is all about, and some of them just can't read them. They don't know whether to pay them, they have questions to ask and they don't know where to go. They ask if there is going to be anyplace set up where violators can go and ask questions if they have questions to ask? Where can we refer them to?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a number on the ticket for them to call.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think it explains it fully on the ticket, Lathon, fully on the ticket if they just turn it over and read it, it tells them their appeal.

MR. WIDER: I was 4½ hours getting that number on the ticket. How confusing can this be?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Lathon, I don't know if Sandy wants to answer it. That's the only mechanism.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The other mechanism, of course would be, I would suggest that if you can't get through to that number, then call Jim Ford and inform him of this; another number will have to be arranged because one of the things that we do want is responsiveness on the part of the consulting firm, and if that number is always busy, then another number should be arranged. If that is occurring, then that is wrong.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Now remember, it is twenty-five after one. We can get into a lengthy discussion on this parking ordinance, but we are going to lose people if we do. Sandy gave a report. We are not voting on anything. It's just a report. If you have any questions, you can put them on Steering or else you can go to Ford himself.

MR. DUDLEY: I was just going to clarify a little bit what Lathon was saying. I believe the problem and maybe it can be explored by Sandy's Committee, and I think that's what Lathon was asking. The phone number is virtually unreachable. I know a number of people that have not been able to get through. They've also had trouble getting through to the Traffic Department. The problem is not so much will they pay it, won't they pay it, it is when did I get this ticket? I don't ever remember receiving this ticket in many cases, and I think there's some questions which should be answered, and they are not getting any answers. I think the Hearing Officers are going to be back-up for some time with unnecessary tickets that possibly could be explained somewhere. I think that's what Lathon was referring to; maybe an informational type.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think tonight on WSTC, Jim Ford was on it and I understand they kept him on extra time because there were so many questions and maybe some of that was clarified. Lathon, if you want anything else, put it into the Committee. We have one more month. I just ask you to submit it to Helen who will put it in Steering if they want to investigate any further.

There is no motion on the Floor. There really is not discussion, but remember the time. Mr. Dixon has left. We have 30 members present.

MR. BLUM: Do exactly what I had done. I appealed all the three tickets that they dug-up from 1979.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, David.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask Mrs. Goldstein about the figures she mentioned. Is that all the City's revenue or does the collection agency get a portion or that or?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The collection agency gets a portion, but the \$1.3 million is projected as net, not as gross.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, and remember it is getting late and there is no motion on the Floor.

MR. DZIEZYC: This is a fast one for Rep. Goldstein. The \$85,000.00 that we received, was that the past-due tickets?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, the July and August was not past-due. No, on September 27, the first past-due notices went out. Those were 3,000 notices worth \$448,000.00. That was the 1979 tickets that Mr. Blum was talking about, and money has been coming in right and left to the Traffic Department and the collection agency regarding this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: I just want to comment on this law. This law was passed originally as regulatory piece of legislation, but it has been lost in all this talk about finances. I want to tell you that it is a very unhealthy situation when you start justifying regulatory legislation on the basis of finances; a very diseased situation. Seriously. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White. Remember there is no motion on the Floor. We're just getting a report.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Madam Chairperson, I just wish to say and this will be important to those who have had unexpected large bills accumulate. One of the most positive aspects of the present system is that they now have monthly control over the tickets so that those who have a violation will not risk getting an unexpected bill for \$50.00. It will be billed monthly.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock. Mrs. Goldstein, continue with your report.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING PARKING FOR STAMFORD OFFICIALS, EMPLOYEES, ETC. - submitted by Reps. Jeremiah Livingston, Handy Dixon, John Zelinski, David Blum, et al., 8/25/83. Board members have had a constant problem with day-time parking at Municipal Office Building, either in lot or on street. Held 8/29/83.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. Present to speak regarding the ordinance was John Canavan and Jim Ford. The Committee voted 2 opposed and 0 in favor of the ordinance, and the reason for this is that the ordinance gave Mr. Ford a great deal of the duties that Mr. Canavan or the Public Works Department now has, and Mr. Ford, absolutely, felt that he could do no better a job at assigning the parking spots equitably than the Public Works Department has done because it's a matter of space. We're going to try to get several additional spaces on Atlantic Street designed just for the Board. The problem is that of space and there is just no way of making more space available in this area.

Furthermore, there are several parts of the ordinance that violate the Charter because those powers are given directly to the Traffic Commission as opposed to the Board of Representatives. So, all in all, we felt that it was not a workable ordinance. It did not address a problem in a healthy, constructive manner and we voted it down.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Goldstein, do you want to put a favorable motion on the Floor, bearing in mind that the Committee voted not to publish this ordinance.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I will move publication of the ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? A motion has been made and seconded to publish.

MR. BLUM: I'm sort of surprised turning this particular item down for the simple reason that I've come here numerous times during the day. I'd like to take Mr. Ryan who is taking the pictures here today of this Board, and show him some of the city vehicles that sit out in the front there that says, "Parking for Board of Representatives." It doesn't say "only." That's the only thing about it, okay? Now, there loaded. I received a ticket here just recently in regards to a meeting that I was called to the Mayor's office, and because I parked for what I felt was a short time into the disabled, I received a ticket

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: (continuing) because I didn't have a permit, but I'd like to take you numerous times when the City truck are sitting in that and nothing happens to them because they're City trucks. If I have no permit to be at a disabled parking without a permit, neither has a City truck, but no ticket goes onboard a City truck.

Now, let us come into the fence area, and we have a space there that says, "For visitors only," and this is suppose to be for members of the Board of Representatives who come in occasionally for City business. I have come in numerous times and I can't even find a spot there and what do we have? We have City employees who come in there and spend the whole day in this City Hall when this spot is left solely for either one or of the Board of Representatives, we either have street parking or we have going into the fence area and we go into the visitors only and no parking. Where are we suppose to park? Where? That is the reason why I, along with Mr. Livingston, Mr. Handy Dixon, John Zelinski, who probably found the same troubles, and maybe who have received tickets. I have been ticketed by a officer, I see her numerous times. She just likes my car evidently. She doesn't even go and look around to see that I'm parked in a area that says, "For Board of Representatives only," and I have a plate on it, but that doesn't bother her. She puts the ticket on anyway. When is it going to stop?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, are you finished?

MR. BLUM: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Jachimczyk has left. We have 29 members present. It's going on to 2 o'clock.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The important thing is everything that Mr. Blum said is really true. There are inadequate spaces; sometimes advantage may be taken of the visitors spaces although Mr. Canavan said that they do try to only give those passes to people who are visitors. But the bottom line is that the ordinance is not going to help this situation. Finding additional spaces will help the situation. Jim Ford or the Traffic Director whoever that might be in the future, cannot do anymore than the Public Works Department did; that is why we turned down the ordinance. Perhaps, a better method can be found although I don't have one, but perhaps on the next Board, that matter could be looked into, but this ordinance does not do it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. McINERNEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want to 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 voting on publication of this ordinance bearing in mind that the Committee came out with an unfavorable recommendation. If you're for publication of this ordinance, vote yes. If you're against publication, vote no. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Publication has been DEFEATED 2 affirmative, 19 negative, 2 abstaining and 6 not-voting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That concludes our report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, at this time I would like to ask for a Suspension of the Rules to consider a resolution which should have appeared on our Agenda, but for some oversight, was not placed on the Tentative Steering Agenda. It's a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution honoring Paddy Moruke on his 80th birthday. Apparently, there is some celebration in honor of Mr. Moruke this week and before we lose the rest of our group, I'd like to have it acted on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a motion made and seconded to Suspend the Rules. All in favor of Suspending the Rules to consider this resolution, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to Suspend the Rules.

SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF PADDY MORUKE ON HIS BOTH BIRTHDAY - submitted by Rep. Jeanne-Lois Santy.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor the resolution honoring Deputy Sheriff Paddy Moruke on his 80th birthday that we all received in the mail 3 weeks ago, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. I'm glad.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Madam President.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday evening, October 3, 1983, at 7:30 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Attendees were Committee members Owens, Rybnick, Gaipa, Franchina, and myself, Gabe DeLuca. Also attending were Ed Condon of the Parks Department and George Barnes of the Halloween Yacht Club.

We voted 5 in favor and none opposed to place the following items on the Consent Agenda: items 3, 4, 5 and 6.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 3, 4, 5 and 6 are on Consent.

- (1) APPROVAL OF NEW LEASE FOR HALLOWEEN YACHT CLUB - submitted by Mayor Clapes and Ed Condon 8/24/83. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee voted 5 in favor and none opposed to approve this lease which is for 10-years payable at a 100% of the A District assessed value. Looking at this lease, we feel that it's one that is beneficial to the City. It costs the City nothing, and according to Ed Condon, the operating expenses only if the City had to maintain the facility would be in the area of \$25 to \$35,000. Right not I move for acceptance of this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to approve the new lease for the Halloween Yacht Club. No discussion, we'll move right to machine vote on approval of the lease. We're voting on the approval of the lease between the City and the Halloween Yacht Club. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 21 affirmative, 1 negative, 1 abstaining and 6 not-voting.

- (2) REQUEST TO CHANGE THE NAME OF "HERITAGE PARK" to a former City employee "Edward Anthony Connell Heritage Park" - submitted by Parks Supt. Robert Cook 8/17/83. Held in Committee 9/14/83. Also requested by Rep. Gaipa 9/14/83.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee voted 5 in favor and none opposed to approve the change of Heritage Park to read, "Edward Anthony Connell Heritage Park." Evidently at the September 1983, there was some question regarding the procedure for naming a park after someone. Fortunately, the night of our meeting, I was able to catch Ben Fraser before he went home for dinner, and he sat down for a few extra moments, and took time to run off a copy of Ordinance 2-21 Section C, Guidelines, item 2 which states, "No City street or facility shall be named to memorialize any person unless such person has been deceased for more than 6 months and only after a specific finding by the Board of Representatives that either no suitable geographical or historical name for such street or facility exists or in the case of a City facility, such facility has been made possible substantially through some such individuals contribution to the community."

We felt that Ed Connell fits the criteria as stated. We also feel that Ed Connell has done much for the City of Stamford. He represents to Stamford what Robert Moses was to the City of New York when it came to park land. Therefore, we wholeheartedly recommend approval of this change, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded to change the name of Heritage Park to Edward Anthony Connell Heritage Park. A motion made and seconded. It's the little park behind Town Hall. No discussion, we are going to move right to a machine vote. Please use your machine if you approved the renaming of this park. I would ask all the members in the Caucus Room to please come out and vote. Your names are recorded as being here. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 20 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 4 not-voting. Just a majority vote was necessary.

Mr. DeLuca, before you go any further, you put #3 on Consent. Don't you have to move for Suspension of the Rules?

MR. DeLUCA: I figured that nobody would see that at this time. We'll come back to that. Now I move for the acceptance of the Consent Agenda, items 4, 5, and 6.

MR. BOCCUZZI: A question. On #4, they already held that, right? If we deny it, those people that ran up West Board Street have to run down it?

MR. DeLUCA: You're right, John. No, November 6th, John. That was a different one.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to put #4, 5, and 6 on the Consent Agenda. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? 4, 5, and 6 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Let's go back to #3.

MR. DeLUCA: I request a Suspension of the Rules to place an item on the Agenda which was inadvertently left off.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded to Suspend the Rules to put item 3 on the Agenda which inadvertently was left off. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? You got the Suspension of the Rules.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (3) PETITION TO HOLD A VETERANS' DAY PARADE ON SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1983 -
start 1:30 p.m. - submitted by Carmine Vaccaro, Chairman, 1983 Veterans Day Observance Committee 322-9238.

MR. DeLUCA: I now move for acceptance for a petition to hold a Veterans' Day Parade on Sunday, November 13, 1983.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion made and seconded. No discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY by a voice vote. I think Gabe, aren't we all invited to march in that parade.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes.

- (4) PETITION TO HOLD 10 KILOMETER RACE ON NOVEMBER 6, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.
Sponsored by Italian Center, and managed by Stamford Running Club, Inc., Atty. Arthur Morin, Jr., 356-1577, letter 9/13/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (5) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER STREET - From Nov. 7th thru Nov. 20, 1983 -
to publicize The Stamford Jewish CenterArt Gallery Committee's 2nd Annual Juried Craft Show. Jewish Community Center, Newfield Avenue, Mrs. Linda Yaffee and Mrs. Marlene Dobrin 9/19/83 letter.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (6) PETITION TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER STREET from the week of Nov. 21st until Dec. 10, 1983. The Westhill Chamber Singers wish to advertise their two Texas Ruby Red Grapefruit Sales, and their Annual Benefit Concert to finance concert tours to Austria and Hungary. Sale days will be Dec. 10, 1983, Feb. 4, 1984. Concert 3/25/84. Jill Horowitz, 199 Rocky Rapids Road. 9/6/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

MR. DeLUCA: That concludes are report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

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

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. The Appointments Committee met on Thursday, October 6, at 7:30 in the Democratic Caucus Room. In attendance were Ms. DeGaetani, Mr. Dixon, Ms. Summerville, Mrs. Signore. Although we four did not constitute a quorum, we pursued, went forward and interviewed the three on our Agenda this evening; Mr. Frank Valluzzo, Park Commission, Mr. Allan Baron, Hearing Officer for the Parking Appeals Board and Mr. Mark Katz, Hearing Officer for the Parking Appeals Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Signore, would you go back and tell us what happened with #1 and 2?

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY

(1) <u>MR. CHARLES DeLUCA</u> (D)	Reappointment	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
30 DeBera Lane		Jan
Held 5/23, 7/11, 8/15, 9/14/83.		Dec. 1, 1986

HELD IN COMMITTEE

(2) <u>MS. KATIE JANNICKY</u> (D)	Reappointment	<u>Jan.</u>
96 Alexandra Drive		Dec. 1, 1986
Held 6/6, 7/11, 8/15, 9/14/83.		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: #1 and 2 were not acted upon. They had already been interviewed at a previous Appointments Committee meeting. They are held. We will make a disposition at our next meeting with those two.

PARK COMMISSION

(3) <u>MR. FRANK VALLUZZO</u> (R)	Replacing W. Sheck whose term expired.	Dec. 1, 1985
34 Prudence Drive		
Held 8/15, 9/14/83.		

MRS. SIGNORE: At this time, I would like to bring to the Floor two of the names that were interviewed for consideration. The first being Mr. Frank Valluzzo for Park Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion. There's a motion made and seconded bearing in mind that the Appointments Committee did not have a quorum for the approval of Mr. Frank Valluzzo to the Park Commission. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on his confirmation. We are voting on the confirmation of Mr. Frank Valluzzo to the Park Commission. Has everyone voted? Mr. Valluzzo is APPROVED by a vote of 24 affirmative, 0 negative, 1 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

HEARING OFFICERS FOR PARKING APPEALS

(5) <u>MR. MARK F. KATZ</u> (D)	Two-year term from day of appointment.
460 Hunting Ridge Road	

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to move him.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a motion made and seconded to approve Mark Katz to the Hearing Officer for Parking Appeals. No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on Mr. Katz. We are voting on #5, Mr. Katz. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Mr. Katz is APPROVED by a vote of 20 affirmative, 0 negative, 2 abstaining, and 7 not-voting.

MRS. SIGNORE: That concludes the formal part of the report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Signore, you did not give a disposition on Mr. Allan Baron. He's on the Agenda.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGNORE: I beg your pardon, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have to have the disposition of Mr. Baron, item #4.

(4) HEARING OFFICERS FOR PARKING APPEALSTERM EXPIRES

MR. ALLAN BARON (D)
35 St. George St.

Two-year term
from day of
appointment.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: We'd like to hold him.

MR. DUDLEY: I did have my hand raised prior to the vote. I just wanted to make it known that the reason I abstained is because I don't agree with any attorneys at this point. It still has no citizen representation as far a Hearing Officers are and I'd like that as a matter of public record.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, it will be a matter of public record, Mr. Dudley. I'm sorry, I didn't see your name on this list. Mr. Baron is being held?

MRS. SIGNORE: That's right. I'd just like to make an addendum to the report. I checked with Mr. DeLuca earlier this evening, and I had talked with Mr. Marra and Mr. Fraser and they had met with the designated members of the Sterling Farms Golf Authority and it was a very productive meeting. I'm sure that the rest of the Board will hear more on it at a latter time. Thank you.

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

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John Roos & Jeremiah Livingston(1) REPORT

MR. ROOS: The Charter Revision Committee met September 9, and the 25. A quorum was present at each meeting. A sub-committee appointed by the Committee also met Saturday, October 8.

The questions to be put on the ballot are being checked and will be available for our next meeting. Also, an informational description of each question will be available for approval and publication.

A meeting is to be held tomorrow night at 7:30. Special consultant, Mr. Donald Goodrich, from Connecticut Consumers Expenditure Council will be present at tomorrow's meeting. Thank you. That concludes my report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Roos. It should be noted that all the Committees are working very hard, but the Charter Revision Committee are putting in many, many hours into this, and Mr. Roos, I'm sorry, did you mention it is going to cost us some money. We have to come in for some money with this, but it's well spent for legal advice.

MR. ROOS: The only money this legal advice is going to cost us is traveling expenses from Hartford to here, possibly, two or three trips. At the most, \$500.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to find it in our budget to transfer it somehow. Thank you, Mr. Roos.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Alfred Perillo and James Bonner

MR. PERILLO: Mr. Bonner is giving the report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sorry, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam President. The meeting was held October 5, 1983, at 8:40 p.m. here in the hall. Mr. Perillo, Mr. Bocuzzi, Mr. Burke, and myself attended which constituted a quorum.

(1) PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLEN AVENUE, RUTZ STREET, AND DeLEO DRIVE STORM SEWER AND BLACK TOPPING PROJECT - submitted by Rep. Dziezyc 9/14/83.

MR. BONNER: The result was that we were to discuss the Glen Avenue, Rutz Street storm sewer report. The Committee was disappointed due to a no-show by the Public Works. They had been invited to the meeting. A letter from the Commissioner of the Public Works was received just prior to the meeting time informing the Committee that the Commissioner would be unable to attend the meeting. No representative of the Public Works attended the meeting.

The Commissioner's letter reported briefly on the design and easements. I think you may have a copy of it. The information was not sufficient for a report. By letter, we are asking the Commissioner to submit additional information to the Committee which information will be: Anticipated schedule for the design completion, easement sign-offs, schedule for out to bid, schedule for project completion, and estimate changes, if any, and also asking him for an 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 10 or 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 14 sketch of the phases of this construction.

We had approved for this work the total amount. However, we had allotted only the amount for phase 1, and when phase 1 was completed, we would allow the money for phase 2 to be given to the Public Works. I will visit with Mr. Spaulding to find out really, where they stand before the meeting. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BOCCUZZI: As a member of the Public Works Committee, I feel that the Commissioner should have let us know a lot sooner that he wasn't going to be able to attend this meeting. That request was sent out September 28th from our office. I'm sure it doesn't take longer to get from City Hall to 72 Noble Street than City Hall to the 4th Floor. The Commissioner has taken it upon himself not to answer or tell us that he wasn't going to be here. The letter he sent to us was October 4th which was not received at our office, if I'm reading it right, was October 5th, ten minutes past 12; which was the day of our meeting. I really think the Commissioner is playing games with us on this particular item. If you remember way back when, when we split that appropriation up, he practically said, "I'm not going to do it until I get the rest of the money," and you know, he's keeping his word even though this Board has stated that we wanted him to do Glen Avenue, Rutz Street project first and then we'll free-up the rest of the money.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing) Consequently, he's figured out a lot of ways not to do the project because when we had him in our Public Works Committee, we were told that we were ready to go; no problem, just give us the money. We can go ahead with the project. We're going to transfer \$360,000, then they can only transfer \$160,000. We went through that whole bit way in the beginning.

I really think the Public Works Commissioner is playing games with this Board as far as that one particular item is concerned. He just reminds me of a kid who owns the football. If he doesn't play quarterback, he takes his football and goes home. That's what he's doing, and I resent the fact that I have to come here and sit and wait with the other members of the Public Works Committee and then pick up an envelope to find out that that day he tells us that he's not going to appear. He had plenty of time to notify us.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sure Mr. Bocuzzi, that the whole Board shares your sentiments. We are the Legislative Body and we should be due that respect. It's unfortunate that this happened. Mr. Bonner will be meeting with him and I think Mr. Bonner should direct him that we appropriated those funds and we expected it to be carried out in this Administration or at least begun, and we do expect it. We are speaking about the Commissioner of Public Works. Mr. Dziezyc, did you have something further to say.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, thank you. I'm disappointed also. I get so many calls from my constituents asking me, "When are they going to start that blasted thing?" Commissioner Spaulding always pulls this deal. He never comes to these meetings. I don't know why; what happened, but I'm very discouraged. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Don't be discouraged Mr. Dziezyc and Mr. Stork, Mr. Bonner is going to meet with him and we hope by our next meeting, we'll have something reported. Thank you, Mr. Bonner. Would you express our sentiments to Commissioner Spaulding.

MR. BONNER: Yes, and I will have a report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: And I will contact him also, personally. Mrs. Hawe has left the meeting and we now have 28 members present. Does that conclude your report, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BONNER: Yes, thank you.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - Co-Chairmen David Blum and Lathon Wider(1) REPORT

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Public Housing and Community Development didn't have a Committee but they did meet. The Co-Chairman met with the Personnel Committee on item 3 on their Agenda on the 5th of October. Thank you, Madam Chairman. That ends my report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

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

- (1) THE MATTER OF PUBLIC TELEPHONES IN THE DOWNTOWN-URC AREA - submitted by Rep. James Dudley. Report made 9/14/83 by Rep. Dudley.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Co-Chairpersons are Mr. Roos and Ms. Summerville but Mr. Dudley is doing the research.

MR. DUDLEY: Just very briefly. The reason this was left on the Agenda, as I reported last month, the project was 99% complete. However, as I anticipated the main area where we were talking about installing telephones being the result of constituent and citizen complaints, has still not been installed. It was suppose to be installed last week. I will keep this in Committee. I spoke to the Telephone Company today as a matter of fact, who assured me it would be put in next week. This is the reason. I hate to leave it on the Agenda but I will not take it off the Agenda until such time as this phone is installed. They've gone through the whole project and this is the first item we requested, and it still has not been completed and I will not take it off the Agenda until such time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley for your persistence.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If I have that time, I would like to commend Mr. Dudley for his action. It's certainly nice to see people in those telephones down the street and they do have them down there. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, we all share your sentiments, Mr. Wider.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday, October 5, at 8:00 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Members of the Committee in attendance were Reps. Dziezyc, Gaipa, Jachimczyk and myself. Excused from the meeting were Reps. Dudley and Gershman. Other members of our Board present were Reps. Blum, Tarzia, Wider, and Alfred Perillo.

At this time, Madam President, I'd like to place item #3 and item #5 on the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #5 is off and item #3 is off.

- (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 Ingrid Center. Held in Committee 6/6, 8/15 and 9/14/83.

MR. STORK: Public Works Commissioner Spaulding originally submitted this item which would have placed the safety and training officer solely within the Public Works Department with availability to other departments in an advisory capacity. Subsequently, Bill Hennessey from the Corporation Counsel's office prepared the Law Department's version which places the Safety and Training Officer within the Finance Department, and reporting to the Finance Commissioner or his designee.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: (continuing) This issue before the Personnel Committee was to decide which proposed ordinance should be brought before this Board for publication. It was clearly preferable to our Committee to unanimously approve the Law Department's version in order to make the Safety and Training officer equally available to all of our City departments. The Personnel Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed to approve the Law Department's version and upon concurrence by my colleagues tonight, the Personnel Committee will hold a public hearing on a date to be announced, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Is there a second to that motion to approve for publication? Seconded. The ordinance that he's referring to is dated 8/11/83, and that is the one that we are approving for publication tonight.

MR. BLUM: I concur with the Committee. I was present in regards to this new ordinance that was drafted by Corporation Counsel Hennessey. The only thing about this I do not agree upon is the term of the Training Officer. In other words, I think he's a contractual worker for two years, and I do not go along with that for the simple reason that a Safety and Training officer should have some guarantees that because somebody doesn't like him as to his performance, he should have the rights as a Safety Officer to be able to control or bring about safety rules and be able to give advice to members of the department. He should be equal, in a sense, to Commissioner Spaulding. He should be able to go to Mr. Spaulding and say to him that he is doing something improper at the incinerator where he had these problems or how he treats workers when they go out to clean up Toilsome Brook, and having a two year span in which, if this man is not well liked by department heads, he can be removed. I feel that this doesn't give him any guarantees of how long he's going to be in this job.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, I would suggest that you go to the public hearing. This is only for publication and all comments should be directed to that public hearing. A motion has been made and seconded to approve for publication the ordinance to create a position of a Safety and Training Officer. Please use your machine. Just a majority of votes for publication. Use your machine, please. We are voting on the ordinance to create a Safety and Training Officer. The ordinance as written by the Corporation Counsel.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is 2 a.m. I know we all have to work tomorrow. Let's proceed as quickly as possible. The motion has PASSED 19 affirmative, 1 negative, 5 abstaining, and 3 not-voting.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE "SEC. 16-14 ANNUITY PENSION PLAN" -
submitted by Rep. Philip Stork 6/6/83. Held in Committee through 9/14/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. STORK: We were forced to hold this item once again, by a vote of 4 in favor and none opposed due to the Law Department's failure to provide this Committee with a long awaited legal opinion, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think it should be noted here that the delinquency is not on this Board, but is on the Law Department because apparently, they are overwhelmed with the work; regardless of what the reason, but that is what's holding up this legislation.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (3) REQUEST FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF SALARY INCREASES, CATCH-UP ADJUSTMENTS, COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS for Stamford Community Development Program and Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program employees - Mayor's letter 6/14/83; Sim Bernstein and Nancy Mitchell's joint letter 11/12/82. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

Above also referred to LABOR LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: These staff members are non-civil service employees who are federally funded and must disperse their monies during the fiscal year of July 1 ending on June 30. These employees are consistently paid less than similarly classified employees and must await the settlement of MEA and MAA contracts before submitting a request for their salary increases. Unlike the MEA and MAA, however, the raises approved by this Board for the SCDP employees are not retroactive and do not enjoy benefits such as pensions, extended sick leave, longevity pay, overtime, etc.

Before us tonight is a 4% catch-up adjustment for fiscal year '82 and 3, and a 5% increase as an estimate as what is needed to fund fiscal year '83 and 4. The Personnel Committee approved these increases by a vote of 4 in favor, none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for the approval of salary increases. Would you have a figure on this, Mr. Stork? We should be voting on a figure here. No figure. While we are waiting, Labor Liaison Committee, do you have a report on this? They did not meet.

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. The amount of money that's available was in their budget. So, there is no additional funds required.

MR. DeLUCA: \$51,000.00

PRESIDENT SANTY: 51 and this is just a transfer in their account? Is this coming to us under Ordinance 510? This is coming to us as a transfer, then; in their own budget account. No? Mr. Stork, can you elaborate on this, please.

MR. STORK: It is through 510.

PRESIDENT SANTY: If it's through 510, then it's a transfer. You do have a figure?

MR. STORK: Well, it's just under \$51,000 and it's outlined in a communication from the Mayor of June 14, 1983. There's quite a few attachments but there is a page that details the breakdown totally \$50,986.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. DeLUCA: I listened to one of the comments that Mr. Stork mentioned that the salaries these people get are nowheres near with some of the non-union people get or some of our MEA managers. I have to disagree to a certain extent. The Director of Stamford Community Development presently receives \$44,363. The proposed budetary salary is \$49,686. This, in essence, is higher than what our Corporation Counsel gets; higher than what our Finance Commissioner get; it's higher than what the Mayor gets; it's higher, I can go on and on, and yet, Mr. Stork leads us to believe that their salaries are nowheres comparable to what our other City officials are getting. The Assistant Director, present salary \$39,000; proposed salary \$43,000. The Director of Neighborhood Preservation Program, present salary \$36,985; proposed salary \$40,423.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) If you look at the Mayor's letter of June 14, he misleads us by stating that the 1982/1983 proposed increase is 7% while the MEA received 8%. I once again call your attention to the fact that we did not give the MEA 8%; it was the binding arbitrator up in Hartford that gave this figure.

I have a worksheet before me that was sent to me, where the proposed percentage increases really range from 8.7% to 12% for 1982/83. '83/84, the proposed salary increases range from a low of 9% to a high of 12.9%. Once again, it's also interesting to note, I'm sure many people that are still here this evening, recall some of the merit increases we approved years ago where it always seemed the director got the 12% and the peon got the 6%. It's no difference with the SCDP that we're looking at over here. The Director, the Assistant Director is getting the 12%. The SNPP Director is getting 12% where as the poor little executive secretary is getting the 8.7%. I would urge that we reject our approval of this recommendation on the grounds that the salaries are in excess of what our top officials are getting plus the percentages are much higher than what the union people have been getting, and to approve something like this here in view of the fact that we just rejected an increase for the Mayor; we rejected an increase for the Town and City Clerk and I would venture to say, I would bet you dollars to donuts that when the Finance Commissioner, the Public Works Commissioner and the Corporation Counsel's increases come before us, that they would be rejected also.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. This is under Ordinance 510. A transfer of funds requires 21 votes.

MR. BLUM: I speak to you this evening in regard to Ordinance No. 510 Supplemental, and I'd like to read to you the first part of the ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, I really don't think you have to. We all have it in our possession.

MR. BLUM: Well, if you do, I'd just would like to tell you that this Board approved on April 4, 1983, by a vote of 27 yes, 6 no, and 1 abstention a resolution for the sum of \$1,263,000.00. This was the budget for the Community Development Fund. There is no transfer. There is no additional appropriation. Within the budget is a 5% cost-of-living adjustment for each employee and, therefore, I feel Ordinance 510 Supplemental does not come under this for the simple reason that wages paid for any position of employment with the City shall not be increased except the funds appropriated or properly transferred. There is no transfer of funds. This Board approved their budget and within their budget is \$200,000.00 for their administration and payment of the salaries for these employees. Within that \$200,000.00 is the 5% cost-of-living adjustment.

Now, Mr. Sim Bernstein was also present at the Personnel Committee meeting, and he says comparable to MAA and MEA salaries, there is no difference. In fact, right now, MEA employees and MAA employees are making more on the schedule that is before the Personnel Committee or Commission. The only thing the 5% is a sort of a catch-up or an adjustment to those various rates and that is all we're talking about. That's why, I don't think in a sense, it is legal for us to have this before us because I don't see where we're going to have an additional appropriation or a transfer of money. This is a grant program and within the grant program, the 5% cost-of-living budget is in there.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum. Before we go any further and I had to stop the tape, we don't have a quorum on this Floor, and we better get a quorum out here fast because we can't transact any business.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Mrs. Goldstein is leaving. We're going to have 27 members present. Ms. Rinaldi is leaving. We're down to 26 people present. Mr. Stork is going to speak next but I would direct your attention, Mr. Blum, to a September 21st letter from the Mayor, directing this as a transfer under Ordinance 510 as legal and proper. Mr. Stork, do you have any comments on this?

ak

HM

MR. STORK: Yes, thank you. As I have stated on the floor of this Board before, and I am not ashamed to state it again, I can be persuaded to change my mind. I have reviewed the documentation that Rep. DeLuca has brought with him here tonight, and I must say, the Mayor's letter in which our Committee placed a lot of faith in, seems to be totally inaccurate, and I am changing my vote to NO, and I suggest that's what we do.

MRS. SAXE: No, I pass.

MR. BOCCUZZI: First of all, I think that the percentage rate as shown by Mr. DeLuca is too much from \$44,449, etc., but what I am interested in is how much of the Grant is actually in salaries and administration. Do you have that figure at all?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does Mr. Stork have that figure? We are now discussing the catch-up adjustments, the cost-of-living for the Stamford Community Development and the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program, item #3 under Personnel.

MR. BOCCUZZI: According to the breakdown here, for a grant of a little bit more than a million dollars, \$1.2, it is going to cost us \$503,645 to administer the Grant. It seems to be that every time we get grants and every time we get anything from the government, we lose 50% of it, or more, in administrative costs, and that the actual money that is supposed to go out from the City to do some good, gets less and less, whether it is 5%, 9%, 8%, or 12%, I think it is getting to be just too expensive to administer this Grant. I think more of the money should be going to the general public. I can see no problem with anybody getting from \$37,000 to \$45,000 a year and they can't make a go of it, there are a lot of people in this town who don't make anywhere near that, and are not getting a raise, whether it be 5% or 7%.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the Question. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the Question, please say Aye. Opposed? The Question has been Moved. Now, the main motion is on the review and approval of salary increases, catch-up adjustments, cost-of-living for the Stamford Community Development Program and the Stamford Neighborhood Neighborhood Program.

MR. BLUM: Inasmuch as I can see that the cost of certain high salaries that we are talking about, the top echelon, can we divide this.....(a chorus of No from the floor)...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, your remarks are not in order at this time. The Motion has been made to Move the Question and it has Carried. We are voting on the review and approval of the salary increases item #3 under Personnel now, 21 votes are required. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The Motion has LOST: 2 Affirmative, 20 Negative, 2 Abstentions, and 2 Non-Votes.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued):

- (4) REQUEST FROM REP. ROBERT "GABE" DeLUCA 9/15/83, pursuant to Ord. 510, to consider contract of THOMAS BARRETT, LABOR NEGOTIATOR, and the City of Stamford, which is expiring by the end of this year.

MR. STORK: Item #4 is being Held by a vote of 4 in favor to do so, and none opposed.

- (5) PURSUANT TO ORD. #510, REQUESTS FROM POLICE AND FIRE COMMISSIONS and MAYOR CLAPES 9/20/83, TO GRANT APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING SALARY INCREASES RETROACTIVE TO JULY 1, 1983:

Police Chief.	\$50,000/annum, 7/1/83
Fire Chief.	50,000/annum, 7/1/83
Deputy Police Chiefs (2 positions).	45,000/annum, 7/1/83
Asst. Fire Chief (apptmt. effective 8/29) . .	44,000/annum, 7/1/83

Letter 8/26/83 from Police Commission indicates no new monies are required to fund these raises, as current salary account is sufficient.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. STORK: Item #5 for salary increases for police and fire personnel, in the case of the Police personnel, they have not had a raise since July 1, 1982; and likewise, the Fire Department personnel have not had a raise since Sept., 1981.

The raises asked for on our agenda tonight, \$50,000 for the Police and Fire Chiefs, \$45,000 for each of two Deputy Police Chiefs, and \$44,000 for the Assistant Fire Chief, are comparable to the increases received by their subordinate employees in recent contract awards.

The Personnel Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed to grant approval of these salary increases, and I so Move. Several Seconds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Discussion? Secondary Committee, Health and Protection? All in favor of waiving secondary committee report, say Aye? Opposed? Carried.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, Madam President, thank you. I would like to speak against these salary increases. First of all, I think that they are entirely too high and we have made, or taken previous action this evening against salaries that in some cases that were lower than these, and I think that we should act accordingly on these. Now, particularly, what upsets me is we are all aware of the problems that our community is facing with police and police response time. I think that the fact that the police on an average, answer calls from 20 to 30 minutes is a totally unacceptable response time for any city.

The fact that this letter from Commissioner Cosentini indicates that no new monies are required to fund these raises, the monies are available in the current salary account, appalls me. When I attend police neighborhood meetings and the police officers say "We don't have men to go out on the street. We can't get them. The Boards don't give us the money." Well, in fact, that's not so.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing): The Boards did give the Police Department money. They gave them enough money to add 20 new men to their department. To date, they have added only five. The money that I assume they will not be needing to fund these raises is the money that they were given to hire 20 additional policemen, and I will not support these salaries in good conscience when we need ... (end of tape, some dialogue lost here.)

MR. ZELINSKI: (some of his dialogue lost at start of new tape)...what would be against this request for the following reasons. One, I believe that the Chief Executive Officer of the City, in this case, should be the highest paid official, and I cannot see where if these are approved, that the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief will be making more than our Mayor.

Secondly, I'd like to remind my colleagues, too, that with the exception of the Assistant Fire Chief, which I am not familiar with, if he does get this, but I know for a fact that the Police Chief, the Fire Chief, and the two Deputy Police Chiefs also have access to a City car, which they take home.

So in addition to the salary, they also have free use of a City vehicle. And again, as Rep. McInerney aptly put, earlier this evening we turned down requests because of them being out-of-line, and again I think these two are out-of-line and I would hope my colleagues vote against this. Thank you.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I am going to speak in favor of it. I think that the time has come when we have to look at these men as being professionals, and I do not think these salaries are out of line for administrators at this level. Mrs. McInerney has spoken about slow police response, and certainly I am certain she is speaking of the same meeting that was in our district.

May I have attention, please? I'm tired, too. But I think that the time has perhaps come when we should fund our entire police force at a higher level. I think that we must actively and aggressively go out and recruit more men. The reason they have only hired five new people was because of screening processes, and probably they did not get the right people to apply the salary level that they are offering. So I would suggest that we support higher salaries for our policemen and our firemen at any level. This is our protection. We say we want protection, and they are not going to do it for nothing. Let's do it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would remind everyone we are down to 25 people. I need a Quorum on this floor. I would ask the people in the caucus to please come out. There are no further speakers. We are going to proceed right to a machine vote. This request comes under our Ord. 510; it requires a majority but not less than 21 votes. We must have 21 to approve this transfer. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? I would ask the members when they are ready to leave, to please clean up their desks. We don't have a cleaning service and it is awkward for the staff to have to come out and clean up what we leave here. The Motion is DEFEATED: 13 Affirmative, 10 Negative, Zero Abstaining, and 2 Not-Voting. That has been defeated. Mr. Stork.

(Note: See Voting Tally #37, Pg. #104 these Minutes, re Pres. Santy's letter dated 10/14/83 stating this item APPROVED as simple majority only necessary for passage.

MR. STORK: Thank you, and that concludes the Personnel Committee Report.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

- (1) REQUEST FOR AN INQUIRY INTO HOW THE TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT PLANS TO COPE WITH THE BURGEONING GROWTH OF THIS CITY REGARDING PARKING AND TRAFFIC FLOW - submitted by Reps. Gershman and Wiederlight 9/19/83.

MS. DeGAETANI: Thank you. Education, Welfare and Government Committee met on Wednesday, October 5, 1983, at 7:00 P.M. in this room. Present were Betty Gershman, Tom Burke, myself. We were later joined by Lathon Wider. Jim Ford and John Thompson from the Traffic Dept. were with us. Mr. Ford spent a great deal of time with us. We did not complete the meeting until about 8:15, explaining what he felt the problems were, and the fact that he felt that the major solution to the traffic problems was the signalization system that has been in the works for some time now. He did also mention that there are things in the works in regard to some road-widening, some more left-turn lanes, and some bridge-widenings. The bridge-widenings possibly to be done with State money; and that they are also working on a proposal to request developers to contribute to infrastructure capital costs in the future, which is currently being done in New York State. He also mentioned that they have started on a 10 to 20-year project, which has been submitted to the Planning Board. And so that took care of item #1.

And Item #2 is being Held. Mrs. McInerney was out-of-town and unable to attend our meeting that evening.

- (2) REQUEST FOR A MEETING WITH THE CHIEF OF POLICE AND THE POLICE COMMISSION TO DISCUSS METHODS OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL POLICE PROTECTION (HIRING POSITIONS WHICH HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN FUNDED BY CITY BOARDS) AND IN NEED OF FASTER RESPONSE TIME TO THE COMMUNITY AND OTHER RELATED ITEMS - submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney 9/21/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE 10/11/83.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

- (1) REP. MICHAEL WIEDERLIGHT'S REQUEST of Sept. 19, 1983 - "Does Stamford High School meet all of the State and City Fire and Building Codes?"

MR. DZIEZYC: Health and Protection Committee met on Oct. 5, 1983 with the following present: Barbara DeGaetani, Joseph Tarzia, Mike Wiederlight, Co-Chairman, and myself. On Item #1, the Committee was satisfied that Stamford High School will meet all of the State/City and Fire Building Codes when the \$72,500 approval that we made tonight will go out for bids, and this will bring up to the latest Codes. They will be completed by next spring and we are satisfied and can remove this from the Agenda.

- (2) 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 5/3/82 through 7/11/83. Approved for Publication 8/12/82. Held 8/15 and 9/14/83.

MR. DZIEZYC: This is HELD because we never received any revised ordinance on microwave transmission.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) 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, 8/15, and 9/14/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. DZIEZYC: That is the end of my report, with Items 2 and 3 being Held in Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Special Committees. I know that Mr. Rybnick has left. He is still attempting to get our refrigerator installed in the wall, but he is having a difficult time with Mr. Canavan.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE - No Report.COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORD. 480 CONCERNING COLISEUM AUTHORITY - to extend its life by 15 years to 1998, per request from Mayor Louis A. Clapes and Finance Commissioner Marra 9/19/83.

MRS. GERSHMANN: The Coliseum Authority Liaison Committee met on October 7th in the Republican Caucus Room. Betty Conti and I were in attendance. There was not a quorum present and therefore, we did not transact any business, but I would like to bring Item #1 out on the floor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion made to bring item, to approve for publication the amendment concerning the Coliseum Authority. This is just for publication. Motion has been made and Seconded. No discussion? Mrs. Gershman, there is no discussion. Would you like to comment?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Yes, I would like to discuss it, briefly. This is not to re-do the whole Coliseum Authority; this is just an amendment to Part 1(e), I believe, if I look quickly; and it extends the life of the Coliseum Authority from 2 years to 15 years. Now, we have already approved the contract with the Stamford Center for the Arts, and the City, and the State, for 15 years, an allocation of the Coliseum Authority funds, for a period of 15 years.

If we do not approve this for 15 years and prolong the life of the Authority, we can be in breach of contract; and it doesn't mean that we can't go back in another month, or two months, or six months, and re-do the whole contract by putting in other things, or taking things out. It's not a very good ordinance, frankly, and it should be re-done, and we can do that, but we should pass it now. It will also free up, well, I am not going to go into the whole thing now. It would be very helpful to the Center to get it moving, if we did it tonight.

COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are just voting on publication. We just need a majority vote. All in favor of this amendment, please say Aye, in favor of publication of this amendment. Opposed? We had better use the machine. Please vote from your correct seat. We are voting on the publication of the amendment.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Oh, please, put it for publication. Please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just for publication, you need a majority.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Gershman, are you going to have a public hearing on this?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Yes, I will have a public hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, thank you. This is just for publication. Just a majority is necessary for publication. It passed: 13 Affirmative, 8 Negative, 2 Abstaining, and 2 Not Voting. Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. I will hold the other item in committee.

(2) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF COLISEUM AUTHORITY BUDGET FOR F/Y 1983-1984 per telephone request 9/19/83 from Commissioner Marra; details to follow.

MR. DeLUCA: In view of the fact that Rep. Gershman is going to hold this item in committee, I would recommend that she request from Pat Marra, a budget complete breakdown of the budget; to submit to us, for approval, of a \$600,000 without an itemized breakdown is an insult to our intelligence. I would like to see the complete breakdown: salaries, utilities, you-name-it, it should be there.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca, I will see that we get it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. Next Committee is Labor Contracts Liaison Committee.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

(1) REPORT. No report.

PETITIONS - None.

RESOLUTIONS

(1) Change date of November meeting from first Monday to second Monday, November 14, 1983. Steering Tuesday, Nov. 1, 1983 (Monday is Hallowe'en).

RESOLUTIONS (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I entertain a Motion to change the date of the November meeting from the first Monday to the second Monday, November 14, 1983? So Moved? Thank you. Seconded.

MR. STORK: I'd like to amend this Resolution from Monday, Nov. 14th, to Wednesday, Nov. 16th, and if I get a Second, I'd like to explain it. Seconded.

Simply put, we'll have Steering on Nov. 1st, and then all those who are campaigning for re-election are going to be out campaigning. Who is going to go to a committee meeting? There are not going to be Quorums. Meetings aren't going to be attended; and then we come up to Tuesday, Nov. 8th, and then we will only have a couple of days after that to hold meetings. Again, you are not going to have Quorums. You are not going to have enough people at each meeting. So I think this Board would appreciate having at least two extra nights, Monday and Tuesday of the following week, to get our work done, and then we can meet on Wednesday night and have our regular meeting.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork has made an amendment to the Motion to change our November meeting date from Nov. 14th to Nov. 16th. It has been Seconded. We are going to vote on that amendment.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, if I can, Madam President, to Rep. Stork, I think his idea is well-taken, however, I would ask if he would re-consider and instead of the Wednesday, make it the following Monday inasmuch as we are used to meeting on Mondays and possibly other Representatives may have other commitments other than what they scheduled for on Mondays.

MR. STORK: No, Madam President, I would like to have my amendment stand as is.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think the time of the month would be down to the 21st at that point, Mr. Zelinski. The Motion on the floor is to approve our November meeting for Nov. 16th. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The Motion PASSED: 20 affirmative, One negative, Zero Abstaining, and 4 Non-Voting.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'd like to make a Motion to Adjourn.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before we Adjourn, can't we just accept the Minutes? We've got to accept some of these Minutes. May I have a Motion to accept...Mrs. McInerney, will you withdraw your Motion? She is not withdrawing her Motion. The Second is withdrawn. Is there a Second to Adjourn? Yes. If you Adjourn and we don't O.K. these Minutes, we are going to have problems. The Motion has been withdrawn. The Second won't withdraw. All right the Motion is on the floor. All in favor of Adjourning, say AYE. Opposed? We are not going to Adjourn at this time.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to accept the May 10, 1983 Special Budget Minutes? So Moved by Mr. Stork.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I have a request here from Mrs. Hawe, who asked that the Minutes of the May 10th Budget Meeting be HELD.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We had 25 members present, three are leaving, so we are now down to 22. Mrs. Guroian is leaving, Mrs. Conti is leaving, and Mr. Zelinski is leaving. We still have a Quorum.

Motion has been made to Hold May 10th Minutes. Any Second?

MS. SUMMERSVILLE: No. No. What's the reason?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mrs. Hawe did not explain any reason. She just wrote a note.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Motion to Hold May 10th minutes. All in favor of holding, say AYE. Opposed? We'll have to use the machine. The Motion on the floor is to Hold May 10th minutes per Mrs. Hawe's request.

MR. BLUM: She's not even here.

MS. SUMMERSVILLE: Point of Information, Madam President. Mrs. Hawe left a note. She did not state why she wanted to Hold the Minutes, and so we do not know why. I would say if it is possible that we could take the vote with the understanding that if there is any correction, she can correct it, but I can't see holding the Minutes. She didn't stay, and it would only have made five minutes difference.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion is on the floor not to accept, to hold May 10th. If you want to Hold them, vote YES. If you want to accept them, vote NO. Has everyone voted? This Motion is to Hold them. The Motion has PASSED: 10 to Hold, and 9 to Accept....10 Affirmative, 9 Negative, 1 Abstention, and 5 Not Voting. Let's count how many people we have on the floor. Mr. Zelinski, will you make a count while you are standing there? We have 22 left, so there were 2 Non-Votes.

MAY 10, 1983 Special Budget Meeting Minutes - HELD.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to accept the July 13, 1983 Special Charter Revision Meeting Minutes? Moved. Seconded. All in favor of accepting, please say AYE. Opposed? ACCEPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

JULY 13, 1983 SPECIAL CHARTER REVISION MEETING MINUTES - ACCEPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to accept the August 29, 1983 Special Meeting Minutes. So Moved by Mr. Stork. Seconded. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AUGUST 29, 1983 SPECIAL MEETING (TO SET DATE OF SPECIAL ELECTION FOR CHARTER REV.) - ACCEPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion to accept September 14, 1983 Regular Meeting Minutes? Moved. Seconded. We have a correction to Sept. 14th.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The correction is on page 28, line 5, the paragraph after Held in Committee, there was a word omitted, it should read "lack of". Then the L&R Minutes, Roman Numeral IV, last line, second paragraph, should be "information" not "informat".

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to accept those Minutes with the corrections as stated? Moved. Seconded. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

SEPT. 14, 1983 REGULAR BOARD MEETING - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY as amended by Rep. Maihock.

MS. SUMMERTON: Before you adjourn, Madam President, due to the absence of the House Committee, I would like the record to state that we still are infested with roaches in this building (at this point five or six people began to talk at once and the dialogue could not be separated). We also had a microphone stolen from this Board and I want the record to show that, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, and please help us to clean up; and let us have a Motion to Adjourn. I don't want anyone eating in this room and am going to call Jerry in the morning to put a stop to it.

ADJOURNMENT: So Moved. Several Seconds.

There being no further business to come before the Board this evening, upon Motion duly made, Seconded, and approved unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 A.M., with the clean-up squad leaving about 10 minutes later.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank all of you who have stayed so late, and for cleaning up.

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

APPROVED:

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

JLS:AK:HM
Encs.