

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 197614th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVESStamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 14th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Monday, March 1, 1976, in the Board's meeting room on the second floor of the Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Frederick E. Miller, Jr., at 9:12 p.m., after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: The Rev. James E. Peters, Bethany Assembly, Newfield Avenue.

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

ROLL CALL: Roll Call was taken by the Clerk, Linda D. Clark. There were 39 members present and 1 absent. The absent member was Theodore J. Boccuzzi.

The PRESIDENT declared a quorum.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: A check of the voting machine was conducted and it appeared to be in good working order.

PRESIDENT MILLER: "The first Order of Business is the consideration of a letter of resignation dated February 24, 1976 and addressed to the President of the Board:

"As of Wednesday, February 26, 1976, I will no longer be a resident of the 9th district. As per the requirements of the Stamford City Charter I am submitting my letter of resignation to the 14th Board of Representatives. During my years of service on the board I found my work to be a challenging and rewarding experience.

"While I have not always been in complete agreement with my fellow representatives, I have a deep and abiding respect for their dedicated interests and opinions. I hope that in some small way I have made a positive contribution to the people of the 9th District and to the City of Stamford. If I can be of any service to the Board, or community, Please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) Theodore J. Boccuzzi"

"The CHAIR will observe that Mr. Boccuzzi was an excellent, conscientious member of this Board for several years. I think his resignation is a loss to the Board. His 9th District constituents were well-served over the years. I believe we all wish the best of luck to Ted in the future, and it would be in order now to entertain a motion to regretfully accept this resignation.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, I would like to state at this time that we accept Mr. Boccuzzi's resignation with deep regret. I have known him for over twenty years, and more recently as a Board member. During our joint tenure on this Board, I have found him to be an articulate and objective individual who made a positive contribution to the community. Not only will he be missed by his constituency, but moreover by the Democratic leadership and this Board as a whole. Mr. Boccuzzi served as a Representative from the 9th District for approximately ten years. What this really means in terms of countless hours spent at meetings can best be answered by those who have been through it. On behalf of this Board, I would like to wish him well and hope that he may once again become an active member of the Democratic Party and I MOVE that we accept his resignation. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED, and SECONDED by Mr. SIGNORE and Mr. LIVINGSTON, and SECONDED by many others. The MOTION on the floor is to regretfully accept Mr. PERILLO?"

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, Mr. President, I, too, would like to speak a few words on behalf of Mr. Boccuzzi. He is the one responsible for bringing me in as a replacement on this Board, and I would like to thank him publicly for the education I received from this experience. We have worked well together in our District and have kept most of our constituents satisfied with our representation. Although we may have differed on some issues on the floor, there were still no hard feelings between us. Mr. Boccuzzi has served on the 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th Boards of Representatives and has served them well. He has been Chairman of the Appointments Committee three times and done an excellent job on that. Mr. President, I'd like now to MOVE that this 14th Board direct you, the President of the Board, to present Mr. BOCCUZZI with a certificate of dedication for the best ten years of service he has performed in representing the Ninth District of Stamford and also the community as a whole."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, I, too, will miss the presence of Mr. Theodore Boccuzzi, for it is not until you have worked with a person for a while that you can truly evaluate him. This I have had the pleasure of doing for seven years and it was during that time that I found Ted to be a man of high calibre and intellect, and with a deep sense of honesty and reasoning. Surely we will fill his vacant seat here tonight, but there are other vacancies on this Board left by his resignation which we cannot fill in one night, or two nights, or even three nights, for it will take a lot to replace the knowledge, the warmth, the pride and dignity and the many other distinguishing qualities he possesses. I will take this opportunity to assure him that he has my blessings and best wishes in all his undertakings. Thank you."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, Mr. Dixon and Mr. Perillo said it very well. Teddy Boccuzzi will be missed on this Board. He was one good Democrat. Mr. Perillo's motion was very much in order. I wish there was a little something that I could add to it. Mr. President, my personal wishes to Mr. Boccuzzi is "God Bless You". I enjoyed serving with you."

MR. COSTELLO: "Thank you, Mr. Miller. I would also like to echo the sentiments of the previous speakers. Mr. Boccuzzi and I served together on the Appointments Committee for a number of years and I really appreciate the help he gave me. Thank you."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. CONNORS: "Teddy is a lovely young fella. Being an old one myself. (laughter and clapping) He was one member of the Board who never seemed to get any older. All the other members seemed to get older, but Teddy seemed to improve as the years went on; and being honest, he was a wonderful member and he did a wonderful job, and I'll tell you one thing, whoever takes his job on the Appointments Committee, he's got a tough nut to crack, because Teddy really did a wonderful job on that Committee. He came up with wonderful reports. He was very substantial, right down the line. If I go any further, you'll think I'm a schoolteacher, So I'm gonna shut up." (laughter)

MR. FLANAGAN: "I don't want just the Democrats to say nice things about Ted Boccuzzi! This is one Republican who said he was a gentleman, he always conducted himself as a gentleman on this Board, and he will be missed. Thank you."

MR. SIGNORE: "I would like to echo what the members of the Board said about Mr. Boccuzzi. I have known him for a number of years and I found him to be serious, high-minded, fine gentleman. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "We will proceed to a vote, then. The question is on regretfully accepting the resignation of Theodore Boccuzzi with the proviso that we so indicate by sending him a certificate of appreciation. All those in favor say AYE. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

"We will now proceed to a replacement. Nominations are in order to fill the vacancy in the Ninth District."

MR. ALFRED PERILLO: "Yes, thank you, Mr. President. If I may, on each member's desk there is a resume of my choice of candidate to fill the seat for the Ninth District. For the benefit of the new members who have joined, and the old as well, let me just elaborate on some of the issues of my choice of candidate. Being the mother of four children, I am sure that you know that her children did attend the local schools. When the children attended Hart School, my candidate was very active in the PTA. taking on the assignment of selling 10¢ stamps to fill a book of \$18.75 to buy \$25.00 War Bonds. All in all, she sold thousands of dollars worth of stamps. Later in life when one child attended Westhill High School, she was very interested in the Ad Hoc Association. This association was founded to solve some problems at Westhill High which still do exist today, but they were recognized and identified then.

"Coming to the West Side of Stamford a few years ago, we had problems of robberies, muggings, hold-ups, and what-not. Again, the West Side Business Association was formed and she was nominated to the position of Secretary of the Association. She was very active in this post and did a terrific job. During Mayor Lenz's administration, she was appointed as official Liaison to the Mayor for any and all problems existing in the City of Stamford. Being a member of the Women's Democratic Club, during the campaign of Governor Ella Grasso, again my wife took on the ticket chairmanship for the dinner in her honor and for those who were there, I'm sure you will remember it was an outstanding success.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. ALFRED PERILLO (continuing): "Serving her first term on the City Committee, it again being election time, she applied for the petition, paid the fee, and got the necessary signatures in the competition to run for the seat. No one, and I stress no one took the time and effort to take out a petition to run a primary to challenge her for the 9th District Seat on the Democratic City Committee.

"For five years she has attended almost all Board of Representative meetings; she has even sat here in this room until 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning on budget nights. Being concerned and interested in government and its operations are the reasons for her involvement. Also participation of sub-committees within the City, she holds an outstanding attendance record in attending meetings at the Hubbard Heights Golf Course, at the Parks Department, at the Board of Recreation, and even at the Sterling Farms Golf Authority meetings. I know of other Board members who were assigned to these same committees and they don't hold the attendance record that she does. I have given my choice of candidate very serious thought, and I mean serious thought; being the husband of the candidate was my very first thought and on the other hand, she has participated in all phases of government, police, education, committees of various kinds, budgets, appeals - all these facts add up to experience in city government.

"Again, being the husband of my choice of candidate does not, in fact, have any control of her position on issues. If you can prove to me that any two married people agree on every and all things that confront them, then I must be married to the wrong person for 25 years! (Laughter) Right? Have I got grounds? I could go on and on, Mr. President, but to cut it off at this point, let me tell you that for the good of the City, and great representation of the 9th District, and for honest government, I place the name of Mrs. Millie Perillo in nomination to fill the seat. Thank you. I might also say one more thing, Mr. President, many constituents in my district are most favorable of us serving together for them."

MR. MILLER: "The name of MILDRED PERILLO has been placed in nomination for the Office of Representative from the 9th District. Are there any other nominations?"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. In respect to Mr. and Mrs. Perillo, I would ask for a five-minute recess."

MR. MILLER: "I believe that would be agreeable to the Leadership. Is that agreeable to the Leadership on both sides? All right, we'll take a five-minute recess."

RECESS was called at 9:30 P.M. RECESS ended at 10:10 P.M.

MR. MILLER: "Will the members please take their seats; will the members please take their seats. The meeting will COME TO ORDER! It is ten minutes past ten and we haven't started on the Agenda yet. Before we proceed with the matter at hand, I wish to recognize MRS. SANTY for a MOTION which has nothing to do with the election.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MRS. SANTY: "Mr. President, I would like to make a MOTION to put up the official "NO SMOKING" sign. (Boos) (Motion is seconded by several members.)

MR. MILLER: "The CHAIR will observe that we have been through this question before, and it is always my position that I will not put up the "NO SMOKING" signs unless the majority of the Board orders me to do so. So, Mrs. Santy has made a motion. Is there a Second to Mrs. Santy's motion? MOTION SECONDED. Mr. Morgan, you have something to say? You SECOND it? SECONDED by many. All those in favor say. . . We have a MOTION for a ROLL CALL VOTE. All those members desiring a Roll Call, raise their hands. The CHAIR sees a sufficient number. The question is whether or not to put up the "NO SMOKING" sign; and in the event that we do put up the sign, that means that nobody in the room can legally smoke. The CLERK will call the roll. The YES vote is to stop the smoking; the NO vote is for smoking."

MR. CONNORS: "For the people that do smoke, you'll end up, you won't even have a quorum half the time; they'll be taking a walk out in the hallway. This is a big joke!"

MR. MILLER: "All right, we'll proceed to a vote. The CLERK will Call the Roll."

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR:

(Yes, to stop smoking)

CLARK, Linda	(D-6)
COSENTINI, Audrey	(R-13)
DeROSE, Joseph	(D-15)
FLANAGAN, William	(R-19)
FOX, John Wayne	(D-15)
GLUCKSMAN, L. Morris	(D-11)
HOFFMAN, Leonard	(R-11)
LOOMIS, Ralph	(R-19)
McINERNEY, Barbara	(R-20)
MORGAN, Michael	(D-12)
RITCHIE, Mildred	(R-10)
ROSE, Matthew	(D-3)
SANDOR, John	(D-4)
SANTY, Jeanna-Lois	(R-18)
SHERER, Donald	(R-10)
SIGNORE, S. A.	(R-18)
WIESLEY, Vere	(R-13)

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION:

(No, to continue smoking)

BAXTER, George	(D-3)
BLUM, David	(D-12)
BLOIS, Julius	(D-14)
CARLUCCI, Leo	(D-5)
CONNORS, George	(D-8)
COSTELLO, Robert	(D-6)
D'AGOSTINO, Thomas	(D-17)
DIXON, Handy	(D-2)
GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	(D-16)
HAVE, Marie	(R-1)
HAYS, George	(R-20)
LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	(D-5)
LOBOZZA, James	(R-17)
LOWDEN, Lynn	(D-1)
MILLER, Frederick E.	(D-3)
NIZOLEK, Christine	(D-2)
OSUCH, Adam	(R-14)
PERILLO, Alfred	(D-9)
RAVALLESE, George	(D-8)
RAYMOND, Jean	(R-16)
RYBNICK, Gerald	(D-4)
WALSH, Peter	(D-7)

MR. MILLER: "The MOTION is LOST, with 17 YES votes and 22 NO votes.

"We will now continue with the election; at the time of the recess, the name of MILDRED PERILLO had been placed in nomination for the Office of Representative from the 9th District. Are there any other nominations?"

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. I enjoy having the opportunity of placing the name of MR. ROBERT E. ROSS, JR. of 24 Myano Court, Stamford, in nomination. Mr. Ross' place of birth is Gary, Indiana. He is a married man, he has three children. He is a veteran of WWII, the 969th Field Artillery, his battalion was the Third Army; he was also a member of the U.S. Army Olympic Boxing Team. His education: he graduated from Roosevelt High School, Gary, Ind. He also has a degree from Pittsburgh Junior College, Pittsburgh, Pa. He is employed at Pitney-Bowes. His membership in professional organizations: he is on the Board of Directors of the Committee on Training and Employment (CTE); he is also a former president of the semi-pro Stamford Royal Giants Basketball Team; and he is also vice-president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), and he is a member of Wilson Memorial Church of God and Christ.

"Mr. President, for me to say more about my nominee would probably prolong things and perhaps rightfully so. Knowing Mr. Ross is a hard worker; he has run for the Board of Representatives; he was defeated by Democrats, but by good Democrats, and he himself is a good Democrat.

"Mr. President, as a member of this Board, I've always felt that when a member of this Board resigns, the co-holder of that seat should have the privilege and the opportunity to nominate that withdrawal's successor. But, however, in this case, and especially because it is a Democrat, even during the times that the Republicans have withdrawn, I, myself, have always felt that the Representative should have the right to name his co-worker.

"Mr. President, this Board, this Board, we are the legislators of the City of Stamford, this Board cannot allow itself (end of Tape #1) to, in the interest of the people, this Board, in no way can allow itself to become a family affair. Mr. President, respectfully, I say, if there were no other nominees, under no condition would I vote or support two people from the same household to represent a district. I would also like to add that Mr. Perillo, Mr. Boccuzzi, they were representation from that district. I do not believe that respectable representation for a district can come from the same household. Thank you, Mr. President,"

MR. MILLER: "The name of ROBERT E. ROSS, JR. has been placed in nomination for the Office of Representative from the 9th District. Are there any other nominations?"

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, is it in order at this point for me to SECOND the nomination of Mr. Ross?"

MR. MILLER: "It is not necessary to second the nomination, but you may if you wish, Mr. Dixon.

MR. DIXON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Then I would like to SECOND the nomination of Mr. Ross, but in doing so, I would like to make some remarks setting forth my reasons and convictions. I do this, Mr. President, with all due respect to Mr. Perillo and to the one whose name he has placed in nomination, but it is my desire to make note of the fact that I have strong beliefs in honesty and in straightforwardness. It is because of this that I have made enemies and no doubt that list will increase this night.

MR. DIXON (continuing): "Under all the recommendations and circumstances, Mr. President, I would not get involved in a matter of this nature which is completely outside the geographical area of my own district, but I know, and I believe that everyone else sitting here is aware that this is no ordinary matter. To the best of my knowledge, the proposed husband-and-wife combination to give representation to a district, as a Representative of this Board, sets a new precedent and that kind of situation introduces aspects of corruption in government and can lead to the destruction of our already weak system, and furthermore bring destruction to the integrity of this Board.

"Furthermore, Mr. President, I have in my possession a map outlining the district in question. The 9th District extends westerly from 1 River Street and borders along West Broad Street and Stillwater Avenue to West Avenue. From that point it borders on West Main Street and Palmers Hill Road, all the way to the Greenwich line. The district has 1,400 registered voters, but what is more important is the district has almost 4,000 people of varying ethnic backgrounds.

"Furthermore, Mr. President, the people of the 9th District are entitled to all of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which, as it relates to this matter, is clean, decent, and honest representation. This I don't believe can ever happen in a single household where one point of view will be projected and imposed on almost 3,000 people.

"The twenty districts are designed to give equal representation throughout the City, 2 men, 2 votes. That's the way it is, and that's the way it should be. This Board is made up of lawyers, teachers, bankers, and many kinds of master minds, and even a common working man such as I, but believe me, I consider myself to be the very least of those, but if I, with all my ignorance and stupidity, can see a wrong about to be committed here, then what about you, Mister? Are you blind, or don't you care?

"I SECOND the nomination of MR. ROSS, first because he knows the community, he knows the District, and he moves among the people of that District. He is a citizen of that District and of the City of Stamford; and then, I SECOND his nomination because he is an upright, straightforward man of integrity, and he is highly qualified to represent the people, all the people that is, of this District. Thank you."

MR. BLUM: "I came here this evening to place in nomination another constituent of Mr. Perillo's who I feel has merit and I feel that she can represent the people in the 9th District. I myself can't go along with the idea that representation can only be in one household. I think we are now in a Bicentennial Year where one of our forefathers who fought for Liberty and Justice for all, fought for representation for all. Can we really feel that there would be representation for all households? I would like to place in nomination, CAMILLE BEVIVINO MOLLO, who resides at 90 Connecticut Avenue; born January 4, 1939; married 17 years to Arthur J. Mollo; 2 children, students at Westover Elementary School.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. BLUM (continuing): "Her education: Cos Cob Elementary School; a graduate of Greenwich High School; attended Cornell University of Medicine; attended University of Bridgeport in accounting, nights; attended the St. Joseph Hospital School for Medical Technology. She was employed in Ligett's Rexall Drug Inventory Control; employed as a home typist for a court reporter; and she is now employed as a waitress at the Bevivino's Restaurant, a family business.

"She's got quite a list of community activities. President of the Stamford PTA Council; Editor of the Stamford PTA Council Newsletter, Chairman of the President's Committee, Stamford PTA Council. She was a Co-chairman of the Scholarship Committee at Westover School, PTA; a member of the Action Committee at Westhill High School; a member of the Board of Education's Citizen Budget Committee; a member of the Sacred Heart Rosary Society since 1967; a member of the Stamford Boys' Mothers' Club; a member of the Stamford Democratic Women's Club; a member of the Steering Committee of the Humanist Workshop at Yerwood Center. She has been president at one time of the Westover Elementary School PTA; and it goes on and it goes on, and I would say this woman has been involved in many, many activities, and certainly she would represent her district very well. I would like to place her name in nomination."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you. The name of CAMILLE MOLLO has been placed in nomination for the office of Representative of the 9th District. Are there any other nominations, are there any other nominations? Mr. Livingston, what's your Point of Information?"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "My Point of Information, I would like for you to explain fully what is going to happen with this vote. How many votes will it take to hold the seat, how will it be determined?"

MR. MILLER: "I will, Mr. Livingston, but first I want to determine is there anyone else who wishes to speak for the purpose of making a nomination? If there is no objection, then the CHAIR will declare nominations closed, and in response to Mr. Livingston's question - is yours a Point of Information, Mr. Baxter?"

MR. BAXTER: "I would like to make a comment, Mr. President. I understand and can sympathize and perhaps even agree with the motivations expressed by the people who have made additional nominations besides Mrs. Perillo, and I feel it's unfortunate, however, that zeal in putting forth these reasons and the people, all of whom I have met by the way, and all of whom I find, what little I know of them, to be qualified. I find it unfortunate that the nomination of Mrs. Perillo has been characterized in their zeal as something less than clean, or smacking of corruption, or dishonest, or irresponsible, or not respectable, and I'd just like to point out that that does not represent my view and I feel it is an unfortunate thing that some people's zeal has carried them that far. Thank you."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER: "I want to get back to Mr. Livingston's question. Naturally, the question did arise concerning whether it was the majority that was needed to elect in the case of having more than two candidates, or whether it would be a plurality. It is the opinion of the President of the Board that all you need is a plurality. The CHAIR would add that that is an opinion with which Mr. FOX in his capacity as Parliamentarian of the Board concurs. It is not a majority, but a plurality which is necessary to elect, and the CHAIR would note that on Page 6 of the Rules of this Board, No. 4, under "Voting", we do have this language concerning elections.

"The candidate receiving the most votes shall be elected, and Mr. Fox and I believe that the clear and obvious meaning of that language is that in order to elect in a case where you have more than two candidates....Mr. Rybnick, I don't want those ballots passed out yet... I'm sorry...in the case of more than two candidates being nominated, it is a plurality which is necessary for election. Now, is there any other comment? If, not...Mr. Connors?"

MR. CONNORS: "You know, in fairness to Mrs. Perillo, I've been on this Board a couple of years. I've never been through anything like this before. It's been customary in the past that a surviving member nominates, regardless of who it is. I mean, but now we're taking. . here we're getting people from other districts that don't belong in that district making nominations; the people who should make the nominations are the people that live in that district period. And I don't see where anybody else has the nerve to even get into another district. I know that I wouldn't go into anybody else's district. I believe in my own district and that's where I belong and that's where I'm going to stay. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you, Mr. Connors. I believe we can proceed to a vote. It is the ruling of the CHAIR that the number of votes necessary for election is a plurality of the votes. The TELLERS will now please distribute the paper ballots. There are three candidates:

MILDRED PERILLO
ROBERT ROSS
CAMILLE MOLLO

Each member of this Board is to write on the paper ballot, the name of his choice for this office. The TELLERS will then collect the ballots. Yes, Mr. Signore?"

MR. SIGNORE: "Because this is such a controversial election, would you please explain these slips?"

MR. MILLER: "Yes. You are to write on the slip nothing more than the name of your choice of a candidate: MILDRED PERILLO, ROBERT ROSS, OR CAMILLE MOLLO.

"Is there anyone who did not turn in a ballot? The CHAIR will announce the tally. All 39 members participated. There were 39 ballots sub-

11,012

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER (continuing): "mitted. This is the tally:

4 votes for MR. ROSS
14 votes for MRS. MOLLO
21 votes for MRS. PERILLO

"The CHAIR declares MILDRED PERILLO elected Representative for the 9th District. Will Mrs. Perillo please come forward? (applause)

"Just raise your right hand. Do you, Mildred Perillo, having been chosen a member of the 14th Board of Representatives from the 9th District of Stamford, do solemnly swear that you will faithfully discharge the duties of said office according to law, so help you God?"

MRS. PERILLO: "I will."

MR. MILLER: "Good luck!"

MRS. PERILLO: "Thank you very much." (applause)

MR. PERILLO: "Mr. President, for those that supported my wife, I thank you. For those who didn't, I thank you, too."

MR. MILLER: "I believe then, I know the Leadership has agreed to pass over voting on Acceptance of the Minutes because we don't believe the membership has had sufficient opportunity to examine the Minutes which are on your desks this evening, so we will pass over Acceptance of the Minutes.

"I will move on to the APPOINTMENT of the SPECIAL COMMITTEES. The CHAIR appoints to the:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: (5 members)

Dr. Lynn Lowden, Chairman (D)
Thomas D'Agostino (D)
Julius Blois (D)
Mildred Ritchie (R)
Barbara McInerney (R)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE: (5 members)

Linda D. Clark, Chairman (D)
L. Morris Glucksman (D)
Dr. Lynn Lowden (D)
Jeanne-Lois Santy (R)
_____ (vacany) (R)

PAGES: Miss Jane Moore Baxter, student at St. Maurice's School
(daughter of City Representative George Baxter)

Miss Kim Walsh, student at Toquam School
(daughter of City Representative Peter Walsh)

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER: "We will now move on to Committee reports, and I would entertain a MOTION from the MAJORITY LEADER that we waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report."

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTSSTEERING COMMITTEE:

MR. DeROSE MOVED to waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report of its meeting held on Monday, February 23, 1976, which appears below:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORTMEETING HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1976

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Monday, February 23, 1976, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman and President of the Board, FREDERICK M. MILLER, JR., at 8:30 P.M. There was one member absent: Jeanne-Lois Santy. Present also were City Representatives Lynn Lowden and David Blum.

The following matters on the Tentative Agenda were acted upon:

(1) MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS:

The 16 appointments on the Tentative Agenda submitted by the Mayor, were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA under APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE.

(2) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION ITEMS:

There were fourteen items of a fiscal nature on the Tentative Agenda which were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA under FISCAL COMMITTEE, with those over \$2,000.00 being referred to a secondary committee.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS:(3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION - INITIATION OF ACTION BY BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR APPOINTMENT OF A 10th CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE.

(4) PROPOSED RESOLUTION - CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF A 10th CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE.

(4-A) REQUEST FROM THE STAMFORD TOWING ASSOCIATION, INC. TO RESOLVE CONFLICT BETWEEN regulations of State of Connecticut Motor Vehicle Dept. and Stamford Police Department, etc.

Above ordered NOT ON THE AGENDA; referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMM.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

- (5) CONTINUING INQUIRY INTO CIRCUMSTANCES CONCERNING CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS WITHIN THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM - Re Barry J. Boodman.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

- (6) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT between the City of Stamford and the STAMFORD POLICE ASSOCIATION for three years from July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

- (7) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT between the City of Stamford and the FIREFIGHTERS LOCAL 786 for three years from July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

- (8) APPEAL FROM PLANNING BOARD'S DENIAL OF MASTER PLAN APPLICATION MP-221 BY APPLICANT JOHN J. P. NOCERINO - to be acted on by April 5, 1976 meeting.

Above ordered NOT ON THE AGENDA; referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE.

- (9) REPORT ON STATUS OF WASHINGTON AVENUE FIRE HOUSE NO. 5.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (10) REPORT ON CONDITIONS ON IROQUOIS ROAD CAUSED BY PATRONS OF "THE HUDDLE TAVERN".

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (11) REPORT ON COMPLAINTS ON UNLEASHED DOGS AND PACKS OF "WILD" DOGS.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

- (12) INQUIRY INTO STONE WALL CONSTRUCTED ON EDEN ROAD AND HOPE ST. -

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE.

- (13) INQUIRY INTO STONE WALL CONSTRUCTED ON VERY MERRY ROAD.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE.

- (14) REQUEST TO RE-NAME "THE HUBBARD HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE" TO: "THE E. GAYNOR BRENNAN, SR., MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE."

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE.

- (15) PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SEWER COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND NOB HILL ESTATES, INC. (former Roosevelt School property in Shippan).

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to SEWER COMMITTEE.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(16) INVESTIGATION REQUESTED REGARDING RELOCATION OF FAMILIES in URG.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE.

(17) REQUEST THAT RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY to expedite improvement of exits 7 and 8 on Connecticut Turnpike.

Above ordered ON THE AGENDA; referred to URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE.

(18) LETTER OF FEB. 17, 1976 FROM MRS. NANCY McAFEE, CHAIRMAN, MITAC, (Moderate Income Tenants Advisory Committee).

Above ordered NOT ON THE AGENDA; referred to PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE.

(19) LETTER OF FEB. 9, 1976 FROM LEONARD HOFFMAN, City Rep. requesting probe into allegations of questionable expenditures alleged to have been made by members of the Board of Education and the School Administration of the Stamford Public Schools, etc. Newspaper clippings of Feb. 7th and Feb. 11, 1976 submitted.

Above ordered NOT ON THE AGENDA, and ordered NOT referred to any committee.

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION, duly SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

FREDERICK E. MILLER, JR.
CHAIRMAN, STEERING COMMITTEE

MR. MILLER: "Is there a SECOND to MR. DeROSE'S MOTION to Waive the reading of the STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT? SECONDED. All those in favor, say . . . Mr. Hoffman?"

MR. HOFFMAN: "Mr. President, could I please ask a question regarding the item that I put before the Steering Committee which was the investigation of the Board of Education. May I ask what happened?"

MR. MILLER: "Yes, we considered that item, it was presented to the Steering Committee. It was listed on the Tentative Agenda for the Steering Committee under CORRESPONDENCE. It was actually printed on the Agenda and it was taken up by the Steering Committee, and it was not the will of the Steering Committee to either place it on the Agenda or to commit it to any of the Board's Committees. So, that item is not before any committee of the Board at the present time."

MR. HOFFMAN: "May I ask, or could I have a suggestion from you, Sir, as to how it could be placed on the Steering Committee?"

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER: "If you again wish to submit it, Mr. Hoffman, that's your privilege, but at the next meeting of the Steering Committee, a vote would have to be taken, or some consideration of it would have to be taken at that meeting. You have the right to again submit it in writing, and if you do either place it on the Tentative Agenda under CORRESPONDENCE. We do have a MOTION on the floor made by MR. DeROSE.

"All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report is CARRIED. We will now move on, but I believe the Majority Leader has a MOTION."

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, we have several people here this evening in our audience who have waited very patiently and it's no secret that, they for the most part, are here because they are concerned with both the POLICE and FIREMEN'S contracts. I would ask, at this time, that we have a SUSPENSION OF THE RULES and that we first take up Items 2 and 3 under PERSONNEL. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The question is on Suspension of the Rules so that we might immediately take up Items 2 and 3 under PERSONNEL COMMITTEE. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Thank you, Mr. President. The Personnel Committee met on Feb. 24th and we had representatives of the Firefighters' Union, Mr. Leary, and other firefighters, and representatives from the Police Union, Sgt. Glander and other police officers with him, as well as Tom Barrett and Mr. Hadley speak to us regarding the Police and Firefighters' contracts. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend out both contracts favorably, yes indeed, both contracts.

"Just as a summary, I know all of us here have received the contracts. These are the major provisions. There will be an \$800 one payment in both contracts for the 18 months from July 1, 1974 to December 31, 1975. Regarding pensions, those who retired prior to 1965 will have a 10% increase in their pensions. Those retiring after 1965 but prior to 1969 will have a 7% increase. This will come to \$25,732 per year. Then there is a \$4,000 life insurance policy for each retiree hereafter.

"The cost of the wage package for the Police will come to \$424,000 for the first two years; \$609,000 for the third year.

"The cost of the wage contract for the Firefighters will come to \$324,000. for the first and second year; and \$465,000 for the third year. I will be happy to answer any questions, if there are any."

MR. MILLER: "We have first, then, a MOTION, Mrs. Goldstein, on the Police Contract, is that right? Well, we have to vote on each one separately, so will you make a motion on the Police Contract?"

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

- (2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT between the City of Stamford and the STAMFORD POLICE ASSOCIATION for three years from July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977 (Letter from Mayor Clapes' of 2/11/76 and contract.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Well, yes, I MOVE for the Board to accept the Police Contract."

MR. MILLER: "All right, we have that motion made."

MR. MORGAN: "SECONDED. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to say that the Fiscal Committee also considered both contracts and in connection with the Police Contract, the Committee voted YES by a vote of 6-0."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. A motion is now on the floor for approval of the Police Association contract. We are now open for discussion and any questions that you may have through the CHAIR to Mrs. Goldstein or Mr. Morgan."

MR. CONNORS: "Mr. President, I MOVE for a ROLL CALL VOTE on both contracts."

MR. MILLER: "No, you have to do it one at a time, Mr. Connors."

MR. CONNORS: "Take the first one."

MR. MILLER: "All right, those desiring a Roll Call Vote on the Police contract, please raise your hands. The CHAIR sees that there is a sufficient number, the vote will be taken by Roll Call."

MR. HOFFMAN: "Thank you, Mr. President, I looked at those contracts and I felt that there were a number of inequities in these contracts, especially from a taxpayer's standpoint. We received most of the figures this evening from someone, regarding the police union, it's a corrected copy which does nothing more than make the pension cost look much worse than they were before."

"According to my calculations, the salary increase from the present salary of \$3,430,000, to \$4,463,000 is a 30.12% increase in salary. I don't feel that this is all that bad, but I believe that we have been given a set of figures by Mr. Barrett that indicates that the pay raise is something like 20%, and it is 30%. I think that someone else should double-check these figures, but the \$1,033,000 in the Policeman's contract does amount to a 30% increase. The fringes go up 23.49% and the pension is out of sight, it's just out of sight! I have . . . (end of Tape #2) . . .

(start of Tape #3 - portion unclear here) . . . department . . . in looking at some of the other items that were in the contract, I felt that there were a number of things that were very generous, many perhaps too numerous to mention. But I found a dozen items in here that I thought were low (?), and I know everybody keeps saying well, something like, we should

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. HOFFMAN: (Continuing)"....accept this contract because it's got to be done now . the policemen and firemen have waited for several years.

"Nevertheless, I think that there are some items in here that are low, the people should know about because I think this is what a representative is going to have to vote on. We're going to have to accept them. I think that one of the things that are wrong is on page 2, under c, all the employees working on a shift commencing after 3 p.m. on any day shall be compensated for all hours on such shift at the rate of 5% in excess of their straight time hourly rate; and after 4:59 at 10%, but 10% I can buy, but I sure don't see the 5% from 3 p.m. on!

"The question of how many people are needed on stand-by. I know in the past we looked into the question of Captain Ursone who was given a tremendous amount of time off with pay, and this was done because one of the things he had was supposedly stand-by time which he had accumulated. There's a built-in pay raise after a certain amount of longevity.

"I question item c on page 5, the method of compensation for work performed on such holidays. It appears to me like this is double time plus a day off and I think this is excessive, very excessive. There are other people who must work on days off, as well as policemen.

"I thought the vacation pay is liberal and after four years, policemen would get three weeks vacation and after that it goes on up to 3 weeks plus a day, three weeks plus 2 days, on up to 4 weeks after 20 years. I felt that the program whereby the City would provide and pay for each employee and his family hospital, medical, major medical, and dental benefits. I think this is a very generous item.

"Effective upon approval by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, the annual pension of each retiree who retired prior to July 1, 1965 shall be increased by 10%; and the annual pension of each retiree who retired between July 1, 1965 and prior to July 1, 1969; will be increased by 7%. I think that we are already confronted with a situation where we can hardly pay these pensions, and here we are going back and increasing these pension benefits.

"On page 9, the policemen are given a \$300 clothing allowance, and I consider this a gift. None of the free clothing that is issued, is taken into consideration; and on page 9 and 10, page 11, it lists this clothing that is given to the policemen. And I think the real kicker is here, page 11, at the top of the page under item k, it says that every two years a survey shall be held to determine if the replacements are needed to the dress regulation uniform for such employee and if so, such replacements shall be issued. So here we're giving these people \$300 a year for maintaining their clothing, and giving them a certain amount of free clothing each year, and then at the end of two years, a survey will be made to give them some additional free clothing if it's needed!

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. HOFFMAN (continuing): "So, I think the \$300 clothing item is saying, fellas, keep your uniforms clean but by golly, anybody else who wears a suit to work, or other clothing to work, you have to maintain that properly yourself or you go to work looking like a slob. I wonder how many ...well, this one's not too bad.

"I felt that the funeral leave for the employees where they shall be entitled to a funeral leave of five working days in the event of the death of a spouse, parent, child, brother, sister, grandparent, grandchild, I think that's very generous. Usually it's three days' leave that's granted.

"Now on outside work, on page 15, the fellows are paid time-and-a-half their regular hourly wage by a contractor or someone who might hire them to do some outside work. And at that particular point in time, they are using out City-owned uniforms, which we pay \$300 a year to keep up!

"I think on page 16, item b, it says here that if an employee is assigned by the Chief of the department to a school or educational program outside of the City of Stamford, he is required to stay overnight by reason of the regulations of the program, or the distance involved, except for the attendance at a military basic training school as established by the laws of the State of Connecticut, he shall receive in addition to his regular pay, eight hours of pay at his regular straight time hourly rate for each day that he is required to stay over-night, at such^a school. I suspect here that a man is paid his expenses plus the day's salary, and this day's salary here we're talking about anywhere from \$46.71 which is going to be the pay rate next July, on to the top pay rate which is \$77.72.

"I think that this sort of thing is just unheard of. If you are sent away by your boss, or your employer, certainly he would pay your expenses and this would be the extent of it. He wouldn't give you any added compensation for this; and here we are doing this in essence paying these people double time to actually improve themselves.

"I feel that page 17, item c, I feel this is a very generous item, considering that the taxpayer foots the bill. And this item c is that such officers and members of the association as may be designated by the association, shall be granted leave from duty with full pay for association business, such as attending labor conventions, educational conferences and other proper association business, provided the total leave for the purpose set forth in this section shall not exceed 12 working days in any fiscal year. So, to me, 12 working days of convention time, I think is rather generous when it's done at the taxpayers' cost.

"On page 18, Minimum Manpower, says no shift demanding the uniformed rotating shift shall be assigned without a minimum of 18 men present for duty. This I just question. It seems rather costly and it would seem to me that we should have greater flexibility.

"Now again, I would just say that the last thing is an article in FORBES MAGAZINE dated Feb. 1, 1976, and it says 'Working 20 years and getting a free ride for 50 years just ain't possible. There isn't enough money in the kitty and it's high time, past time, we realized

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. HOFFMAN (continuing) "that such a pattern cannot be followed. Our life span these days is too long. Three score and ten adds up to 70. For most of our 15 or more years, we're supported by Father, and often Mother; then after working 20 to 25 years, for a city, or state, or a Federal bureaucracy we should be able to retire on over half of our highest pay? And expect to spend the remaining 30 or so years as free-loaders? NO WAY!

"Mr. President, I would urge my fellow Representatives to vote NO for these contracts until such time as these pension programs are worked out more equitably because I think if we do not do this, I think that certainly the City of Stamford is going to be facing fiscal suicide, fiscal disaster, just as New York City has done. I just don't think there is any way we can keep up with these pension programs. Thank you, Mr. President, for your attention."

MRS. MCINERNEY: Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I would like the record to show that I will NOT vote on the police contract tonight, since I have a relative who would receive a sizeable benefit from this agreement and therefore my vote would be prejudiced. I will not allow myself to be put in a position of conflict of interest on any vote that comes before this Board; and I would also like to urge any other members related to members of either the police or fire departments to abstain from voting as well."

MR. MILLER: "Mrs. McInerney will abstain from discussion and voting on this item of the police contract."

MRS. RAYMOND: "Thank you, Mr. President, while I, too, share some of Mr. Hoffman's reservations, I don't feel that tonight on a contract that's been in negotiation for a year and a half, is quite the time for these reservations to be voiced.

"I am somewhat disturbed, as a new member, that we apparently have no in-input into negotiating clauses at the beginning of that process but rather are called upon instead to react to the finished product. And as such I have looked over this contract as a package we are receiving, and I am prepared tonight to vote in favor of that package, again, as I said, with some reservations about some of the provisions.

"I would hope that when the next contract is up for negotiation that this Board will formulate a process by which we may have some in-input into Mr. Barrett and discuss some of the things that we perhaps are unhappy with. However, at this point, the policemen and the firefighters have been waiting a year and a half for a contract, it's been a long drawn-out process, I see absolutely no value in picking out portions of that contract that we perhaps are unhappy with, defeating it and going back to the negotiating process again. I think only everyone loses if we do that tonight.

"I would further like to say that while I am not necessarily happy with the way it's put together, I think the remuneration, the total remuneration that the policemen and firefighters receive in this City is certainly well worth what we, as taxpayers and citizens, get in return. I wouldn't want my husband to be a policeman, and I don't think a lot of us would really like to do the job. I commend the men that do it, I think it's an extraordinary responsibility, and I would certainly urge all the members of this Board to vote in favor of this contract and I would further urge that these men get their back pay as quickly as possible. Thank you."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER: "Mrs. Raymond, the CHAIR would simply observe that under the law in this State, negotiation of contracts is basically a function for the Mayor, and the legislative body of a city has rather a limited role. Basically, we can either accept or reject but negotiation is basically the Mayor's job."

MRS. RAYMOND: "Well, then, I would hope that perhaps we might develop a procedure on this Board to have in-put to the Mayor's office on contract negotiations."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that Mrs. Raymond's points are really very well put; and cover some of the considerations that the Personnel Committee have in relation to the contract. However we did feel it was a fair contract and a very well-negotiated contract."

"In relation to some of Mr. Hoffman's comments, many of the items that you singled out, Mr. Hoffman, have been part of the police contract for many, many years. As all of us know, it's very, very difficult to negotiate out an item once it's in, if that was even the intent, and I'm not saying that that was an intent."

"In relation to the 20% increase in the settlement, the percentage is figured on base salary, and when you figure the current base salary as \$12,128 and the ending salary in three years as \$14,563, you do get a 20.1% increase."

"The other item which involves around the pensions, first of all, the percentage that the City would be paying into the pension fund is rising because of the actuarial recommendations to the negotiators. We did fund this pension, well, it was funded at 25% base and by the end of the contract, it will be up to a 37% base and this is based upon recommendations by the actuarial firm that has been helping the City. Also the additional pension cost on the retirees who retired previous to 1965, and then that span before 1969 and after 1965 was given to these people because, unlike other workers who are on Social Security and do get Social Security cost-of-living increases, police and firefighters, if we want to discuss them, do not have social security, do not have that kind of benefit, and so the negotiators told us they felt it was really justified to give them some kind of cost-of-living increases, and so that should account for some additional monies."

MR. SANDOR: "Mr. President, I would like to go on record voting against the police contract because I feel that none of the facts of the police contract were made available to the public so that they might understand the full contract and make their feelings known to their Representatives who could then vote their choice. To me, this is the only way to have good government. Thank you."

MR. SIGNORE: "I looked at the contract, and on the face of it, it looks excessive in parts, but I wish to ask some of the Representatives if they would take this particular job as a policeman or a fireman for the salary involved. Would they go down dark alleys at night, would they go up to some of the bad areas in town, and would they get into squad cars and speed off to some emergency not knowing at which intersection they might get hit. Or if they were a fireman, would they go into a burning building, without any fear or apprehension? That's all I want to say."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. CONNORS: "Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, the years I've been on the Board, I argued this six years ago, this is actually the first time the Police and the Fire Departments sat down with the Personnel Committee and gave us an explanation. I think it's a pretty good contract, I mean you can take it apart, no doubt.

"There are many things there which you might think are a few inequities, but after all, I have to go along with Mr. Signore. After all, how many people of us in this room would like to take their jobs. You know we can sit out here and criticize, but supposing we were in the same circumstances. Now as far as pensions, if you'll look at your budget books and see what some of these people are receiving in pensions, years and years back, it's a disgrace to the City of Stamford. There's no doubt they are entitled to a little adjustment.

"You take any union, which I happen to be in, being retired also, when the union makes a contract, they make an adjustment for the union members who are retired. So, they're making a little adjustment here which isn't too much money and they're never going to get rich because the ones who retired before 65 are drawing very poor salaries without any Social Security. That's why so many have to go out and try to get a job to build up a little Social Security.

"I think it's a pretty good contract, both contracts, and I feel it would be very unfair of us tonight to vote against either contract, whether it be Police or Fire Department. I feel they're both good contracts and they gave us a very good explanation, as Mrs. Goldstein stated; and that was actually the first time, over a period of years, that they ever came in and we got an explanation, we got a good explanation. It's something we've been looking for for years. I hope it continues in years to come. Thank you very much, Mr. President."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, would like to speak on this contract, and one thing we should all recognize is that this contract is an agreement that has arrived out of the process of collective bargaining. It has been give-and-take on both sides. We should also recognize the fact that we have a negotiator that this Board of Representatives was very influential in making the Finance Commission and the Board of Finance recognizing that the City of Stamford needed a negotiator for our contracts.

"There is no purpose, no sense, in having a negotiator if we cannot respect his opinion. If we come to the conclusion that we cannot respect his opinion, then it is time for us to seek a new negotiator. Mr. President, these contracts, if we were to nit-pick, there are items that all of us could raise a little sand about, but we have to recognize these contracts as a total package, and we have to recognize the fact that our policemen are our protectors and we have to allow certain adjustments for some of the daily chores that they will have to do in our behalf. You cannot compare policemen to tool and die makers, to conductors on trains, you have to recognize a policeman as a safety factor in our City. Thank you."

MR. MORGAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. If there are no other speakers already on your list, I would like to MOVE THE QUESTION."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: "There are other speakers on the list. I wish you wouldn't make a motion like that with a qualification like that, Mr. Morgan!"
(laughter) But there are two other prospective speakers so I guess I can move on. Mr. Blois, nothing? Then Mr. Blum."

MR. BLUM: "I think that two years of collective bargaining has been long enough. These contracts are long over-due. The process of collective bargaining is a two-way street and it takes give-and-take. It's time that it be voted on."

MR. MILLER: "If there is no further comment, I think we can proceed."

MR. MORGAN: "Now, I'd like to MOVE THE QUESTION."

MR. MILLER: "All those in favor of MOVING THE QUESTION, please say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED. We will proceed to a vote. Well, we've already had a request for a ROLL CALL VOTE. It is necessary, in the event that this Board rejects a contract, for the Board to communicate to the Mayor the reasons for the rejection of the contract. So, in the event that this contract is rejected, the PRESIDENT would have to conclude that the membership had accepted the criticisms given during the debate since there were no negative reports from the Committees involved.

"A YES vote is a vote for approval of the contract; a NO vote would be opposed to approval. The question is on approval of the collective bargaining contract between the City of Stamford and the Stamford Police Association. The CLERK will CALL THE ROLL, and I would note before we call the roll that we do have a full complement so far as the membership of the Board goes since we had the replacement in the 9th District, but Mrs. McInerney will NOT be on the floor for this vote, so we now have 39 members present. The CLERK will call the roll.

"The MOTION is CARRIED by a vote of 37 YES, 2 NO, as follows:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR:

BAXTER, George (D-3)
BLUM, David (D-12)
BLOIS, Julius (D-14)
CARLUCCI, Leo (D-5)
CLARK, Linda D. (D-6)
CONNORS, George (D-8)
COSENTINI, Audrey (R-13)
COSTELLO, Robert (D-6)
D'AGOSTINO, Thomas (D-17)
DeROSE, Joseph (D-15)
DIXON, Handy (D-2)
FLANAGAN, William (R-19)
FOX, John Wayne (D-15)
GLUCKSMAN, L. Morris (D-11)
GOLDSTEIN, Sandra (D-16)
HAWE, Marie (R-1)
HAYS, George (R-20)
LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah (D-5)
LOBOZZA, James (R-17)
LOOMIS, Ralph (R-19)
LOWDEN, Lynn (D-1)

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR (continued):

MILLER, Frederick E., Jr. (D-3)
MORGAN, Michael (D-12)
NIZOLEK, Christine (D-2)
OSUCH, Adam (R-14)
PERILLO, Alfred (D-9)
PERILLO, Mildred (D-9)
RAVALLESE, George (D-8)
RAYMOND, Jean (R-16)
RITCHIE, Mildred (R-10)
ROSE, Matthew (D-3)
RYBNICK, Gerald (D-4)
SANTY, Jeanne-Lois (R-18)
SHERER, Donald (R-10)
SIGNORE, S. A. (R-18)
WALSH, Peter (D-7)
WIESLEY, Vere (R-13)

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION (NO):

HOFFMAN, Leonard (R-11)
SANDOR, John (D-4)

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT between the City of Stamford and the FIRE FIGHTERS ASSOCIATION for three years from July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977 (Letter from Mayor Clapes 2/11/76 and contract.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Thank you, Mr. President. Basically, the Firefighters' contract reads similar to the Police contract. Once again, the Personnel Committee voted unanimously to approve the contract and send it out with a favorable approval to the rest of the Board and I SO MOVE."

MR. MORGAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. The Fiscal Committee also considered this contract and voted 6-0 in favor of the request."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. We now have out on the floor for discussion the Firefighters' contract."

MRS. COSENTINI: "yes, I reluctantly have to ABSTAIN on this because one of my most very favorite relatives happens to be a lieutenant with the Fire Department."

MR. MILLER: "The RECORD will indicate that Mrs. Cosentini is leaving the floor for this vote. She is abstaining from discussion and from voting. In effect, she is leaving the floor of the Board. Mrs. McInerney has returned to the floor of the Board; we have 39 members present."

MR. HOFFMAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. I would say again that I would object to this contract. Again I do take heed of what Mr. Signore said. I do believe that the police and the firemen do a very fine job. The figures that we were given again were incorrect. The salary increase, in the case of the Fire Department, is 30.94%, and this means that the present salaries, which is \$2,618,000 goes to \$3,407,000 or an increase of \$789,000. Fringes are up 23% and a little bit more than a half of 1%; the pension costs are up 99.29%."

"I wondered about the item on Page 11, item #5, effective 7/1/73 - Employees and Mechanics Maintenance of Fire Alarms, Fire Prevention Bureau and Clerical Divisions shall have the option of working on Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Columbus Day, and Veterans' Day if the holiday falls on the regular day of work. My question here would be are these people then paid at holiday rates, or are they given time off equivalent to the time worked at holiday rates? Could you answer that Mrs. Goldstein?"

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Mr. Hoffman, would you repeat your question, please?"

MR. HOFFMAN: "Yes, ma'am. Item #5 on page 11. I am wondering if the people who work, the employees in the mechanic maintenance of fire alarms, fire prevention bureau, and clerical divisions, are these employees, if they choose to work on any of these holidays, are they then paid at holiday pay rates or are they given time off equivalent to the time worked at holiday rates? Because I think here are jobs that could very easily be postponed, possibly, with maybe a need to work on Sundays or some of these holidays, but I question that. Would they indeed be paid on Holiday pay rates or would they be given compensatory time off?"

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Well, Mr. Hoffman, if the holiday falls on their regular day of work, they will be given a holiday rate as I understand it."

MR. HOFFMAN: "O.K. On Page 19, I question this under "e". Each employee who does not regularly perform fire-fighting or dispatching duties shall receive one additional day of vacation in each calendar year following the 9th anniversary of his employment. Is this for officers only?"

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Is that item I, item C? Well, it say, Mr. Hoffman, 'this shall be used as a guide for officers'. Pg. 19, item C, Mr. Hoffman, O.K. Well, this paragraph refers to ... (end of tape #3)... (start of tape #4) . . page 19, top of page 19, I c, I'm reading it, Mr. Hoffman. As I understand this, each employee refers to each firefighter."

MR. HOFFMAN: "Ma'am, I don't mean to be mean or disagreeable, it says 'each employee who does not regularly perform fire-fighting or dispatching duties' so this would mean, seemingly, officers. It's not an important thing, I just wondered about it. I'm sorry to belabor the point."

"Item #24, again, this is funeral leave. I think that's a very generous item. I think on page 25 it says 'additional funeral leave in connection with required travel or any unusual circumstances shall be granted in the discretion of the Chief of the Department'. I think that's also very generous because you are already giving the firemen five days or three days in the event of the closeness of the relative."

"The City shall provide and replace uniforms and protective clothing as follows'; and in addition to that, 'the employee who is required by the Board of Fire Commissioners to wear his dress uniform shall be paid the sum of \$300 as a clothing maintenance allowance per contract'. Here again, I think this is like in the Police contract where the City supplies the uniforms and then pays them \$300 to maintain them. The insurance policy where the City will provide and pay for each employee and his family medical, major medical, and dental benefits equal or superior to the plans presently in effect'. I think that's excessive."

"and effective upon the approval of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, the City shall provide and pay for life and insurance policy in the face amount of \$4,000 for each employee who thereafter retires'. I think everybody but the taxpayer is getting this now, if you work for the City you get it, and this is one of those items, that if it is continued to be put into the various contracts, it won't be long, you know, you could just go out and sweep the streets of the City here, and you'll be getting these kind of benefits and I think this is wrong."

"On page 28, #4, effective 30 days after approval by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, the annual pension of each retiree or his survivor, who retired prior to July 1, 1965, will be increased 10% and the annual pension for each retiree, between July 1, 1965 and prior to July 1, 1969 shall be increased 7%.' I think this is absolutely wrong as it was before."

"Lastly, on page 33, under Wages, you also have a built-in salary increase by means of longevity pay, which is seldom afforded taxpayers. Again, I think my primary objection to this contract would be some of these items that I have listed here, but also the 99.29% increase in cost of the pension program. Thank you for your attention."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. COSTELLO: "Thank you, Mr. President, after just reading this, this Board has just approved the policemen's contract, and I don't see where it has any alternative to not approve the Firemen's contract. Every time that fire engine goes out of the house, these firemen are putting their lives on the line to save us and as I say we just approved the Policemen's contract and this one is almost identical and these people deserve everything they get. Thank you."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Yes, I do hate to belabor this point of percentages. However, the percentage increase is based on base pay and the base pay, for the firefighters, as for the police, goes from \$12,128 to \$14,583, over the life of the contract. You cannot include the \$800 lump sum payment in there as part of the percentage because this \$800 lump sum payment does not affect these pays, and with that you get this 20.1% increase.

"Also, in relation to, not specific points, that Mr. Hoffman made, but many, many points. There are things that may not have pleased the Committee en masse. However, we had to look at this contract over-all. We had to consider the kind of jobs those firefighters and police, which has already been approved, but the same holds true for both. These men do an outstanding job.

"These items have been in our contracts for four years, and they're not about to be taken out as things stand now. Perhaps, with input, if the Board deems it important, these things can be given to Mr. Barrett to possibly negotiate out. One item that has not been mentioned and is really quite important, Mr. Barrett and the both unions agreed, to have open to bid the insurance carriers, so that rather than having to take the carrier that we have taken in the past, which was part of the contract, the carrier was part of the contract, the carrier was named in the contract in the past, this might have cost the City more money. In the future, or at least for the life of this contract, we can go out to bid for numbers and we felt that this was really a good new item in the contract."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I would like to have my input on this particular contract. Mr. President, all of us are not fortunate enough to be members of the Personnel Committee. If we were, we would know a few basic things. That is, that the overwhelming majority of our firemen live right here in the City of Stamford, and those who don't, live nearby, and I think that's very important. Mr. President, this contract, like the Policemen's contract, reflects, reflects the job and the responsibility that rests in the hands of these men. I am hoping that this Board will support this contract as well as we have supported the Policemen's contract and I would hope that this Board, Mr. President, we all can't talk at once (order is called, Mr. Miller bangs the gavel) ... I would hope that this Board will support this contract as well as we have supported the Policemen's ... it's the Republicans, Mr. President (laughter) "

MR. MILLER: "Do continue, Mr. Livingston."

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, I'm not going to prolong things, but these contracts are similar. It is, you cannot nit-pick over an agreement that has been arrived, PLEASE, through the collective bargaining process; we cannot nit-pick over it. Hopefully, we will follow the recommendation of the Personnel Committee and support this contract. Thank you."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, I just want to say one thing. First of all, I'd like to say that I guess the possibility to rework any contract that eventually comes before this Board is kind of remote, but I do think that all Board members should be made to realize one thing, that there seems to be a problem as to how much money the City can continue to give the various unions. I would hope that the members of all City unions, not just those before us this evening, would realize that it's time to "bite the bullet" and give notice to all union members that we cannot keep on giving increases upon increases, year after year after year."

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, Mr. President, May I MOVE THE QUESTION?"

MR. MILLER: "We will vote on moving the previous question. The MOTION is CARRIED. We will now move on to a vote. We have a request for a ROLL CALL VOTE. There is a sufficient number, one-fifth of the members present. The vote will be taken by Roll Call. There are now 39 members present. The question is on approval of the Firefighters contract. Vote YES for the contract; NO against it.

"The MOTION is CARRIED by a vote of 37 YES, 2 NO, as follows:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR:

BAXTER, George	(D-7)
BLUM, David	(D-12)
BLOIS, Julius	(D-14)
CARLUCCI, Leo	(D-5)
CLARK, Linda D.	(D-6)
CONNORS, George	(D-8)
COSTELLO, Robert	(D-6)
D'AGOSTINO, Thomas	(D-17)
DeROSE, Joseph	(D-15)
DIXON, Handy	(R-2)
FLANAGAN, William	(R-19)
FOX, John Wayne	(D-15)
GLUCKSMAN, L. Morris	(D-11)
GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	(D-16)
HAWK, Marie	(R-1)
HAYS, George	(R-20)
LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	(D-5)
LOBOZZA, James	(R-17)
LOOMIS, Ralph	(R-19)
LOWDEN, Lynn	(D-1)
McINERNEY, Barbara	(R-20)

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR (continued):

MILLER, Frederick E., Mr.	(D-3)
MORGAN, Michael	(D-12)
NIZOLEK, Christine	(D-2)
OSUCH, Adam	(R-14)
PERILLO, Alfred	(D-9)
PERILLO, Mildred	(D-9)
RAVALLESE, George	(D-8)
RAYMOND, Jean	(R-16)
RITCHIE, Mildred	(R-10)
ROSE, Matthew	(D-3)
RYBNICK, Gerald	(D-4)
SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	(R-18)
SHERER, Donald	(R-10)
SIGNORE, S. A.	(R-18)
WALSH, Peter	(D-7)
WIESLEY, Vere	(R-13)

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION (NO):

HOFFMAN, Leonard	(R-11)
SANDOR, John	(D-4)

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "I think the Personnel Committee should be commended on the job that they have done."

MR. MILLER: "We can commend the Personnel Committee. Thank you."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, I would like to give some input to the Personnel Committee for next year's negotiations on the Fire contract. I would like to see some of the men who are employed as driver now ... (MR. MILLER says here that he doesn't think this is the proper time)....I would just like to say, Mr. President, that I would like to see the other Fire Station open as well."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. MILLER: "We will now proceed to the regular Agenda. We're back at Appointments Committee. Now. And I would ask for the full cooperation of the Board members, especially during the Appointments report, because we do have a large number of appointments to consider, and I think it is necessary for us to do this as quickly and as efficiently as possible. The Appointments Committee Report, Mr. Dixon."

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, the Appointments Committee met February 26th at 7:30 p.m. in the Republican Caucus Room. Those present were George Ravallese, Leo Carlucci, Robert Costello, Peter Walsh, Donald Sherer, Sal Signore, Vere Wiesley, and myself, Handy Dixon. At this point, Mr. President, I would like to make note of the fact that because of the several committee meetings held at the same time tonight, it was necessary for some of the members of this Committee to be absent from time to time in order to participate in portions of other committee meetings.

"Mr. President, the rule of the Committee is that if a member is not present during a particular interview, he cannot vote on that appointee. This, I think, will explain the abstentions made throughout the report. They are not there because a member did not, or would not, vote for the appointee. It is simply because he was not present at the interview.

"At this point, Mr. President, in compliance with Section 706 of the Charter, I would move for the suspension of the residency requirements in order to present the name of MR. VINCENT ROTONDO, a resident of Westport, Connecticut, for Commissioner of Public Works in the City of Stamford."

MR. MILLER: "Is there a second to that motion? MOVED and SECONDED. The question is on suspension of the residency requirement, Section 706 of the Charter, so that we might consider the appointment of Mr. Vincent Rotondo, as Commissioner of Public Works. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed, NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, Mr. Rotondo is a Republican. He resides at 15 Mansfield Place, Westport, Connecticut. The Appointments Committee met with and conducted an extensive interview with Mr. Rotondo, and did in fact determine beyond a reasonable doubt his qualifications, expertise, and ability to fulfill the requirements of the position the Mayor has so wisely chosen him for. That meeting, Mr. President, was held on Saturday, January 3, 1976, at 10:00 a.m. in the Democratic Caucus Room. This being the second submission of Mr. Rotondo's name, I would say that in our January meeting, Mr. Boccuzzi made a list in the presentation to which there is little that I can add.

"However, for the record, and possible benefit of those not present at that time, I would simply repeat the following: Mr. Rotondo is married and lives with his wife and two children. He is a home-owner and a taxpayer in the City of Westport. He has served in the U.S. Airforce and was honorably discharged in 1953. Educationally, Mr. Rotondo received an Associate Science degree with high honors from Norwalk College in June of 1969; completed a course in Basic Principles of Sewage Treatment from the University of Connecticut in April of 1963. He completed a course in Laboratory Training in the Connecticut State Department of Health in June, 1970; and completed a course in Effective Supervisory Practices and Labor Relations at the University of Bridgeport, Stamford branch, in June of 1974.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. DIXON (continuing): "On Mr. Rotondo's experience and background, he was Director of Public Works, had complete charge of all public works and engineering in the City of Westport for a period of three years. He was Superintendent of the same city's Pollution Control Division for twelve years. He was also Instructor and Program Developer for the State of Connecticut, Department of Education Manpower Development Training Course.

"Mr. Rotondo has been the recipient of many honors and meritorious awards. In 1967, he received the E. Sherman Chase Award for excellence of maintenance and operations of water pollution control facility, the only one of four to be so honored in the past seven years in the entire New England area. In 1971, he received a special award from Connecticut Water Pollution Abatement Association for promotion of advanced education in control of water pollution.

"Mr. Rotondo has taken on many civic responsibilities. He is noted for his excellent performance in the June flood of 1972 at which time he was appointed by the First Selectman of Westport to act as Public Works Coordinator. In 1973, he initiated drainage improvements to correct deficiencies caused by the June flood.

"There is more I could say, Mr. President, about the appointee, but at this time I would like to mention some of the accomplishments that Mr. Rotondo has made during the short time he has been in office. I requested this of Mr. Rotondo and he forwarded this letter to me. And I would just like to run through it briefly.

"The letter is dated February 26, 1976 and the subject is 'Progress Report: 12/15/76 to 2/27/76'. It goes on to say:

'In regard to your request for a progress report of my actions as Public Works Commissioner over the past ten weeks, I offer the following information:

'Major emphasis has been devoted to improvement of administrative techniques, communication between all Bureaus, and responsiveness to the public. The major improvements are listed under the following three categories: ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS and CAPITAL PROJECTS.

'Under ADMINISTRATION I have instituted the following:

- ' - Monthly Staff Meetings, including all supervisory personnel
- ' - Monthly Work Performance Reports by Bureau and Division Heads
- ' - Daily Staff Meetings of Bureau Heads and Deputy Commissioner and Operations Officer
- ' - Appointment of a Complaint Coordinator to facilitate immediate response to all citizen complaints

'Under OPERATIONS the following improvements have been made:

- ' - Positive security measures being taken to eliminate damage and theft to public equipment
- ' - Public street drainage improvements to remove icing hazards now being implemented
- ' - Investigation underway for better control of gasoline distribution system
- ' - Implementation of the Utility Audit now pending approval of the Board of Representatives at the March meeting.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. DIXON (continuing):

- ' - The use of 70% sand and 30% salt mixture was initiated to control snow and ice emergencies. This system was begun on February 5, and should effect considerable dollar savings and lessen possible damage to the ecology.
- Cessation of lax methods of control on Project "Change Orders."

'Progress on CAPITAL PROJECTS is as follows:

- ' - Toilsome Brook - Bracewood Lane Project begun. Allegations for Dannel Drive, Silver Birch Project acquired.
- Revaluation of City Garage Project by in-house committee. Report due Board of Finance in April.'

"Mr. Rotondo then went on to say that there are other projects pending implementation shortly, that he has only listed those which have been accomplished over the past ten weeks.

"Mr. President, I would simply report at this point that the Appointments Committee is satisfied, and on behalf of the Committee, I would now place the name of Mr. Rotondo before you and this Board and move for his confirmation. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you, Mr. Dixon. Mrs. McInerney?"

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. I would like to second the name of Vincent Rotondo for Public Works Commissioner for the City of Stamford. In all of my dealings with Mr. Rotondo, I have found him to be very aware of the problems of Stamford, and very responsive to the people of the community. I would hope that the other Board members would support him."

MRS. RAYMOND: "Thank you. I, too, would like to second Mr. Rotondo's nomination. I have had a number of dealings with Mr. Rotondo during the past several months. For some reason, the 16th district seems to be in close contact with the Public Works Department. I have been very impressed with his follow-through, with his ability to listen, and I have been impressed with his management approach to the entire Department. And most of all, I have been impressed with the fact that he has been able to tell me "No" to some of the things that I have requested, and tell me "No" in a nice way with an explanation as to why. I think that Mr. Rotondo deserves the confirmation of this Board so he can get on with the business of running the department and not have his confirmation pending, and I would hope that everyone else on this Board would vote for his confirmation."

MR. HOFFMAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. I thought Commissioner O'Brien did a good job, and we now have the pleasure of approving Mr. Rotondo's appointment and I think we will find that Mr. Rotondo will fill a big pair of shoes and will do his job well. He seems to be experienced, as some Representatives have said. Certainly, it seems that Mr. O'Brien was, and I would hope that we could put partisan politics aside this evening and vote for his appointment."

MRS. COSENTINI: "In view of the hour, I'll just add I agree with all the wonderful words said about Mr. Rotondo, and I'll second it also."

MR. BLOIS: "Thank you. Being on the Public Works Committee, I found that Mr. Rotondo is very capable of handling the Public Works Commissioner's job. The man is very conscientious. He will listen to every complaint that you have, but first and foremost, he will take action on it. He won't just leave it on his desk. And as far as qualification goes, I think, given a little time in

MINUTES OF MARCH 1. 1976

MR. BLOIS (continuing) "the seat, he will have the Public Works Department pretty well straightened out, and truly, the man knows what he is doing. And I hope the Board would support him, too, tonight."

MR. WIESLEY: "Well, I'll have to agree with most of those things, but I felt all along that if we had approved him ten weeks ago, we'd have had a head start. He hasn't slowed down at all during that ten-week period of time. Somebody said he had a big pair of shoes to fill. He also has a big pair of feet with him." (laughter)

MR. MILLER: "I think we can proceed with the vote. The machine has been cleared. The question is on confirmation of Vincent J. Rotondo as Commissioner of Public Works. Cast your vote UP for YES, or DOWN for NO. There are forty members voting. Mr. Rotondo has been confirmed by a VOTE of 25 YES; 15 NO.

MR. DIXON: "Next on the Agenda, Mr. President, is the name of MR. JULIAN SCHWARTZ. Mr. Schwartz is a Republican and resides at 15 Meadowpart Avenue, West. The length of his residency in Stamford is sixty years. He is semi-retired; and in his early years, he graduated from Stamford High School in the class of 1918. In his vocational field, Mr. Schwartz has operated a private retail business in Stamford; he has worked as a reporter for the Stamford Advocate for ten years; and has retired from the position of Chairman and Manager for Station WSTC. Mr. Schwartz is presently involved in civic projects including the Rehabilitation Center and The American Red Cross. He is at present Vice-Chairman on the Commission on Aging, and it is that Commission to which he seeks re-appointment. Mr. President, I would like to say at this point that the Committee interviewed two other appointees for the COMMISSION ON AGING, which I will report on next. I would just like to note that what I am about to say now applies to them and will not be necessary to repeat.

"I was very much impressed with the delightful expressions of happiness these people are sharing on this Commission. It appears that they have formed a sense of belonging and are in fact making a contribution to a very, very worthy cause. Mr. Schwartz mentioned many accomplishments he personally has made, and wished to continue to make if he is re-appointed. The Committee voted 6 YES, with 2 ABSTENTIONS, for his confirmation, and I so MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "Is there a SECOND to that motion? MOVED and SECONDED. The machine has been cleared. The question is confirmation of JULIAN SCHWARTZ as a member of the COMMISSION ON AGING. Cast your vote UP for YES, or DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted?

"MR. SCHWARTZ has been confirmed by a vote of 29 YES, 10 NO, 1 ABSTENTION."

MR. DIXON: "Next, Mr. President, is the name of REV. CYRIL S. PETERS. Rev. Peters resides at 15 Rose Park Avenue and has been a resident of Stamford for fifty years. He is a Republican and proudly presents himself as a man of 83 years. He is an Associate Minister at Bethel A.M.E. Church of Stamford, and he is noted for his good work in hospitals and throughout this community. He has already served two full terms on the Commission on Aging. The Appointments Committee approved him with six yes votes and two abstentions, and I would move now for his confirmation."

MR. MILLER: "Moved and seconded. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote. The REV. PETERS has been confirmed by a vote of 32 YES; 7 NO; 1 ABSTENTION.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON: "The next name is that of MRS. EFFIE MASSIE. Mrs. Massie resides at 26 Main Street, and has been a resident of Stamford for 59 years. She is retired and is a Republican seeking re-appointment to the Commission on Aging. Mrs. Massie is known in many parts of this city for her very charming and outgoing personality which enables her to reach the hearts of the many senior citizens with whom she works, and with whom she is so closely associated. The Appointments Committee approves Mrs. Massie who is herself a senior citizen, with a vote of 5 YES, with 3 ABSTENTIONS, and I move for her confirmation.

MR. MILLER: "Moved and Seconded. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote. MRS. MASSIE has been confirmed by a vote of 29 YES; 8 NO; 3 ABSTENTIONS."

MR. DIXON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Next is the name of MRS. LOUISE WORSHAM, who seeks re-appointment to the Human Rights Commission. Mrs. Worsham is a registered Republican. She resides at 638 Hope St., and has been a resident of Stamford for 24 years. She is a high school graduate and has attended college briefly. Mrs. Worsham's present occupation is that of an assistant trust officer. She takes great pride in the fact that she has served on the Human Rights Commission for six years, but is very reluctant to take credit for the many contributions she has made. Mrs. Worsham has also served four years and six months on the Republican Town Committee, and she continues to demonstrate her deep concern for people and good government. The Appointments Committee approved the appointee with 5 YES and 4 ABSTENTIONS, and I so move for her confirmation."

MR. MILLER: "We're going to have to have a little order in the room if we're going to continue, particularly since we owe the speaker a little attention. Moved and Seconded. We can proceed to vote. We observe that members are not in their seats, and if they're not, we can't vote. And I think these matters deserve our attention. The machine has been cleared. UP for YES; DOWN for NO.

"MRS. WORSHAM has been confirmed by a vote of 29 YES; 11 NO."

MR. DIXON: "The next name that appears on the Agenda is that of MR. WILLIAM GREANEY. His name has been withdrawn.

"So we move on to number seven. The next name is that of MR. JOHN N. WILTRAKIS who is seeking re-appointment to the Human Rights Commission. Mr. Wiltrakis is a Republican and resides at 8 Westcott Road, and has been a resident of Stamford for 5½ years. Professionally, he is a senior corporate attorney, Department Director with ITT, Continental Baking Co. Mr. Wiltrakis is a recipient of a Political Science degree from Loyola University in 1962; Juris Doctor of Law degree from University of Illinois, College of Law, 1965; he had post graduate Law Studies at University of North Carolina and New York University, plus numerous continuing legal education courses and seminars.

"Mr. Wiltrakis has very varying degrees of experience in his field of endeavors in which includes legal specialty work in the Civil Rights Law: moderator of numerous seminars on equal employment opportunity, Director of Equal Employment Opportunity of major international corporations; Chairman of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission of major trade association; Active member of equal opportunity and labor law committee, Westchester-Fairfield Corporate Counsel Assn.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

"Mr. Wiltrakis feels that because of his background as an attorney, he has rendered and will continue to render valuable service to the Human Rights Commission and, I might add, that the Appointments Committee is in full accord with that, but, Mr. President, in spite of Mr. Wiltrakis' background, which, without^adoubt is a reservoir of knowledge, experience, and expertise, I feel that in all fairness to him, the members of the Board, and the public, that I should make known the fact that another group sat in on this particular interview. This group represented the Stamford Chapter of the National Organization of Women. This organization (NOW) is opposed to the re-appointment of Mr. Wiltrakis, alleging that since he is Chapter Chairman of the Connecticut Rights-to-Life Corporation, impossible conflict of interest is constituted.

"The Appointments Committee questioned Mr. Wiltrakis a length on matters pertinent to the Rights-to-Life organization. The possible conflict of interest being his interpretation of the law as it applies to conflict of interest. His answers to our questions were satisfactory; The Committee feels he vindicated himself from the allegations.

"Therefore, Mr. President, the Committee having voted 7 YES; with 1 ABSTENTION, I would move for his confirmation. Thank you."

MR. FOX: "It is a privilege for me to second the nomination of Mr. Wiltrakis. I feel that the City of Stamford is fortunate to have someone of his ability and integrity, willing to devote his time to our city. I second his nomination."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote, UP for YES, DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted? Mr. Wiltrakis has been confirmed by a vote of 26 YES, 14 NO."

MR. DIXON: "The next name on the Agenda is that of MR. ATHANASIOS LOTER. Mr. Loter is a Republican and resides at 220 High Clear Drive. He has been a resident of Stamford for eighteen years (Mr. Miller banging the gavel and calling for order) and is seeking re-appointment to the Board of Ethics. Mr. Loter is presently Chairman of that board. He is a Research Chemist and has a B.S. degree in Chemistry. He has also done graduate work in chemistry at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute from 1946 to 1950. Mr. Loter feels that as a charter member of the Board of Ethics, having served continuously since its inception, he has demonstrated fairness and fulfilled all the requirements of the office.

"The Appointments Committee was impressed with the degree of experience Mr. Loter possesses, and therefore voted 6 YES, with 2 ABSTENTIONS for his approval, and I so MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "Is there a second? Moved and seconded. Two-thirds of the members present and voting are required. I think we can proceed to a vote."

MR. HOFFMAN: "I take a great deal of pleasure in seconding the nomination of Mr. Loter. I have known Mr. Loter for a number of years. I think that he served the Board of Ethics admirably in the past. I think that he was very impartial. He took the Board of Ethics and removed it from politics, and I would certainly hope that all the Board members would return him to that particular job. Thank you, Mr. President."

MR. MILLER: "The machine has been cleared. The question is on the confirmation of Athanasios Loter as a member of the Board of Ethics. Cast your vote.

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER (continuing) "UP for YES; DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted? Mr. Loter has been confirmed by a vote of 28 YES; 12 NO."

MR. DIXON: "Next, Mr. President, is the name of MR. JACK PALMER. Mr. Palmer is seeking confirmation of his appointment to the Patriotic and Special Events Commission. He is a lifelong resident of Stamford, and presently resides at 22 Carriage Drive South. He is a Republican and a former member of this Board. Mr. Palmer was a student of the Stamford schools and is a graduate from the Stamford High School. He attended the University of Connecticut. Presently he is a member of the Stamford Historical Society; President of the Marine Corp League; and has a wide range of other activities and interests. And I might say that Mr. Palmer has a special interest in parades and has participated in all the recent parades in Stamford. By a vote of 6 YES, and 2 ABSTENTIONS, the Committee has voted to approve Mr. Palmer's appointment and I move for his confirmation."

MR. MILLER: "Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. The machine has been cleared. The question is on confirmation of Jack Palmer as a member of the Patriotic and Special Events Commission. Cast your vote UP for YES, or DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted? MR. PALMER has been confirmed by a vote of 21 YES; 19 NO."

MR. DIXON: "The next name "

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "Mr. President, I would like the Minutes to show that I abstained from this next vote."

MR. MILLER: "I would suggest, Mr. D'Agostino, that you just leave the floor, since it's a closed ballot, so the record will show that Mr. D'AGOSTINO is leaving the floor during this vote. We now have 39 members present."

MR. DIXON: "Next on the Agenda is the name of Mr. CARMINE D'AGOSTINO, who also seeks confirmation of his appointment to the Patriotic and Special Events Committee. Mr. D'Agostino is a Democrat and lives at 159 Woodbury Avenue. He is also a lifelong resident of Stamford. By trade, he is a machinist. He graduated from Stamford High School in the class of 1938 and he has served in the United States Armed Forces. Mr. D'Agostino has a strong interest in the City of Stamford and would like very much to become actively involved. This being the Bicentennial Year, he feels that he can give a lot of in-put to the many programs and activities formulated in Stamford. The Appointments Committee approved Mr. D'Agostino's appointment by a vote of 7 YES and 1 ABSTENTION, so I would move for his confirmation."

MR. MILLER: "Moved and Seconded. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote. Mr. D'Agostino has been confirmed by a vote of 26 YES, 12 NO, and 1 ABSTENTION."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, the next name on the Agenda is that of Dr. Michael Sabia. That name is being HELD IN COMMITTEE because there has been no interview of Dr. Sabia."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON (continuing)

"Continuing on, Mr. President, I would now present the name of MR. KENNETH R. LANGE who seeks re-appointment to the School Building Committee. To give you further information, I would say at this time, his term runs concurrent with the Mayor's term which expires December 1, 1977. Mr. Lange is a Republican and resides at 1887 Newfield Avenue, and has been a resident of Stamford for eight years. He is also an architect, and has a Bachelor's degree in Architecture from the Pennsylvania State University. Mr. Lange has a very broad range of experience in the field of architecture and has demonstrated the skills and ability to fill all the requirements and duties of the position. The Appointments Committee has voted UNANIMOUSLY for his approval and I move now for his confirmation."

MRS. SANTY: "It gives me great pleasure to second Mr. Lange's nomination. We are very fortunate to have a man of such expertise. Mr. Signore joins me in that Second." (laughter and chuckles)

MR. MILLER: "The CHAIR would note that Mr. D'Agostino has returned to the floor. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote. Is there anyone who has not voted? Mr. Lange has been confirmed by a vote of 28 YES; 11 NO; 1 ABSTENTION."

MR. DIXON: "I would now present the name of MR. HARRY P. ALTER, Mr. President, who is seeking re-appointment to the Board of Taxation. Mr. Alter resides at 202 Idlewood Drive. He is a Republican and has been a resident of Stamford for 56 years. Presently he is serving as Chairman of the Board of Taxation. Professionally, Mr. Alter is an accountant. He has broadened his scope in the field of accounting by attending New York University, The University of Bridgeport, and Fordham University. He has thirty years of experience in accounting, taxation, systems and procedures and budgetary controls. Mr. Alter has strong desires to be re-appointed as this would enable him to complete some changes he personally has initiated for improvements in the Tax Department. The Committee feels that Mr. Alter has demonstrated eminent qualifications for this appointment, and has voted UNANIMOUSLY for his approval, and on that behalf, I would move for his confirmation."

MRS. RAYMOND: "Yes, it gives me great pleasure to second Mr. Alter's nomination. I think Mr. Alter is a very competent and qualified gentleman. I have known him for a number of years personally. I have had some very close dealings with him, and I think we're very fortunate to have a man of his calibre willing to serve this city."

MR. SHERER: "Yes, it's also in order for me to second his nomination. His professionalism is a great addition to the Board of Taxation, as well as his concern for maintaining the continuity of the great work that they are doing to re-vamp the department, and I join that Second. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "I think we can proceed to a vote. The machine has been cleared. Cast your vote. Note for the record that there are 39 members present, since MR. CONNORS has left the floor, probably for the evening. If there is no one who has not voted, we will now take the count. MR. ALTER has been confirmed by a vote of 25 YES, 14 NO."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON: "MR. HERBERT B. KOHN, Mr. President, is the next name on the Agenda. Mr. Kohn has been a citizen of Stamford for 21 years. He is a registered Democrat and resides at 6 Kenilworth Drive East. Professionally, he is President of Komar Furniture, Inc. He is a graduate from the University of Ohio, and has also attended Colby College. He is also a veteran of the United States Armed Forces. Was a veteran. Mr. Kohn is a member of the Stamford Development Corp. and is actively engaged in many civic duties and responsibilities. In seeking confirmation of his appointment to the Environmental Protection Board, Mr. Kohn has expressed great interest with the assurance that his appointment to that Board will bring the kind of expertise that will permit its growth and at the same time will protect the interest of the citizens of Stamford. The Committee approved his appointment by a UNANIMOUS vote, and I would now move for his confirmation. Mr. President, I might add that Mr. Kohn has made a disclosure of his real estate holdings as required by the Charter."

MR. BLOIS: "I would like to second the motion of Mr. Kohn, and I would like to say that I have known Mr. Kohn for a very long time. And he comes to us with the highest quality of capabilities, and he has been very active in the City of Stamford in many aspects, in sports, in politics, whatever-you-have, he's got it. He's a gentleman all the way through; he's got good common sense and a lot of knowledge. I would hope that this Board would put him in. Thank you."

MR. RAVALLESE: "I also endorse Herb Kohn. It's a great pleasure to see an East-Sider finally get on some board."

MR. LOOMIS: "They've said it all."

MRS. HAWES: "Yes, thank you. I would also like to second the nomination of Herbert Kohn. I think he'll do a good job, as he always has in the past with anything he's involved with in the City. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "The CHAIR has declared the question is ^{on} confirmation of Herbert Kohn as a member of the Environmental Protection Board. Cast your vote, UP for YES, DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted? Mr. KOHN has been confirmed by a vote of 25 YES, 13 NO, and 1 ABSTENTION."

MR. DIXON: "Last but not least is the name of Mr. SEYMOUR WEINSTEIN, who lives at 41 Foxwood Road. Mr. Weinstein is a registered Democrat and has been a resident of Stamford for 5 years. He is a lawyer, having received a B.A. degree from Yale College in 1957 and a law degree from the University of Connecticut in 1963. Mr. Weinstein is seeking confirmation of his appointment to the Stamford Transit District. From 1963 to 1969, he was Counsel for the New Haven Railroad and was involved with operational matters of the railroad, trucks, busses, financing, and subsidies. From 1971 through 1975, Mr. Weinstein was counsel with a chemical company and involved in the financial affairs of the transportation department. He is well aware of Stamford's transit problems, and feels that his appointment will provide the implementation needed by its resolutions. He, too, has received the UNANIMOUS approval of the Appointments Committee and I now move for his confirmation."

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM: "I, too, would like to second the nomination of Mr. Weinstein. I believe this time we have a man who brings the expertise on transportation that is needed. Thank you."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, at the end of the Appointments, the report from the Appointments Committee, I would like to be recognized on a point of Personal Privilege."

MR. MILLER: "At the end of the entire report of the Appointments Committee? Yes? Thank you. We will now proceed to a vote on the appointment of SEYMOUR WEINSTEIN as a member of the Transit District. Cast your vote UP for YES, DOWN for NO. Is there anyone who has not voted? MR. WEINSTEIN has NOT been confirmed. There are 26 NO votes, 13 YES votes."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, the name of ARTHUR STEIN which is also on the Agenda is being HELD IN COMMITTEE. MR. STEIN could not make it to the meeting, and he has not been interviewed."

"That ends my report. Thank you." (SEE NEXT PAGE FOR TALLY OF APPOINTMENTS)

MR. MILLER: (pounding his gavel for attention) Mr. Livingston?"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. I will not prolong things by my statement. I am positive that there will be some Board members that will disagree with my feelings, but Mr. President, we have before us, on the Agenda, "

MR. MILLER: "Are you making a motion to adjourn?"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Yes, Mr. President."

MR. MILLER: "That's not a Point of Personal Privilege, but you can make the motion, Mr. Livingston, so go ahead."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Before us, we have an Agenda of the Fiscal Committee. We're talking about spending probably close to three million dollars of taxpayers' money. Mr. President, all of these items should take half ... and deserve careful ... "

MR. MILLER: "Why don't you just make the motion, it's not debatable."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "I make a motion that we adjourn to tomorrow night at eight o'clock."

MR. MILLER: "The CHAIR would observe that this order would not be appropriate (pounding the gavel), and next Monday would not be good either as we were all invited to Drug Liberation, and I think it would not be fair to adjourn to that evening. The CHAIR would simply observe we go any further with this MOTION that it is our understanding that there are some items on the Agenda, I think a couple, which must be acted upon by a certain date, and if we don't act, we'll have certain problems. I believe those items are both in FISCAL and in LEGISLATIVE AND RULES."

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: The following appointments were voted upon, using the voting machine specified in the Rules of Order. The vote is recorded below:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSIONER:

Term Expires:
Nov. 30, 1977

(1) VINCENT J. ROTONDO (R) VOTE: 25 Yes
15 Mansfield Place 15 No
Westport, Conn. 06880
(second submission)

COMMISSION ON AGING:

(2) MR. JULIAN SCHWARTZ (R) VOTE: 29 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
15 Meadowpark Ave., West 10 NO
(re-appointment) 1 Abstain

(3) REV. CYRIL S. PETERS (R) VOTE: 32 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
15 Rose Park Avenue 7 No
(re-appointment) 1 Abstain

(4) MRS. EFFIE MASSIE (R) VOTE: 29 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
26 Main Street 8 No
(re-appointment) 3 Abstain

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION:

(5) MRS. LOUISE WORSHAM (R) VOTE: 29 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
638 Hope St., Springdale 11 No
(re-appointment)

(6) MR. M. WM. GREANEY (R) Name withdrawn Dec. 1, 1978
133 Culloden Road
(re-appointment)

(7) MR. JOHN N. WILTRAKIS (R) VOTE: 26 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
8 Westcott Road 14 No
(re-appointment)

BOARD OF ETHICS:

(8) MR. ATHANASIOS LOTER (R) VOTE: 28 Yes June 30, 1980
220 High Cleark Drive 12 No
(re-appointment)
(vote required: 2/3 of those present and voting)

PATRIOTIC AND SPECIAL EVENTS:

(9) MR. JACK PALMER (R) VOTE: 21 Yes Dec. 1, 1980
22 Carriage Drive, South 19 No
(replacing J. Hogan, whose
term expired)

(10) MR. GARMINE D'AGOSTINO (D) VOTE: 26 Yes Dec. 1, 1978
159 Woodbury Avenue 12 No
(replacing Stephen Sackman 1 Abstain
who resigned) 1 left floor

HEALTH COMMISSION:

(11) DR. MICHAEL SABIA (R) HELD IN COMMITTEE Dec. 1, 1980
22 Rambler Lane
(re-appointment)

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued: The following appointments were voted upon, using the voting machine specified in the Rules of Order. The vote is recorded below:

SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE:

(12) MR. KENNETH R. LANGE (R)
1887 Newfield Avenue
(re-appointment - term
runs concurrently with
Mayor)

VOTE: 28 Yes
11 No
1 Abstain

Term Expires:

Dec. 1, 1977

BOARD OF TAXATION:

(13) MR. HARRY P. ALTER (R)
202 Idlewood Drive
(re-appointment)

VOTE: 25 Yes
14 No

Dec. 1, 1980

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD:

(14) MR. HERBERT KOHN (D)
6 Kenilworth Drive, East
(replacing Edw. Connell
whose term expired)

VOTE: 25 Yes
13 No
1 Abstain

Dec. 1, 1978

TRANSIT DISTRICT:

(15) MR. SEYMOUR N. WEINSTEIN (D)
41 Foxwood Road
(replacing A. Masciarelli
whose term expired)

DENIED
VOTE: 13 Yes
26 No

Dec. 1, 1979

BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS:

(16) MR. ARTHUR STEIN (D)
24 Hannahs Road
(re-appointment)

HELD IN COMMITTEE

Dec. 1, 1980

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 1976

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Would it be in order, Mr. President, to make a motion to adjourn until Wednesday or Thursday night?"

MR. MILLER: "I think Wednesday being Ash Wednesday is a day which some people would be"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Then I make a motion that we adjourn until Thursday night."

MR. MILLER: "All right. The CHAIR will observe that we do have a meeting of the Personnel Board of Appeals for Thursday night, but that could be delayed until the end of the regular Board meeting. I just want to get some indication from Mr. Morgan if adjourning to Thursday would present any legal problems with regard to any of his items."

MR. MORGAN: "No, Mr. President. There are two items that must be acted on the first part of March, the Stamford Day Care Center and the Community Development Program request, but the delay of a week would not be significant. As Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, I would like to say I would like to see the Fiscal Committee items taken care of tonight."

MR. MILLER: "All right, but this is not a debatable motion. We are just seeking information. Mr. Fox, is there any business in your committee which must be acted upon before Thursday evening?"

MR. FOX: "Mr. President, there is only one item which I would like to have acted upon by the middle of March ... by this Thursday, in answer to your question, no, sir."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you. I don't think there are any other items on the Agenda which are of the emergency nature. Now, we have a motion on the floor. We have a motion on the floor to adjourn to Thursday evening at 8:00 p.m."

MRS. RAYMOND: "I would like to thank Mr. Livingston for making ^{the} motion and I hope that the whole Board will second that motion "

MR. MILLER: "Moved and seconded. We'll take a vote on the motion. The question is on adjournment to Thursday, adjournment of the regular meeting to Thursday at 8 p.m. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. (A few NO votes) The motion is CARRIED. The meeting is ADJOURNED.

The meeting was ADJOURNED at 12:30 A.M. (3/2/76) to be continued on Thursday, March 4, 1976 at 8:00 p.m.

APPROVED:

Frederick E. Miller, Jr.

By

Helen M. McEvoy
Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Assistant
and Recording Secretary
Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Connecticut

Frederick E. Miller, Jr., President
14th Board of Representatives
HMM:JV:MS

Note: Above meeting was broadcast over
Radio Station WSTC in its entirety.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED MEETING OF MARCH 4, 197614th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVESSTAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

An Adjourned Meeting, being adjourned from the Regular Monthly Meeting of the 14th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Thursday, March 4, 1976, in the Board Meeting Room, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, in order to complete the unfinished business still pending from the previous meeting of March 1, 1976.

The meeting was called to order by the PRESIDENT, FREDERICK E. MILLER, JR., at 8:08 P.M.

INVOCATION - None was given, as this is a continuation of the March 1, 1976 meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: The PRESIDENT led the members in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL: Roll Call was taken by the CLERK, LINDA D. CLARK.
There were 36 members present, and 4 absent. The absent members were: Leonard Hoffman (R-11), Michael Morgan (D-12), Christine Nizolek (D-2), and John Sandor (D-4).

The PRESIDENT declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: A check of the voting machine was conducted and it was found to be in good working order.

PAGES: Gene Hays and Gary Hays, students at Davenport Ridge School, and sons of 20th District Representative George Hays (R).

MR. MILLER: "I believe Mrs. SANTY wishes to be recognized at this time."

MRS. SANTY: "This evening I would like to express to the smokers of this Body that non-smokers also have rights. The right to breathe clean air, free from harmful and irritating tobacco smoke; this right supersedes the right to smoke when the two conflict. I think it is imperative that non-smokers start demanding their rights. The smoker has a right to accept health risks for himself, or herself, but he does not have a right to expose non-smokers to these risks.

"I refer to Public Act 74-126, an Act prohibiting smoking at public meetings in public buildings. No person, as it states, shall smoke in any room in a public building while a meeting open to the public is in progress in such room. I have a copy of the law and also an opinion from the State Attorney General which defines this building as a public building and that the language of the statute is clear and explicit, and contains no exceptions or qualifications.

MRS. SANTY (continuing): "Therefore, an election not to post the sign is invalid. I would like to add that the object of the Non-Smokers' Rights Law is not specifically to arrest smokers who ignore the law, but to convince smokers that laws are serious and not merely polite requests. I ask you, Mr. President, to remind the members of this Body to respect and obey the law."

(Some sounds and talk, inaudible on the tape)

MR. MILLER: "I don't think that was called for; and I don't think it's necessary in here. Yes, I do. Mrs. Santy has the right to make the MOTION she is making."

MRS. SANTY: "I am not making a MOTION to post the sign because I do not have to make the motion."

MR. MILLER: "Well, the CHAIR would simply like to make a few observations. We went through this at great length in the 13th Board. We have the State statute and the basic problem seems to have been that there is no question that once the sign is posted, smoking is then prohibited.

"The question which is raised over and over again is, do the people having control of the premises have the duty to put up the sign. Now, I'll tell you something about the history of this as far as the Board is concerned. There was an opinion written by JOEL FREEDMAN when he was CORPORATION COUNSEL, which indicated that we did not have a duty to put up the sign. You understand that was an opinion and we know what a corporation counsel's opinion is, and it is highly persuasive, but it's not necessarily something that we have to follow.

"Later there was an opinion authored by Mr. Lynch at the direction of Robert K. Killian, Attorney General of the State of Connecticut, and this was in response to a letter from Dr. Lloyd, the Commissioner of the Department of Health, and that opinion, of course, conflicted with Mr. Friedman's opinion. It was Attorney General Killian's opinion, through Mr. Lynch, that the people having control of the premises have a duty to put up the sign. Here again, an opinion from the Attorney General is not the same as a letter from a Court.

"It is my position, and it has been my position, that as far as I am concerned, when the Board is in session here, the people who have control of the premises would be a majority of those present and voting on this Board. On one occasion, I did, on my own, put up the sign and there was a motion made and passed to take it down; but my basic position is that it is up to a majority of this Board. I do not accept the argument that it is necessarily illegal to not have that sign up on the wall. I think it is an open question and the answer to the question, if it can't be resolved through litigation in court, is to change the law up in the Legislature; but it seems to me that an obvious loop-hole was left here and the obvious cure is to get the law changed, to get the statute changed so it would be more explicit. So, if anybody wishes to make a MOTION to put up the sign, I will accept that motion."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, at this time, I would object to any motion being made to putting up a sign against no smoking. This is a meeting that was adjourned and it's a continuation of the previous meeting. We went through this process, a vote came out. I object to that sign being on that wall, and I feel obligated that you should take it down, and I AM going to smoke. I object to that sign, take it down!"

MR. MILLER: "You see, according to the statute I was just referring to, the sign has to have letters at least four (4) inches high. Now that sign would be illegal."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, I'd like to say another thing. This is our room; we, elected by the People of our districts have a right."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Livingston, Mrs. Santy has made a comment. Now, there's no motion on the floor."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "There's no motion on the floor, but as a Point of Personal Privilege, I feel that that sign should be taken down. There's been no motion to put that sign there. This is our room. It says 'Thank you for not smoking.'"

MR. MILLER: "I can't see the sign, Mr. Livingston, because the flag is in the way, but it really doesn't make any difference whether that sign is up, because in order to have this statute become operative, you have to have a sign with letters four inches high, and that sign doesn't qualify."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "But the point is, Mr. President, no one should have the right to come in this room and paste things on our walls unless this Board approves of it."

MR. MILLER: "I don't know who put the sign up, Mr. Livingston, but it's beside the point I think."

MRS. COSENTINI: "We all have rights and privileges. I think Mrs. Santy is absolutely correct. I would like to say I think it's a shame that laws all have to go to court before anybody is going to enforce them, frankly. Obviously, if we were going to challenge a ruling, the non-smokers would lose since the smokers clearly have the majority, but I think I would have to appeal, then, to the good conscience of those people who share this room with those of us who do not smoke."

"The law says that we must teach in the public schools the evils of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs, and so forth and so on, in terms of health. That's a requirement. We just established a Drug Liberation Committee on this Board because we are concerned with the kinds of harm that drugs can do to the body. Smoking has been proven, also, to be a harmful substance to the body."

"If we don't wish to share in your particular indulgence, I don't think we should be forced to, simply because you have majority. Majority rule is majority rule of protection of the minority, otherwise, it is merely some kind of a repressive government."

(MR. LIVINGSTON removed the sign)

MR. SIGNORE: "Mr. President, I think Mr. Livingston's action of taking that sign down is uncalled for. I believe you're the President of the Board, and you run this Board. It does not state on that sign anywhere, anything about not smoking; it just says "Thank You For Not Smoking", and that's thanking the people who do not smoke; it doesn't stop anybody from smoking. I think that was uncalled for, for him to get out of his seat and pull the sign down! He doesn't own this Board!"

MR. MILLER: "My only point, Mr. Signore, is that as far as the statute that we're discussing, whether or not that sign is up on the wall, is beside the point, because even if we had voted to put it up, or if I had insisted that it be put up on the wall, it doesn't have letters that are four inches high."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Yes, Mr. President. I can't say let's move the question, because I don't think there's a question on the floor, but I think it would be better if we just got down to Board business."

MR. MILLER: "Your point is well taken, but I let Mrs. Santy make a statement and I think it's only fair to allow others, but I would remind everybody that we don't have a motion on the floor."

MR. FLANAGAN: "Ladies and gentlemen of the Board, for 22, twenty-two, years, I smoked three packages of cigarettes a day. Ten years ago, on the advice of my doctors, because I had developed chronic bronchitis, I gave up smoking. Every night that I sit in this room with the smokers, it is damaging my health. That's not just a matter of conjection, that's a matter of fact, so as a minority who would prefer not to see this room filled with smoke every night that we meet, I would like my rights to be thought of when you talk about this question, because it does damage my health. If any one of you think that cigarettes don't bother you and that they're not bad for your lungs, just is untrue with the facts today."

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. On the brighter side, I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate all the candidates who won the City Committee election this past Tuesday (clapping), especially the Democrats who won their elections."

MR. CONNORS: "To go along with what Mr. Flanagan said, forty years ago, a doctor told me, if you don't stop smoking Camels, you're going to die. Well, I lived a long time since, and outside of a little coughing now and then, I don't have too many troubles in the world, and I'm still smoking, and I'm still smoking Camels! They're supposed to be very, very bad for me, a very strong cigarette; I should've taken a weaker one, and I haven't taken a weaker one since and I'm still coughing and I'm still smoking!"

MR. MILLER: "I think it's time to just cut this off ... no more talk about smoking ... if there's no motion"

MR. SIGNORE: "What about putting the sign back up, Mr. President, it doesn't say anything about not smoking, it just says thank you for not smoking; it's talking to the people who do not smoke."

MR. MILLER: "I don't know who put the sign up, and I don't care if the sign is up or not; if somebody wants to make a motion to put it up, we'll have a motion to put it up, but it's not going to make it illegal to smoke, according to the statute. I think we'll go on to the Fiscal Committee."

MRS. RITCHIE: "I make a MOTION to put the sign up because I have been a chronic sufferer of sinus condition, and after I'm in a smoke-filled room, the next day only I know what a severe headache I have, and other people who suffer with sinus know what I'm talking about. "

MR. MILLER: "Mrs. Santy's sign?"

MRS. RITCHIE: "Any sign. I think that the thank you for not smoking is sufficient, because the people who are conscientious will obey it."

MR. MILLER: "No, it's not going to be sufficient."

MRS. RITCHIE: "All right, then, let us put the official sign up."

MR. MILLER: "All right, we'll vote on the official sign. MOVED and SECONDED by Mr. Signore."

MR. RAVALLESE: "This is the same meeting. We postponed it from the last meeting and we voted on that, so we cannot vote again on it."

MR. MILLER: "I don't agree with that, I'm sorry, Mr. Ravallese. I think if there's no more discussion, we'll take a vote on this. The question is whether or not to put up the sign, and there's no question about it once that sign with the letters four inches high is upon the wall, there's no question about it, it's illegal to smoke. I don't know who is going to enforce that, we don't have a Sergeant-at-Arms, but .. you can't make a motion for a machine vote, you want a motion for a roll call? Those desiring a roll call, raise their hands. All right, there's a sufficient number, we'll take the vote by roll call. A YES vote is for the sign to go up; a NO vote is in opposition."

MR. BAXTER: "Question, Mr. President. Assuming this vote should win tonight, and if we voted on it at the next meeting, the sign, I take it would then come down, if that motion should win?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, let's put it this way, Mr. Baxter, if we vote to put up the sign at this meeting, we'll put up the sign for the balance of the meeting, and I will promise to put up the sign at the beginning of the next meeting, and if anybody wants to make a motion to take it down, we'll entertain that motion."

MR. BAXTER: "Then I take it, from your ruling before, that we could make this motion as many times during any one evening as we choose?"

MR. MILLER: "I would say so, yes. Well, not during the same evening, no."

MR. BAXTER: "Well, this is the same evening. I'd like you to clarify your ruling to Mr. Ravallese, sir. How many times, during the same meeting, can the same motion be made?"

MR. MILLER: "I would say that it could be made only once in one evening. I know this is a continuation of a previous meeting."

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Mr. President, shouldn't this be a matter that should go before the Steering Committee?" (laughter)

MR. MILLER: "No, it's been before the Steering Committee before. (Laughter) We'll take a vote, the Clerk will call the Roll. The record will indicate that Mr. Connors, Mr. Walsh, and Mrs. Raymond are not present. There are 35 members present. The Clerk will call the Roll."

ROLL CALL on MOTION TO PUT UP THE NO SMOKING SIGN:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR:

CARLUCCI, Leo	D-5
CLARK, Linda D.	D-6
COSENTINI, Audrey	R-13
DeROSE, Joseph	D-15
FLANAGAN, William H.	R-19
FOX, John Wayne	D-15
GLUCKSMAN, L. Morris	D-11
McINERNEY, Barbara	R-20
OSUCH, Adam	R-14
RAYMOND, Jean	R-16
RITCHIE, Mildred	R-10
ROSE, Matthew	D-3
SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	R-18
SHERER, Donald	R-10
SIGNORE, S. A.	R-18
WIESLEY, Vere	R-13

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION:

CONNORS, George	D-8
COSTELLO, Robert	D-6
D'AGOSTINO, Thomas	D-17
DIXON, Handy	D-2
GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	D-16
HAVE, Marie	R-1
HAYS, George	R-20
LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	D-5
LOBOZZA, James	R-17
LOWDEN, Lynn	D-1
MILLER, Frederick E., Jr.	D-3
PERILLO, Alfred	D-9
RAVALLESE, George	D-8
RYBNICK, Gerald	D-4
WALSH, Peter	D-7

THOSE ABSTAINING FROM VOTING:

BAXTER, George	D-7
BLUM, David I.	D-12
BLOIS, Julius	D-14
PERILLO, Mildred	D-9

MR. MILLER: "The MOTION is CARRIED, with 16 YES votes; 15 NO votes; and 4 abstentions. You can put it up, Mrs. Santy. I give you the honor." (applause)

MR. CONNORS: "In other words, any member of this Board, if you'd like to have a smoke, he could take a walk?"

MR. MILLER: "I guess that's what you'd better do."

MR. CONNORS: "This meeting is going to get ridiculous; it's bad enough now, it's going to get worse."

MR. MILLER: "All right, Mr. Connors, the law is the law. There's no question about it, the majority want it up....so."

MR. CONNORS: "No, it's not the majority, it's close."

MR. MILLER: "We'll move on to Fiscal Committee business."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, if I could, I'd like to retract to the Appointments Chairman for a moment, please."

MR. MILLER: "All right, do you have a point? Just a second, please."

MR. SHERER: "Mr. President, I would like to hope that in the interest of fair play, and the fact that we are the law-making body of this community, that members on both sides of the aisle, who voted either way, would be willing to abide by the law that the majority of this Board has passed, and I notice that people are still smoking; while that sign is up, the law says "No Smoking". I would hope that they would respect that law."

MR. MILLER: "I think I'll move on to Fiscal, but before we move on to Fiscal, I'm going to call on Mrs. McInerney again because she has something left over from Appointments, and we've already closed on that, but it is a question?"

MRS. McINERNEY: "I couldn't do it because we adjourned last month, or last week. Through the Chair, Mr. President, I'd like to ask Mr. Dixon and his Committee if they would make copies of the resumes of the candidates who are coming before our Board and mail them to us prior to the Board's meeting. Now we had an agenda of 16 people Monday night and some came on, some did not, but prior to coming here Monday night, we never even see any of those resumes and I think it would only be a common courtesy to have each and every one of us receive a copy where we could make our own ruling as to whether or not we feel the people are truly qualified and can research them."

MR. MILLER: "Your point is well taken. Thank you. You heard that, Mr. Dixon? Do you have a response?"

MR. DIXON: "I would just like to ask Mrs. McInerney if she has, in the past, been receiving resumes?"

MRS. McINERNEY: "No, Mr. Dixon, but I think it would be a very good idea for future business of this Board, because some of these people are completely foreign to me, and I don't hear anything about them until the night we're voting and you must remember that their terms quite out-live ours on this Board. Some of them are appointed for five years, and I just would like to know a little bit about them and their expertise and their criteria for seeking seats on these particular committees and commissions."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Dixon, and Mr. Boccuzzi before him, always did go into the background of these appointees."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, that, to my knowledge, has always been included in the report. Now I'm sure it would impose a hardship on the Committee and the office to get this out to 40 members."

2
MRS. McINERNEY: "Mr. Dixon, this is in the interest of good City government and good City boards and bureaus, and I think if we get a copy of a resume from the Mayor's office that it wouldn't cost that much to mail 40 copies and put it in the mailing."

MR. MILLER: "Well, let me just correct a misunderstanding here. We don't necessarily get a resume from the Mayor's Office and we haven't. All we get from the Mayor's Office is a letter to the President of the Board with a list of his appointments. Then once we get the names, then the person who is appointed by the Mayor is asked to fill out a form for this Board. So we don't get anything from the Mayor's office. We have a form to be filled out here."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Well, couldn't a copy of that form, once it's filled out, be sent out to all 40 Board members with the mailers that we get during the course of the month?"

MR. MILLER: "It could, but you have to remember the Steering Committee meets always normally two weeks before a full Board meeting. Sometimes the Mayor gets the names down almost just before the Steering Committee meets. So I just want to make a point that it might happen that it will be impossible to get these resumes out quite a few days before the regular Board meeting, but we'll try."

MR. DIXON: "Just to throw a little more light on that, I might say that we don't always get a complete resume on a candidate. A lot of them just don't submit resumes; they fill out the form and provide the Committee with the information that is required on the form. We don't always get a resume."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Mr. Dixon, is a resume sent to the individual town committees?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, we don't get into that, but Mr. Dixon can respond if he wants to, but all the Mayor has to give the Board is a letter with the appointments and it is the Board policy to give these people a form which they are to fill out."

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "Shouldn't this be put in writing and go before the Steering Committee, Mr. President?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, I think it could be; I think it would take a lot of time, but I recognized Mrs. McInerney and I think she's raised this point now."

MR. SIGNORE: "I would like to say that Mr. Dixon and Mr. Boccuzzi have given excellent reports on each candidate. However, I think that Mrs. McInerney's suggestion has merit in the fact that if every representative was given the information on the candidates before they came to the meeting, it probably would save a lot of time, a lot of energy on Mr. Dixon's part, and he could just nominate the people and then they would know how they felt before they walked in the room and I think it would save an awful lot of time."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Yes, Mr. President, I think the most important thing on my mind right now is that, and I brought it up in caucus last time, I think we should have a report on the attendance record of these people that are being re-appointed. In view of what we found about a few other people, I think it would be to the betterment of everybody if we know how these people attended meetings."

MR. MILLER: "Well, the CHAIR would simply observe that that question has been asked at various times when people were coming in for re-appointment, but you know our Chairman of the Appointments Committee has only so much time; I can't state here that we are going to have a definite policy of looking up everybody's attendance record." (End of Tape A)

MR. LOBOZZA: "On someone who is being re-appointed, just to have a simple form stating that the man had 70, 80, 90 percent, it wouldn't be too much trouble at all, I don't think."

MR. MILLER: "Well, I think it would, if you want to change the form to ask that question, you can talk to Mr. Dixon, because we could change the form to include another question, but if we're talking about a lot of research, minutes of the meetings of these various boards and commissions, it does take time and the office doesn't have time to do it."

MR. CONNORS: "Being a former member of the Appointments Committee, I don't think it's fair to a chairman or anybody else, to ask them, presuming now they can't meet on say Thursday night or Friday night. How is it humanly possible to have a report in before the Board members on Monday night? Now, I was on that committee for about six years and I know for a fact there are certain nights certain individuals cannot meet with you, they cannot give you a resume; I think it's very unfair to any chairman to ask him to get a report into every member of this Board's hands by Monday night, the following Monday night. No, after all, they bring in a very good resume and after all we sit here and we listen to them, what they say, and I feel that they are really justified in what they say because they bring out exactly everything that is supposed to be brought out. I don't think half of the memos they send out would even be read and let's be honest about it."

MRS. COSENTINI: "Again, we have to remind ourselves what our duty is on this Board. If we need research, we should provide for it. I don't think there is any excuse for any of us to vote without adequate information or the feeling that we do not know what we are about. Our Appointments Committee has been thorough as far as I've been able to see thus far. If they need assistance, if we have to alter our procedure, if we have to make demands on the Mayor to send names down early, then this should be done. I don't think there is any excuse for sloppy procedures and I don't think there is any excuse for inadequate procedures. If we need additional help, we take those measures and get it for ourselves."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, respectfully to Mrs. Cosentini, I think she referred to sloppy presentations "

MRS. COSENTINI: "I said there's no excuse ever for"

MR. MILLER: "I don't think she is talking about anybody on the Board necessarily; she's talking about the procedures."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mrs. Cosentini. Mr. President, I believe the department's committee has always done a, well, an exceptional, good job in their presentation. The point should be well taken, but I honestly believe Mr. Connors brought out some very valid points. How on earth are these reports to be given in the proper kind of way? Thank you."

MR. RYBNICK: "The information I was going to remark on, George has presented it."

MR. HAYES: "Mr. President, I will speak in favor of the comments both by Mrs. Cosentini and by Mr. Lobozza. This is in no ways critical of the job our Appointments Committee has done, but I don't think there is any committee that can perform so good but what there is not room for improvement. I think that the issue of attendance at various commission meetings is extremely important particularly now since one particular commission's poor attendance record has been brought to light, and since this Board's vote seems to be the key to a person being put on a commission, I think we must take into consideration prior attendance records, and the Appointment Committee could well accept or reject a man's excuse for a poor attendance record, but we don't need people who don't attend meetings. Thank you, Mr. President."

MR. SIGNORE: "I've listened to all parties so far, but I want to make this comment, there is really no rush to get the Appointments through since many times the Mayor does not appoint them on December 1st or whenever they're due. There's no reason why, if a meeting is held on a Friday night, that Mr. Dixon has to rush through and get all the reports to the Board of Representatives members. He could hold it back another month. I'm not taking away from Mr. Dixon's performance, because I think he does an excellent job, and I sit on that Committee with him, but there is no reason to rush it through to the Board when the Mayor doesn't even rush the appointments down to the Board. Thank you."

MR. DIXON: "Well, I've been sitting on the Board now for going on to eight years, and I've served on the Appointments Committee for a term and a half, which is three years. Now, this is the first time I've ever heard any criticism of the Appointments Committee report. Now, I'm beginning at this point to wonder why. Now, if it's a question of getting more information, I'm sure the Committee will be willing to do that; if it's a question of getting a record of attendance, the most we can do is ask those who are applying, then we would have to take their word for it. I don't think we have the time to do the kind of research that would give any proof to this Board, but in the last couple of months, I can say that we've asked all of those that have come before us for re-appointment about their attendance. Now, I've omitted that in the report, but if it satisfies the members of this Board and if they would have me do that, I would question the attendance of every re-appointment coming before the Committee."

MRS. RITCHIE: "Mr. President, when the names are submitted to the Mayor by the Town Committee, the resumes, which I know the Town Committee requests before interviewing, should also be forwarded to the Mayor, and then His Honor can enclose them along with his list of names to the Board for consideration. Then they can be duplicated and passed down to ourselves. Thank you."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Since I brought it up, I would like Mr. Dixon to realize it is not done in criticism of him or Mr. Boccuzzi. I did it because I, personally, never have enough information about the candidates prior to the night of the Board meeting. I do not think it would do any harm to ask them to send you a copy of their resume prior to your appointments meeting and when it is received in this office to have it run off and a copy sent each Board member; so if, in fact we want to look at it, research it ourselves, call the person, ask them their criteria, their reasons, what their future hopes for Stamford are, so we can get a better feel on what we're doing prior to coming to our Board meeting. It's a simple little thing of more information and I think it won't do any harm."

MR. MILLER: "The Chairman of the Appointments Committee normally has these resumes before the night on which the appointees are interviewed. so it's just a matter of getting them duplicated and run off and out to all of the Board members. I just want to make it very clear that first of all, it costs more money. the more we reproduce papers, the more money we spend; the more material we mail out, the more money we spend; but that's beside the point for the moment, but I do want to make it clear that because of the time situation, it might happen on occasion that these resumes would not be out that early, because it could very well happen that the Chairman of the Appointments Committee wouldn't know who was getting appointed until two weeks before the full Board meeting, then you have to get out the resume to the appointee, he has to get it back and so on. So, I'm just pointing out that very often you'll be talking about two-week time spans!"

MRS. McINERNEY: "If I may, Mr. President. I only receive no agenda about three or four days before the meeting also."

MR. MILLER: "Yes, well, I think that should be sufficient; I think that number of days for an agenda is sufficient."

MR. WALSH: "Mr. President, as a member of the Appointments Committee, I would just like to concur with Mr. Dixon that at the last meeting, every member that came before us was asked about his attendance record and also I don't see the need of every member getting a resume because that's the Appointments Committee's job to question these people and if they don't trust the Appointments Committee, what's the sense of having an Appointments Committee."

MR. LEWINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. At this point, I, myself, I don't mind saying and probably some of my colleagues will criticize me for making this type of statement. I believe that Mr. Dixon has been criticized unjustly. He most certainly has been criticized. I have sat on this Board for a number of years now, well, if you want to talk about me smoking, we'll talk about that later, but right now we're talking about that Appointments Committee. Mr. Dixon, no chairman of that committee has received the type of abuse, I feel, that Mr. Dixon has received tonight, and I object to it. Thank you."

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, I don't mean to minimize the importance of this particular item, but it would seem to me that this is a matter that could rather easily be resolved if it were placed before the proper committee, or perhaps before the Leadership of this Board. I would just remind the members of this Board that we have a rather lengthy agenda. I don't know if we are going to be able to resolve anything right here and now, as far as this particular item is concerned. I would only wish that someone would either make a motion to put this before a committee so that we can go ahead with the meeting and get these important matters over with and come back to this at another point in time, when we would be able to give it a little additional thought and be able to come up with a satisfactory conclusion for all."

MR. MILLER: "I don't think we need a motion because the President is agreeable to instructing the Administrative Assistant to copy these resumes as they come in and get them out to the Board members. I am merely pointing out that the Board members are not to expect that they will necessarily have these resumes several days before the full Board meeting, and I would further comment I cannot control what goes on in the Mayor's office, or with some of the Party Leadership, and if indeed it would be advisable for the Mayor to get up summaries of the

MR. MILLER (continuing): "backgrounds of each of his appointments and get those out to the members, that's up to the Mayor; there have been mayors in the past, not the recent past, but there have been mayors who have done that, and if that is what is desired, you might take that up with the Mayor's office."

MR. RAVALLESE: "Just a couple of comments, Handy Dixon is doing a fantastic job on that Board and I can't see how he can really improve on it. I know he's asking all the questions in there, and I don't know what else the Board wants from Handy Dixon."

MRS. RAYMOND: "Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I would just like to reiterate that I don't think that anyone has intended any criticism of Mr. Dixon. I think he's doing a fine job, a very difficult job on Candidates Committee, but I would like to say, as a new member of this Board, that I have felt, not only in the area of candidates' appointments, but in other areas as well, a lack of information, and I think that by requesting additional information for Board members prior to voting, I don't think it should in any way be understood to be an indictment of a chairman of a committee, but rather a request by a Board member, or Board members, to have more information so they can more carefully consider their votes and be more comfortable with voting, and I would hope that would be the spirit with which the request was given."

MR. SIGNORE: "I wish to agree with Mrs. Raymond and I might add that Mr. Dixon does an excellent job running that committee and I'm on that Appointments Committee and no one is criticizing Mr. Dixon's performance as chairman of that committee; and I also wish to add that there's no Republican smoking. The No Smoking Sign is posted on the wall; it's been up there for almost 45 minutes, and I see Damocrats are still smoking."

MR. MILLER: "I think we've had enough of this. The President will observe that we have no Sergeant-at-Arms here."

MR. SIGNORE: "You're running the meeting, Mr. President."

MR. MILLER: "That's right, Mr. Signore. I said we do not have a Sergeant-at-Arms and I'm not leaving the Chair to stop people from smoking."

MR. SIGNORE: "I think it's ridiculous."

MR. MILLER: "Well, I don't think that remark was called for at all, Mr. Signore. I think it was completely out-of-order."

MR. WIESLEY: "This is probably just more of the same, I'm on the same committee as Mr. Signore and Mr. Dixon are. I don't think we've been insulted or our intelligence has been insulted. Mr. Signore and I are on the same committee in the Republican Town Committee and we got the same kind of insult, if you want to call it that, but it's a case of "right to know", have a little information for us and if you want to turn it back to a committee, I would suggest that it goes back to the Appointments Committee and let's kick it around a little bit and see how we can come up with the kind of information that might be more knowledgeable for you all."

MR. COSTELLO: "I'm afraid this is going to be repetitious, but since we all continue to speak and the time is being near 9:00 and we haven't even started yet, I would also like to say that Mr. Dixon is doing an excellent job, and I hope we do start soon."

MR. DIXON: "Now, Mr. President, my name has been called about two dozen times in the last five minutes, and I hope we can get this off the floor and get on with our business. The thing that I want to say is that I don't take exceptions to what has been said. I don't think I, as a person, have been criticized. I don't have that feeling. I think the criticism is pointed to the Committee and I think the intent is to provide some kind of improvements in our functions and I would accept it as being that."

MR. BLUM: "I would like to say that when we ended the last meeting last Monday, the Appointments Committee had given their last report. I think we should go on with the further part of our agenda. We haven't even started and it's nine o'clock. Time to go on, Mr. President."

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "I make a MOTION that that request be put in the Minutes and be brought before the Steering Committee."

MR. MILLER: "I think I already agreed to the request. I don't think there is anything to make a motion on. We'll try to get out the resumes, but if want the Mayor to do something, talk to the Mayor. Let's move onto Fiscal."

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Gerald Rybnick

MR. RYBNICK: "The meeting of the Fiscal Committee met Feb. 24, 1976 at 7:30 p.m. Present were: Chairman Michael Morgan, Sandy Goldstein, Linda Clark, Jeremiah Livingston, Audrey Cosentini, and George Hays. Absent were: Vice Chairman Gerald Rybnick, Christine Nizolek, Jean Raymond, and Ralph Loomis was excused. The Committee met jointly with the Personnel Committee to consider the Collective Bargaining contract between the City and the Stamford Police Association, and the Collective Bargaining contract between the City and the Firefighters' Association. Both contracts are for three years beginning July 1, 1974 and ending June 30, 1977. Voting on these two requests was postponed until the Committee meeting held on Thursday, February 26, 1976. At that time the committee voted 6-0 in favor of these requests."

"The meeting of Thursday, February 26, 1976 at 8:00 p.m. Present: Chairman Michael Morgan, Vice-Chairman Gerald Rybnick, Linda Clark, Christine Nizolek, Jean Raymond, George Hays, and Ralph Loomis. Absent: Sandy Goldstein, excused; Jeremiah Livingston, and Audrey Cosentini."

- (1) \$ 500.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 510.0943 - DENTAL CLINIC - To make available contribution from the Stamford Dental Society, Inc., Stamford, in the sum of \$500.00 toward the establishment of a dental clinic at the Health Department. Check received and deposited in the City's General Fund. (This is a "wash" transaction) (Mayor Clapes' letter 12/29/75; Board of Finance approved Jan. 8, 1976) (Held in Committee Feb. 9, 1976).

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE for an additional month, pending a meeting with Dr. Gofstein."

MR. MILLER: "The record will indicate, by the way, that Mr. Baxter is no longer present at the meeting and Mr. Loomis is now present, so we have 35 members present. (Note: Mr. Baxter left at 8:30 p.m. and Mr. Loomis arrived at 8:55 p.m.) All right, we are now on #2 under Fiscals."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) \$ 300.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Request for appropriation to be reimbursed by State of Connecticut as a PREPAID GRANT to be used for the support of activities of the Vocational Youth Organization (FHA) at RIPPOWAM HIGH SCHOOL. The 100% prepaid grant under P.L. 90-576 is for the 1975-76 fiscal year to be conveyed to the Youth Club Advisor per Division of Vocational Education, State Dept. of Education. (Letter of 1/29/76 B.R.Reed, Asst. Supt./Business. Approved Board of Finance 2/9/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor of this request, and I SO MOVE."

MOVED and SECONDED. MOTION IS CARRIED.

- (3) \$ 300.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Request for appropriation to be reimbursed by State Dept. of Education, Division of Vocational Education, as a 100% Prepaid Grant for the Youth Club Advisor of the Vocational Youth Organization, (FHA) at WESTHILL HIGH SCHOOL, for fiscal year 1975-76. (Letter 1/29/76 from B. R.Reed, Asst. Supt./Business. Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor of this request, and I SO MOVE."

MOVED and SECONDED. MOTION IS CARRIED.

- (4) \$ 300.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Request for appropriation to be reimbursed by State Dept. of Education, Division of Vocational Education, as a 100% Prepaid Grant for the Youth Club Advisor of the Vocational Youth Organization. (DECA) at RIPPOWAM HIGH SCHOOL, for fiscal year 1975-76. (Letter 1/29/76 from B.R.Reed, Asst.Supt./Business. Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor of this request, and I SO MOVE."

MOVED and SECONDED. MOTION IS CARRIED.

- (5) \$1,250.00 - CTE - COMMITTEE ON TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT, INC. - Request for additional appropriation to cover "hard cash match funds" (5%) pledged 8/21/75 in order to obtain grant of \$22,500 for 1975; (1976 will be 5% of \$72,500; ditto for 1977) from the Connecticut Planning Committee on Criminal Administration and/or the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Justice Department, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended; for the purpose of establishing and operating a "Youth Services Bureau Program". (Letter from Mayor Clapes 2/4/76; Letter 2/3/76 from John T. Brown, Jr., Executive Director of CTE, and supportive letters and data, applications, etc.) (Approved by Board of Finance 2/9/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted on March 1, 1976, 6 YES; 3 HOLD; 1 Absent, with regard to this request; and I SO MOVE."

MR. SIGNORE: "Mr. President, I understand from some of the membes of the Fiscal Committee, the Republican members, that the full information, the full facts, were not given to the Fiscal Committee, and I'd like more clarification on this, if we can have it."

MR. MILLER: "Can you respond to that, Mr. Rybnick?"

MR. RYBNICK: "There was some discrepancy or something that the Training and Employment received a notice of the letter for Friday, and they came in Friday, and what information they gave to Mr. Morgan, I don't have it, because we had to have a joint meeting prior to our own meeting here. There's a confusion in the dates, is what I am trying to say, our meeting was held on Thursday and they received a notice that the meeting was to be held on Friday. So, that is why they missed our meeting and thought it was very important that we take it up at this meeting. So, I am very lacking in the information myself. I cannot give it to you."

MR. MILLER: "Well, the matter has been reported out and SECONDED. It's on the Agenda, now we are open to discussion of whatever kind you might have."

MR. SIGNORE: "In other words, you can't put it back in committee?"

MR. MILLER: "You can make a motion to put it back into committee."

MR. SIGNORE: "Well, I make a MOTION that we put it back into committee."

MR. MILLER: "O.K., it has been MOVED and SECONDED to put this Item #5 under Fiscal back into Committee. So any debate now is limited to discussion as to why it should go back into committee."

MR. HAYS: "Mr. President, just to further clarify Mr. Rybnick's comments on this. The people requesting this money were, I believe, invited to a meeting on an incorrect date. We don't fault those people because it was not their mistake, but I, for one, just believe that we cannot pass out approvals of monies without a good interrogation of those people requesting it, and I think as a matter of policy, our Fiscal Committee should attend to this business seriously and listen to the people and then make their judgment. So, I am one for holding this in committee."

MR. LOOMIS: "Well, I was just going to say what George said for me. I hope the remarks with the motion made by Mr. Signore doesn't reflect any questions or negative attitudes we have on the request. It's just that we haven't had a chance to talk to the people who are proposing this appropriation and I think it was felt we should have an opportunity to talk to them in some detail about the program, and given that situation, and as I understand it from Mike, there's no urgency about this money. In other words, if they don't get it this month, it's not going to fall apart or anything."

MR. FLANAGAN: "Well, Mr. Loomis stated that if they don't get the money this month, it won't create any problems. I don't know that to be a fact. All I see is the three grants totalling \$167,500.00 that require hard cash matching funds vs. in-kind contributions of \$1,250 for 1975.

"Now, if we're jeopardizing \$167,500.00 for a \$1,250 appropriation, then we're being irresponsible. I would assume, although I do not agree with the Board of Finance on many issues, I would assume that on this particular one that they were presented adequate information. The fact is that this Board of Representatives, through its administrative process, supplied CTE with an erroneous meeting date, a date one day after the Fiscal Committee met. So, if we, in rejecting

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FLANAGAN (continuing): "this, or returning this to Committee, jeopardize the funds, it is something that we were in error and not CTE. I would just like you to look at the relative numbers. \$167,500 grant, that we may be jeopardizing, by withholding a \$1,250 hard cash contribution, not in-kind, but an actual cash contribution."

MR. LOBOZZA: "I think the point was made that we are not jeopardizing this money and as I recall, there were funds that were disputed between the Board of Recreation and this organization you are backing. I would like to have a little more time to study this and I would like to see a presentation on this before we vote this money."

MR. RYBNICK: "I think it's not the fault of CTE not appearing before us and I think if we should not jeopardize this by holding this. I think it's only fair that we vote on this tonight and pass it."

MR. LOOMIS: "Well, I have the letter before me which people have been referring to and I see nothing that indicates that if we do not pass judgment at this meeting that this amount would be, as Bill has said, jeopardized. I don't believe it will be. In my impression in talking to Mike was that it wouldn't be jeopardized. So, I would vote in favor of keeping it in committee, and I do think it is the responsibility of the Fiscal Committee, as a proper representative of the Board, to evaluate and go over these requests and I think we should have that opportunity at its next regular scheduled meeting."

MR. SIGNORE: "Well, whether it's in jeopardy or not, if it's not done properly, I think it should be held in committee until all the facts are in."

MR. ROSE: "Thank you, Mr. President. I think this has been well spoken, too, but the fact still remains that if the committee had kept its date, this would have been out. I have no objection to this going back into committee, but definitely I would like to know whether it's going to affect it or not. That's the only objection I have, to know whether it's going to affect it or not. I think it's little enough money to spend for the amount we're getting and I just don't know whether it's going to be affected, or if the whole thing will be lost. That's the only objection I might have, but there's no other objection than that."

MR. HAYS: "If you have no other names on your list, Mr. President, I MOVE THE QUESTION on Mr. Signore's motion."

MR. MILLER: "There is another name on the list, Mr. Hays, but I wish you wouldn't make a motion to move the question with a qualification. Can I just ask Mr. D'Agostino to speak, if you'll withdraw that motion. He's the only one left."

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "I, too, would like to see that go into committee so we can get along."

MR. MILLER: "I think we can proceed to a vote. The question is on the MOTION to put item #5 under Fiscal BACK INTO COMMITTEE, and necessary for approval of that motion would be a majority of those present and voting. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER (continuing): "The CHAIR is in doubt, so we'll take a division, using the machine. A YES is to put it back into committee; a NO is opposed to putting it back into committee. All right, we'll take the count. The MOTION TO PUT BACK INTO COMMITTEE IS CARRIED by a vote of 22 YES; 13 NO."

(6) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE RE-FUNDING OF THE STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM for the City's 10 Day Care Centers for the 1976-77 Fiscal Year in the sum of \$434,092.00 per DCA Budget Form 125 submitted; also DCA-126 "Guide Form for Certified Resolution of Applicant." (Mayor's letter 2/2/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Board of Finance approval is not required. On March 1, 1976 the Fiscal Committee voted UNANIMOUSLY in favor of this request and I SO MOVE." (End of Tape B)

MR. MILLER: "This was given also to another committee."

MR. WIESLEY: "The Education, Welfare and Government Committee met with the Fiscal; we had a quorum, four: Baxter, Clark, Ritchie and Wiesley, and we agree with them on the proposal."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION IS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

RESOLUTION NO. 1041APPLICATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976-1977 FOR RE-FUNDING
THE STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapters 128, 129, 130, 132 and 133 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Commissioner of Community Affairs is authorized to enter into contract with municipalities, human resources development agencies and non-profit organizations:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES:

1. That it is cognizant of the conditions and pre-requisites for State assistance imposed by Chapters 128, 129, 130, 132 and 133 of the Connecticut General Statutes.
 2. That it recognizes the responsibility for the provision of local grants-in-aid to the extent that they are necessary and required for said program.
 3. That the Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute a contract with the State of Connecticut if such an Agreement is offered, and to execute any amendments, recisions, and revisions thereto, and to act as the authorized representative of the City of Stamford.
 4. That the filing of an application in an amount not to exceed FOUR HUNDRED THIRTY-FOUR THOUSAND NINETY-TWO DOLLARS (\$434,092.00) is hereby authorized.
-

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (7) \$17,738.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Additional appropriation to cover the cost of a utility service study by J. P. Clark Company (Mayor's letter 2/6/76. Board of Finance approved 2/9/76, contingent upon contract being approved by Corporation Counsel.)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE until a representative of J. P. Clark can meet with the Committee.

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Perillo, do you agree with this?"

MR. PERILLO: "We concur."

- (8) \$20,000.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - Code 114.0901 - Special Professional Services - Additional Appropriation for amount required to implement the recommendations contained in Ernst & Ernst (auditors) report concerning collection of current and delinquent taxes).

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor of this request and I SO MOVE."

MR. WIESLEY: "We also concur."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED."

- (9) \$ 160.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - CODE 114.2101 - Convention, Dues and Conferences - Additional Appropriation for membership in the Municipal Finance Officers Assn. (The Commissioner of Finance and two representatives to be members.)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor, and I SO MOVE."

- (10) \$21,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 620.1215 Furnace Repair. Additional Appropriation to carry out emergency refractory repairs to the 1973 Conventional Incinerator. Bureau of Sanitation, Incinerator & Sewage Treatment Plant. (Mayor Clapes' letter 2/4/76; letters of 1/27/76 and 1/30/76 from Vincent J. Rotondo) (Approved Bd. of Finance 2/9/76)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and I SO MOVE."

MR. PERILLO: "Public Works Committee concurs."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. There is a question regarding the amount of the appropriation, Mr. Rybnick. Would you just clarify this? We're talking about Item #10 under Fiscal, now what is the amount again?"

MR. RYBNICK: "Twenty-one thousand dollars (\$21,000)."

MR. SIGNORE: "Wasn't that changed to \$32,000? But I see Mr. Perillo says that's another appropriation. Thank you."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. FLANAGAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to remind this Board that the 13th Board of Representatives in their meeting of Oct. 6, 1975 approved an emergency appropriation of \$62,000 to the Public Works Department to fill in an abandoned excavation site located on Ferris Avenue, which is the site of the Holiday Inn that was proposed for Stamford. I objected to the \$62,000 and requested that it be cut to \$25,000 because the then Commissioner of Public Works, John J. O'Brien, could not justify \$62,000 for fill. However, there was supposed to be an extreme, dire emergency existing during which there was a house that was in danger of sliding into the excavation. Since that date, October 6, 1975, not one single cubic foot of fill has been placed in that excavation...."

MR. PERILLO: "Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with this item."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Flanagan, would you show how this is germane?"

MR. FLANAGAN: "Not one cubic foot of fill has been placed in that excavation to prevent the house from sliding in. There have been approximately 3 or 4 loads of rubble dumped on the site and then after that was done, there was an injunction brought against the City by the owners, and then nothing further has been done. I bring this out, and I sat on the last Board and I did not expect to be a member of this Board, but I, for one person, in this City, would keep track of that \$62,000 to see that it was not misappropriated. Now the point of bringing this forward now is to show that there is \$62,000 in the Public Works Department account that has not been used, that could be transferred to take care of this cost. It could be done by the Board of Finance without our Board being involved. I want, regardless of how this vote goes now, and this is no emergency, this is a report, I want this Board to realize that there is \$62,000 in the Public Works account that in all probability will never be used and we will never have any control over; it will be the Board of Finance that approves the transfer, and that this is something we must be constantly on the lookout for because it has been a pattern that has gone on for years and years and years, that when one Board goes out of power and another one comes in, the Public Works Department, not the Public Works Commissioner, but the people who are there year-in and year-out have funds that we don't know anything about and we have lost control of them; and I have the figures here and Curley will remember the debate that night. There's 62,000 bucks that they said they needed and they haven't used it and they have other monies in the same position. I think really, the right way to handle this thing would have been by a transfer, approved by the Board of Finance, not by coming here for additional funding."

MR. RYBNICK: "I think in regard to what Mr. Flanagan has said, I think that \$62,000 is being held in abeyance. I think there was a court order prohibiting them from using that particular money and I think they plan on doing it just as soon as it is released by the courts."

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, Mr. President, for Mr. Flanagan's information, just yesterday I talked with the Commissioner on that issue and he is going to give me the matter in writing. As well as that 75,000 bucks that we gave them for that Harborview project down there, too. As soon as I get it in writing, I'll report it."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BLOIS: "Ladies and gentlemen, I think we are arguing among ourselves for no reason at all. This money is needed and it's needed very badly. If you continue to neglect to give them this money right now and worry about the other monies later, the garbage is going to pile up there down there on that dump something awful. So, I recommend that everybody look over their conscience and vote to give them this money tonight."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. This seems to me to be another classic example of listening to Mr. Flanagan of what our Board knows and doesn't. It seems like we always have the proverbial gun to our heads in voting monies for emergency appropriations and I do happen to remember that that house was, in fact, going to float into that hole, and if they haven't filled it yet, I would certainly not approve this until I would make sure about this was going to go where it was allocated to go."

MR. LOOMIS: "I just wanted to say, that on behalf of the Fiscal Committee, we're convinced that this appropriation was a necessary one, and I believe Jimmie Loboza, from the Public Works Committee, if he didn't personally witness what was going on down there, certainly had convincing testimony as to the need of these funds; but nevertheless, I think what Bill points out should be well-taken and I think that perhaps we, on the Fiscal committee, should be cognizant of that money and beware of such moves if they occur in the future, but I would in summation here, vote in favor of this appropriation. I think it's very much needed."

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, Mr. President. Under "Communications" I have some other remarks to make in reference to this issue and when you get to that, maybe you could clear up some of this."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Yes, I wouldn't want to see this held up for the simple reason, as it was said, the garbage will pile up and we do have a problem down there. But again, we do have to investigate into these monies because if there was money there and it's not being used, I think we better check into it."

MRS. SANTY: "Could Mr. Perillo perhaps bring to light some of the information that he has, before Communcations comes up?"

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Perillo, if there is something relating to this vote, maybe we could bring it out now?"

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, I've been requested by some members in Public Works as well as Board members for a tour of the Incinerator, and I've got this tour set up for this Saturday morning at 10 o'clock. Anyone wishing to tour this Incinerator and see where this \$21,000. is really going to be spent, they are welcome to the tour. I want to know approximately how many people are going on the tour because they want to know how many guards to have there. This Saturday morning, 10:00."

MRS. RITCHIE: "As a member of Public Works, it was presented to us that they are in dire need and I would hate to see a condition in Stamford such as we had in New York, so, either let us hold this until after we get the extra appropriation that Mr. Perillo said we're looking for, or pass it and hold back on the other monies or request the other monies be returned to us."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS: "Mr. President, may I remind this Board that we probably did give them too much money up there during that road project, that big hole, but let's not forget that that is one project that they've committed the monies to. Now, until you get a release from the courts, how can you ask for that money back? Very probably, they will go up there when they get the release and fill the hole. Now, if there is any money left, then I would say that we would be within our rights to ask for it back, but that is entirely a different project. Now you're talking about an incinerator that the City needs and needs it very badly, and it's been out-of-commission for a while, and if any of the Board members are interested in garbage, take a ride down there and see how it's piling up. That's all I can say to you."

MR. WIESLEY: "I don't think there's any question about the emergency features of this request. Mr. Flanagan has brought up some money that has been set aside for some time before, but what we all need to do is take a look at the Bond Issue, Item #13, there is \$40,000 in there for modifications of the 1973 Incinerator, and I just wonder if we're compounding the issue a little bit and putting a little more money in there. If we fix it now, do we have to spend the \$40,000? That hasn't been done yet; I think we have a chance to save some money there and let's look at that pretty hard."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, I see this as being completely unrelated to the matter concerning the hole that we have appropriated money for. Now, they are asking for this money to do a specific thing and I just don't think we ought to keep bringing in some other matter that has nothing to do with it at all. I do think it would be a good idea to keep surveillance, if you would accept that word, on the \$62,000 that was appropriated, but I think we should focus our attention to this specific matter and this specific amount and decide whether we are going to give them the appropriation or not. So, no, I can't move the question. I wish I could."

MR. FLANAGAN: "Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Board. I brought this up because I thought this was the correct time to tag it before, to bring it before the Board, this issue. This is a new Board, over half the members are new members and I can see this pattern of us losing control of monies that one Board appropriates when another Board takes control, and again with changes in Public Works Commissioners and Mayors, I think from a technical standpoint, we have to approve the emergency appropriation tonight. As I say, I chose this forum to focus the Board's attention upon situations that have been existing in the past and will continue to exist. The \$62,000 was absolutely necessary that day last October and it has not, not one penny of it, legitimately been expended to this date. We have to be constantly on our guard against this sort of thing. In this case I would have to, because of the technical problems, have to vote for this emergency appropriation. However, it should not be before this Board, the Board of Finance could have taken care of this themselves, if they had been asked for a transfer, but they would not be asked for a transfer because nobody in the new administration would have remembered that there was \$62,000 sitting around doing nothing. So, let's just watch it in the future. Thank you."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. PERILLO: "Yes, again, most of these members haven't been down by the Incinerator to see what's really going on down there. When the '73' and '78' are broken down, that thing was built to burn 380 ton of garbage a day, now it's broken down, they're losing '53' which burns only --- they're trying to burn over 150,000 ton a day and that other 200,000 ton a day is being piled up! Last week we had a fire there that lasted for about three hours and we've had two more small fires since then, and take your choice ... lots of fires ... that's it."

MRS. COSENTINI: "Yes, after listening to the testimony, I think everybody is right. I think we need the incinerator and we should not take a chance on some technicality of the funds not being available, and pass these funds, but I do thank Mr. Flanagan for alerting us to an area that we should be aware of as good Board members."

MR. CONNORS: "Last week I sat in a meeting for almost an hour listening about the incinerator. Are we going to go back, as Mr. Perillo said, to what we did before, let the stuff pile up and then pay time-and-a-half or double time, to get it out.

"I mean they have a break down there, there's no doubt about it, and they're trying to straighten it out. Now, we as members of this Board, and especially it being in the East Side, and I happen to live there, the incinerator happens to be in the East Side on Shippan Avenue, we'll suffer more than anybody. These people can talk all they want about it, but it's right in our area and they're having trouble over there and rather than see it pile up, I'd say that we should vote for the appropriation and get rid of it. Thank you, Mr. President."

MR. LOOMIS: "I just wanted to say that from the tenor of some of these remarks, particularly Mr. Flanagan's, there is skepticism cast over this appropriation. The fact was that the Administration, after having been alerted on January 27th by Mr. Canavan, Mr. Rotondo, Mr. Ketcham, and the Mayor himself, all wholeheartedly endorsed this appropriation, in addition to which all of these fellows appeared before the Fiscal committee and voted unanimously in favor of it, after the Finance Board had done likewise.

"In addition to which we all came back and met once again to vote more money, because actually we are going to need a few more dollars than the \$21,000 which appears under #10 here. So, just to set the matter straight, wherever this matter has been fully discussed, it's gotten the full-hearted support of both those in Administration, and those on the Board of Representatives, at least the Fiscal Committee, and the Board of Finance."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. Technically, we will be forced to approve this emergency appropriation, but I would like to have Mr. Perillo keep us alerted as to the court proceedings on this particular case, whether or not it is ruled that we can or cannot fill in the hole. If it is ruled against us, then I would like that money returned to General Fund as soon as possible."

MR. PERILLO: "I made that request, just yesterday, to the Commissioner, believe me."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS: "Through the Chair, I think it was directly ... I think it was Mr. Loomis that made a remark a moment ago about \$40,000 in the '73 incinerator account? Well, somebody over there, who was it, Mr. Wiesley? Is that a fact?"

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Wiesley, do you care to respond?"

MR. WIESLEY: "We have a letter here from Mr. Hadley that was sent dated Feb. 27th to Michael Morgan, Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, and Vere Wiesley, Chairman of Education, Welfare and Government Committee, on this subject, attaching a draft of the resolution authorizing the issuance of these bonds, and it has the general statement, and as it is broken down by various capital projects. Among the various capital projects, there is one item under new construction which includes \$40,000 for the modification of the 1973 Incinerator."

MR. BLOIS: "Is there any reason why they can't take this \$21,000 out of the \$40,000 that they have appropriated already?"

MR. WIESLEY: "Well, they haven't appropriated the \$40,000 yet, that's still to come under Item #13, that's part of the total you have there. What I was saying, Mr. Blois, is that if we approve this money, the \$21,000, and then the \$10,000, or \$11,000 or whatever is to come, which I think we have to do, then we ought to take a good look at whether the \$40,000 has to be spent or not."

MR. BLOIS: "Well, in answer to that I would say that in 3 to 4 to 5 years, you will be spending more monies again on the inside of the box, like you're doing today."

MR. WIESLEY: "There's no doubt about that, but this money they're talking about here is a '75-'76 budget we're talking about."

MR. BLOIS: "O.K., but we will be spending monies on it again, I'm sure. There's no question about it. There's terrific heat and pressures in there."

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, I think we've heard enough about this item this evening to know what the appropriate action should be, so therefore I would MOVE THE QUESTION."

MR. MILLER: "It's MOVED and SECONDED to MOVE THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. We'll vote on that. The MOTION is CARRIED."

"Now we'll vote on the MAIN MOTION which is Item #10 in Fiscal. The MOTION is CARRIED."

- (11) \$ 182.14 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 510-5203 - Education (Account Clerk; Secretary; Clerk-Typist) - Additional Appropriation to cover cost of MEA contractual fringe benefits for educational purposes (courses: Marketing; Inter.Acct.; Fed.Inc.Tax II; and Pers.Indus.Rltion.) (Mayor Clapes' letter 1/30/76; Dr. Gofstein's letter 1/20/76) (Approved Board of Finance 2/9/76).

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE, pending a meeting with Dr. Gofstein."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (12) \$ 497.80 - BOARD OF RECREATION - PROPOSED RESOLUTION AMENDING CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGETS AS FOLLOWS: (This is a TRANSFER to effect needed lighting to help prevent vandalism at the Barrett Park Facility.)

From: 1974-75 Capital Budget # 5 New Furnace. \$261.80
 1974-75 Capital Budget #13 Tennis Courts. 236.00
 \$497.80

To: 1975-76 Capital Budget #6A Barrett Park Facility. . \$497.80

-0-

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and I SO MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

RESOLUTION NO. 1042

AMENDING THE 1975-1976 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET OF THE RECREATION DEPARTMENT BY ADDING \$497.80 TO 1975-1976 CAPITAL BUDGET #6A ENTITLED "BARRETT PARK FACILITY", TO PROVIDE NEEDED LIGHTING TO HELP PREVENT VANDALISM, TO BE FINANCED BY THE TRANSFER OF \$261.80 FROM 1974-1975 CAPITAL BUDGET #5 ENTITLED "NEW FURNACE", AND BY THE TRANSFER OF \$236.00 FROM 1974-1975 CAPITAL BUDGET #13 ENTITLED "TENNIS COURTS".

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford in accordance with the City Charter:

1. To adopt an amendment to the 1975-1976 Capital Projects Budget by adding the amount of \$497.80 to a project known as Capital Budget #6A "Barrett Park Facility", said sum to be used to provide needed lighting to help prevent vandalism, in the Department of Recreation.

2. To finance said project by a TRANSFER of funds from the following accounts in the amounts so indicated:

FROM: 1974-1975 Capital Budget # 5 New Furnace \$261.80
 1974-1975 Capital Budget #13 Tennis Courts 236.00
 \$497.80

3. That this resolution shall take effect upon its adoption.

* * * * *

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (13) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,483,195.00 TO FINANCE CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET OF 1975-1976, TO BE FINANCED WITH FUNDS RAISED BY BORROWING. (Approved by Board of Finance February 9, 1976. Mayor Clapes' letter February 5, 1976.)

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and I SO MOVE."

MR. WIESLEY: "The Education, Welfare and Government Committee concurred with this."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED."

MR. WALSH: "Mr. President, on my agenda, I have \$8,720,847.00."

MR. RYBNICK: "That's a wrong figure."

MR. WIESLEY: "There is a mistake apparently, and the original bond that they had authorized was in the \$8.Million figure, and the new bond they're requesting is \$9,483.195."

MR. MILLER: "That's right, \$9,483,135."

MR. WIESLEY: "No, that's \$9,483,195 less \$40,000!" (Chuckling)

MR. MILLER: "All right, I think we can proceed to a vote on this item #13, this resolution authorizing the issuance of General Obligation Bonds of the City of Stamford. All those in favor, say AYE, all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

MR. WIESLEY: "In connection with the one that was just passed, Mr. President. Did you get a copy of this? The reason I ask that is that further in this paragraph, he is stating "upon approval of the Board of Representatives in the March meeting, we would appreciate this wording be incorporated into the official minutes of the meeting." ... so"

MR. MILLER: "Well, what are you reading from?"

MR. WIESLEY: "This is from Mr. Hadley's letter to Michael Morgan and I."

MR. MILLER: "It would be included anyway, Mr. Wiesley, but if you want to make a MOTION to that effect ... "

MR. WIESLEY: "I SO MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED to include the wording mentioned by Mr. Wiesley."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)BOND RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NINE MILLION FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTY-THREE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE DOLLARS (\$9,483,195.00) - GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY TO FINANCE CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1975-1976, AS AMENDED, TO BE FINANCED WITH FUNDS RAISED BY BORROWING. (Mayor's letter of February 5, 1976)

stated that this Resolution is to authorize the issuance of bonds to finance certain of the Capital Projects for the fiscal year 1975-1976; said the BOARD OF FINANCE APPROVED this at their meeting held February 9, 1976 by UNANIMOUS VOTE of 5-0; said this must go back to the Board of Finance after approval by our Board.

MOVED for approval of the following Resolution No. 1043; SECONDED and CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by a voice vote, there being 36 present and 4 absent:

RESOLUTION NO. 1043

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NINE MILLION FOUR HUNDRED EIGHTY-THREE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE DOLLARS (\$9,483,195.00) - GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY TO FINANCE CERTAIN OF THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1975-1976, AS AMENDED, TO BE FINANCED WITH FUNDS RAISED BY BORROWING.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 630 of the Charter of the City as amended, the Board of Representatives of the City has received a letter from the Mayor dated February 5, 1976, requesting it to authorize the issuance of bonds to finance certain of the capital projects contained in the capital budget for the fiscal year 1975-1976, as amended, that are to be financed with funds raised by borrowing; and

WHEREAS, this Board has been furnished with a certified copy of a resolution of the Board of Finance approving the aforesaid authorization;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD:

Section 1. That there be and hereby is authorized, under and pursuant to the Charter of the City and any other general or special statutes thereto enabling, the issuance and sale from time to time of general obligation, coupon, serial bonds of the City in the aggregate principal amount of Nine Million Four Hundred Eighty-Three Thousand One Hundred and Ninety-Five Dollars (\$9,483,195.00) for the purpose of paying for capital projects consisting of the several public improvements or other municipal works of a permanent character or for land taken for the purpose of such improvements or municipal works, all as hereinafter more fully described.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

Each of said capital projects is included in the capital budget for the fiscal year 1975-1976, as amended, duly adopted, and reference is hereby made to the said capital budget as amended for a complete description of the particular capital projects hereinafter designated. The said capital projects and the extent to which they are to be financed with the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized are as follows:

1975-1976 CAPITAL BUDGET AS AMENDED

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:Sewer Commission

Extension of Sewers South of Parkway	\$2,750,000	
Emergency Correction	100,000	
Plan and Design	50,000	
Interceptors	<u>1,000,000</u>	\$3,900,000

Storm Drains

City-Wide Storm Drains	\$ 25,000	
Drainage South of Parkway	150,000	
Valley Road, Forest & Fenway Streets	75,000	
Toilsome Brook	<u>600,000</u>	850,000

Highways

City-Wide Resurfacing & Reconstruction	\$ 100,000	
City-Wide Raised Manholes	15,000	
Industrial Service Road	200,000	
Washington Avenue Extension	<u>122,257</u>	437,257

Sidewalks and Curbing

Curbing City-Wide	\$ 10,000	
Sidewalks City-Wide	10,000	
Board of Education Sidewalks	<u>15,000</u>	35,000

New Construction

Municipal Maintenance & Training Facility		
Yard #1	\$ 10,000	
Incinerators	50,000	
Modification of the 1973 Incinerator	40,000	
Multi-Purpose Incinerator	400,000	
Pump Replacement	25,000	
Town Garage	15,000	
City Garage	14,500	
Municipal Office Building	50,000	
Rice School	12,000	
Town Hall	85,500	
Liquid Waste Incinerator	6,500	
Rehabilitation of Town Hall	<u>33,591</u>	742,091

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

<u>New Equipment</u>		\$ 150,000
----------------------	--	------------

Bridges

North Street Bridge	\$ 50,000	
Reconditioning of Bridges	20,000	<u>70,000</u>

TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS

\$6,184,348.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD:

Cove Island Beach Improvements	\$ 2,887	
Setting of Encroachment Lines		
(a) Rippowam River	2,000	
(b) Noroton River	2,000	
Design and Engineering:		
Future Flood Control Projects	<u>2,000</u>	8,887

PARKS DEPARTMENT:

New Lighting	\$ 40,000	
Replacement of Equipment and Vehicles	10,000	
Terry Conners Rink	45,000	
Marina Repairs and Improvements	50,000	
Terry Conners Rink Water Recirculator	<u>1,200</u>	146,200

BOARD OF RECREATION"

New Playfields and Improvements	\$ 10,000	
Fencing and Backstops	10,000	
Lifeguard Boats	2,400	
Ethel Kveskin Theatre Addition	42,500	
Maintenance Building Addition	32,000	
Barrett Park Facility	6,500	
Mechanical Equipment	7,000	
Emergency Renovation, Cove Island Utility Bldg.	5,000	
E.J.Hunt Administration Bldg. Renovation	<u>3,000</u>	118,400

POLICE DEPARTMENT:

Emergency Generator	\$ 19,500	
Traffic Light Equipment-Weed Hill/Newfield Ave.	12,000	
Pavement Marking Machine	2,000	
Fingerprint Projector	<u>850</u>	34,350

FIRE DEPARTMENT:

Communications - Fire Alarm Cable	\$ 12,500	
Communications-Replacement Obsolete Radio Units	7,500	
Increase Water Mains Supplying 25 Hydrants		
Present Size Not Adequate	<u>20,000</u>	40,000

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)LONG RIDGE FIRE COMPANY:

Equipment	\$ 10,000
-----------	-----------

TURN-OF-RIVER FIRE DEPARTMENT:

Equipment	10,500
-----------	--------

NEW HOPE FIRE DEPARTMENT:

Equipment	10,700
-----------	--------

STAMFORD EMERGENCY SERVICE:

Radio Equipment	5,000
-----------------	-------

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE:

Renovation and Remodeling of Sunset Home	600,000
--	---------

HUBBARD HEIGHTS GOLF COURSE:

Reconstruction of Tees	2,500
------------------------	-------

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS:

Equipment	4,300
-----------	-------

STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER:

Observatory Weatherproofing	\$ 8,150	
Fire Road	660	
Auditorium Entrance	5,000	
Deck-Theatre Stage	4,520	
Floor Tiling - Feed House & Dairy Room	3,395	
Air Conditioning	1,635	
Road and Area Paving	3,000	
Sound System	650	27,010

FORT STAMFORD:

Site Improvements	40,000
-------------------	--------

BOARD OF EDUCATION:

Springdale School Phase II	\$ 786,000	
Stamford High School Auditorium	400,000	
Riverbank Media Center	20,000	
Northeast Media Center	20,000	
Continued Asphalt Resurfacing & Improvements	15,000	1,241,000

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Southeast Quadrant Project	1,000,000
----------------------------	-----------

<u>TOTAL OTHER THAN PUBLIC WORKS</u>	<u>\$3,298,847</u>
--------------------------------------	--------------------

<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	<u>\$9,483,195.</u>
------------------------------	---------------------

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)
 (Bond Resolution No. 1043 cont'd)

Section 2. That said bonds shall be issued in the name of and upon the full faith and credit of the City and, subject to the Charter of the City and other applicable provisions of law, in the manner and in the principal amounts that the Board of Finance may determine from time to time, including, but without limitation, the determination of the form, date, number of issues, dates of payment of principal and interest and all other particulars, and said Board of Finance or, if authorized by the Board of Finance, the Commissioner of Finance may determine the rate or rates of interest which the said bonds are to bear.

Section 3. That each of the capital projects hereinabove described and contained in the capital budget for the fiscal year 1975-1976, as amended, is hereby confirmed as a duly authorized capital project.

* * * * *

- (14) \$2,034,000.00 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 - APPLICATION FOR FUNDING -
Proposed Community Development Program includes Second Year
Activity Program and Budget for Fiscal Year 1976-1977 - (Submitted by Mayor
in letter dated 2/20/76).

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor of this request WITH SERIOUS RESERVATIONS. Basically, the Committee feels that there was not adequate time to review this request since the proposed budget was received only six days prior to our meeting, and that the presentation by the Community Development staff did not adequately answer many questions raised by members of the Committee. I MOVE for approval."

MR. LIVINGSTON: "The Housing Committee met and we concur."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you. MOVED and SECONDED. Mr. Glucksman?"

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "The Urban Renewal Committee met last Thursday with the Fiscal Committee regarding this matter. At this meeting, Nancy Mitchell was there and Finance Commissioner Hadley was there. At that meeting we were all informed that the reason the Urban Renewal Commission's request of \$1,200,000 which was cut back to this \$400,000 figure, which they are now giving them, was because of the timing factor involved in this funding. We were told that since the URC plans were not finalized yet, they felt that many of the needs of the URC could be postponed at this time.

"However, if you look at the plans and the request of the URC and the ultimate amount given, what is being cut out of this funding is the Elm Street Widening. The reason we were told for this determination was that since it was not 100% definite that a department store would be located in the URC area, they felt that the widening and improving of the street would be for naught and therefore there would be no need for this at this time. However, my Committee and I take great issue with such logic, and the URC plan does envision the creation of this Super-Block, and if one store does not locate there, I'm sure another will. Hopefully, the State will see fit to give us the funds necessary to improve Exits 7 and 8 on the Thruway, and therefore with this increased traffic, I would be very short-sighted, I believe, to feel that the improvements of Elm Street could be delayed for any length of time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. GLUCKSMAN (continuing): "Also, it must be remembered that the Urban Renewal Contract, the Disposition Contract, provides that the Elm Street Widening is a binding feature and the City is responsible to do this work no matter what happens; this is one thing we are obligated to do for the Developer. As such, I don't know how it can be determined that such improvement may not be needed. It's definitely binding on us. Again, the Committee and I completely understand and we appreciate the time consideration involved in the Community Development funding, but we still feel it is very short-sighted planning to not provide for this URC request at this time, it being such a crucial time in the completion of a plan.

"Therefore, while we do so with great reservation, and we're doing so because of the timing factor involved in Community Development regulations. The Urban Renewal Committee of the Board does recommend that the Board approve this Community Development Plan, but we want to do so with the admonition to the Board that the Urban Renewal Commission will probably be here in the not-too-distant future looking for further funding from the City to provide for this Elm Street Widening, and I just want everybody to be warned of this factor. Now, again, we do concur with the Fiscal Committee and we do vote for approval of this Plan, but again, with great reservation."

MR. MILLER: "We'll get back to Mr. Rybnick because he hadn't completed his report and then I'll get back to the other Chairman, Mr. Livingston."

MR. RYBNICK: "Basically, the Committee feels there was not adequate time to review this request since the proposed budget was received only six days prior to the meeting, and that the presentation by the Committee of the Development staff did not adequately answer many questions raised by the members of the Committee. That's incomplete on this particular one." (End of Side C)

MR. MILLER: "Thank you, the floor is now open for discussion."

MR. SIGNORE: "I have reservations as to, from what I can gather Mr. Rybnick said that they didn't have time enough to go over the question, and I am looking at the list here, so I have reservations as to the equitable distribution of the monies, and I am in favor of holding it in committee. I'd like to make a MOTION to HOLD IT IN COMMITTEE if I can."

MR. MILLER: "All right, we have a motion to put this back into Committee by a motion made by Mr. Signore. MOVED and SECONDED by Mrs. Santy. Debate is now limited to the question of whether or not to put Item #14 back into committee. I'm going to go with the list I have. Mrs. McInerney? No, she doesn't wish to speak now."

MR. LOOMIS: "Yes, let me address myself to Sal's motion. If we do not pass favorably on this appropriation, we lose all those monies by March 12th. Now, I explored this alternative with Commissioner Hadley. I said, suppose we reject this and send it back to the Mayor with corrections, additions, what have you -- and technically we can do that, assuming we have another special meeting of this Board, and then pass on it with whatever corrections we wish to make. Now that assumption, you must keep in mind, that the Mayor will make the changes that we suggest to him, he doesn't have to, he could send this same program which he has already submitted to us right back to us and we would once again be faced with either accepting it exactly as it is, or rejecting it altogether because the fact of the matter is, given the nature of this Federal Grant, the Mayor is the one who proposes where the money goes. He does so after going all about the City with hearings after hearings in several neighborhoods.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LOOMIS (continuing): "The problem we had is this, first of all Jerry Rybnick apparently had some commitment from Nancy Mitchell and others that monies spent in certain neighborhoods last year would not be again spent in similar places this year. Apparently, that commitment wasn't lived up to. Secondly, we got this program very late, only a couple of days before the meeting. Some items are described rather in detail, others are hardly described at all, and it's very difficult to make any kind of judgment when such a program is submitted in this fashion. Thirdly, Mike asked, for example, under Pg. 6 - Salaries -- there is \$150,000 for Salaries. Now, how many people are we funding? Well, we're told three for \$150,000, and there is no breakdown or no explanation of why there was such a large sum of money. Well, some people said, well, this included some thing else, and some said, well, it didn't. Well, the conclusion here is that we just didn't get a good reading on what was going on here, and we got it in such a time that was too late to go back and really do a lot of homework. We are faced, unfortunately now with either passing it by March 11th, or 12th, I forget which, very similar in terms of time, or having the whole thing rejected.

"Lastly, I make one last point and add to what Lois has said. This program is predicated on Federal dollars that we have received over many years, and primarily on the dollars that have come into the Urban Renewal projects during the late Sixties or early Seventies. We are getting all this money primarily because of past monies, Urban Renewal monies, but what has happened under this program, under this Administration, the previous one, is that they have cut back the Urban Renewal dollars and given them to a lot of other programs and we're only getting four hundred and some odd-thousand dollars to our Urban Renewal Program which desperately needs much more funding.

"So I guess, to sum it all up, we are concerning, the Urban Renewal Committee of which I am Vice Chairman, and the Fiscal Committee of which I am a member, but unfortunately we have the gun to our heads and I don't know of any alternative for this Board to take unless it wishes to reject some \$2,000,000, or the other course is to accept it as it has been presented to us tonight."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Loomis, by what date do we have to act on this?"

MR. LOOMIS: "Well, Nancy Mitchell says it has to be submitted by March 12th, a week from tomorrow; so now, you know, if we want to have a special meeting between now and that time, we can go over this. The thing is, of course, that the Mayor doesn't have to take our recommendations. He could submit exactly what he has given to us right here."

MR. MILLER: "I just wanted to bring out one point. Obviously, the problem is that there isn't enough of a time span between the period when they're holding the workshops and the hearings, and the date on which they have to get this in. Now, would you know, does anybody know, can they hold these hearings and workshops earlier than January? Mr. Rybnick, would you know?"

MR. RYBNICK: "This what the Board is asking for, the Fiscal Committee is asking for, in the future, that these be pushed up and would come in time for us to act differently on it."

MR. MILLER: "O.K. I think Mrs. Clark has something on this."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CLARK: "Yes, Mr. President. Thank you. I spoke with Nancy...I think it was Monday or Tuesday of this week, and did inform her of the problems that we felt about this. I told her that I felt we should have the complete proposal thirty to forty-five days in advance, and she said 'Well, that's fine, but all I understood I had to do was get it to the Steering Committee meeting a month before the meeting' I told her that this was not true, that we would appreciate something like this at least 30 to 45 days in advance and she promised that it would be done in the future but there was no way to do it this time."

MR. SHERER: "Thank you, Mr. President. Once again we see that we have a pistol to our heads. We have no choice. It's a question of letting the City of Stamford down, letting them lose over Two Million Dollars. It's just a shame that these procedures have to be continually followed and it's not just a matter of Community Development. I think we have seen it on a number of items just this evening. I would hope that the people of Stamford will see by our comments this evening and those people who are administering these programs that we are concerned and that if, in fact, we vote this program in this evening, this allocation, that it is obviously under protest. Thank you."

MR. HAYS: "Mr. President, Mr. Loomis has spoken the same comments I had a little earlier."

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Thank you. I just want everybody to realize and not to misunderstand me, that I do believe as Mr. Loomis said, that anything we do here, I would not want to jeopardize this funding. It's \$2,000,000 the City will get at no cost to the City, so it's stupid to throw it away just because I feel that an error may have been made, but at the same time we can't throw away the money and we will have to find a solution for it, but I just wanted to bring it up and that's why I used the word "admonition" before when I said that they may be back for more money, but at the same time we can't throw away too many dollars. I urge the Board to approve this funding."

MR. DIXON: "Mr. President, I think we are going through the same thing that we went through last year. I think there is a justification for the reservations that some of the members have, and I certainly don't think we ought to risk losing this money. As Chairman of the Housing Committee last year, I worked very closely with Mrs. Mitchell, and I believe she holds the workshops and public hearings for the sole purpose of getting in-put from the various parts of the community, which, in turn, is used as the basis for the decisions made as to how the money is going to be allocated."

"It's an unfortunate thing that we are all put in a position with our backs to the wall and have to place a so-called rubber stamp on a matter that's as important as this. I think we ought to show good faith and approve this tonight contingent, if possible, on some specific measures being taken to assure that this kind of thing doesn't happen again. It's an important thing, the Board of Representatives, this Board is the last one to get this and the last to act on it and I certainly think that they ought to give us ample time to do so. It would be a good thing if we had it for a couple of months and just in case we should reject it, it would have a good opportunity to get back to us before the deadline. Thank you."

MR. FLANAGAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. The Community Development Program, as it is presented to the Board, contains good projects, good works, things that are needed in this City, but I'd like to remind this Board, in this City, that since 1965 Stamford has been committed to a massive Urban Redevelopment Program. To date there has been over 100 Million in private funding committed to this project and 150 million of Federal and Local funding. Under the new Federal programs, there will not be any more categorical grants which has been the system of funding this project over the years. The funding will have to come from the Community Development grants. URC, unfortunately, is competing with many interest groups in the City for these funds. In the last year they have received less than half of what they were able to justify as a grant. This year, again, they are receiving less than half. As this method of Federal funding goes on, it's going to become smaller and smaller, as the pie becomes smaller. In the meantime, people will be aware of the eligible programs and there are people who will put pressure on the Mayor and others to get their piece of the pie.

"As Mr. Glucksman pointed out, we're headed for a short-fall in the Urban Redevelopment Project and let us remember and let everybody in the City remember that when we take funds, Federal funds that come into the City, which could, and I think should, be spent at least in a large part on Urban Redevelopment, we will eventually come to a short-fall. Elm Street happens to be one that was listed as a need in the application that the Urban Redevelopment Commission sent to the Mayor, and it has been deleted. The money has to come from some place, it's not going to go away. Elm Street has to be finished, it's a mess right now, and it's going to become more and more of a focal point as other things are finished and here we are with a bottleneck on Elm Street. In the event that this creates a problem within this next fiscal year before we have any other Federal funding available, there will have to be an emergency appropriation put before this Board, so let us be aware that this is not a pork barrel that can be spread throughout the City without jeopardizing the future of our Urban Redevelopment Project.

"We're just about ready to wrap this thing up. I believe that Macy's has made a firm commitment. I believe that within the next thirty to sixty days, another store will make a firm commitment and I feel that the monies that were committed for the project, including the next million dollars that should be appropriated in our next Capital Projects budget, will be necessary over the role of this short period of time, the next twelve to twenty-four months, and we're just not facing up with this particular program that's been presented to us for approval does not face up to the hard reality that we have an Urban Redevelopment Project on which the whole future of our City hinges. and it doesn't seem to be an emergency in the people's sight throughout the City to see that it's still given the highest priority and I hope that this thinking changes in the near future. Thank you."

MR. BLUM: "Well, I concur with some of the statements made here. It's true that the Community Development Act, this plan, was brought to us kind of late, but there are many projects that are being brought out, the South End, this Rehabilitation program that have to go forward. I think that this \$2 Million should be passed as one of our representatives has stated with some reservation that the next time around, in the next budget, or next appropriation, that we should have a little advance notice to go over this entire two million dollars."

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "Mr. President, I, too, find it hard to vote for this for the simple reason, to have \$150,000 for three employees...."

MR. MILLER: "Of course, the motion is, you know, to put it back into committee, that's what we're talking about."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. I'm a little bit unhappy, too, about a few of the items in here. I note that Lawn Avenue Park Development, we had in last year, I don't know if Mr. Rybnick has any information as to the status of that project, or the status of Ludlow Street."

MR. MILLER: "I'd like Mrs. McInerney to have as much latitude as possible, but I think we do have this question as to whether or not to put this item back into committee."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "O.K. If it's possible, I think I would like to support the motion to put it back into committee and have a special meeting, and perhaps try to reallocate some of the monies in here that are going for items like studies and salaries to things that are more meaningful to the City than things of that nature, things that it was intended for. I don't know whether anyone read the recent ruling from Hartford, but they made a very sharp ruling on exactly what this money could and could not go for. Now perhaps we're not paying too much attention to what happened up-state."

MRS. RITCHIE: "I also would like to put this back into committee because under the heading of Recreation, they are allocating \$205,000 for Recreation, and yet our own Recreation Department budget keeps shrinking. How are we going to stock these places?"

MR. HAYS: "Mr. President, to the point of reallocation, it is my understanding that we cannot reallocate, only the Mayor can allocate under this program and also germane to the subject, some people are given thought on how to vote because of the comment that \$150,000 applied to three salaries. That's not totally correct; there are three salaries within a \$150,000 figure, but all of the consultants are in that same figure, also negotiations and other fees, legal fees, an attorney that is retained full time are all within that \$150,000 figure, and the Office of Administration."

MRS. SANTY: "I CALL THE QUESTION, Mr. President."

MR. MILLER: "All right, we'll vote on moving the previous question. All those in favor say AYE, all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

"Now we'll vote on the MOTION which is before us, which is the motion made by Mr. Signore, to put this item, Item #14, back into committee, and that would really commit the President to the Call of a Special Meeting within a week, which I definitely would do, should this pass. The question is on putting Item #14 under Fiscal back into committee. We'll take a vote on that question. All those in favor say AYE, all those opposed NO. The MOTION is LOST."

"We'll proceed to a debate on the Main Motion, approval of the item."

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "I just want everybody to understand one thing, the Community Development Department of the Mayor's Office has worked on this thing now for nine months to last year. They put a lot of study into it; while they may have made an error, I don't believe they can change the allocation of this money within a week, which we voted against doing it anyway. But I think you have no choice. I think you have to appropriate the funds and I think that's the way it's going to have to be."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RYBNICK: "I do have a time table here and the filing of the application must be submitted to the State Clearing House for a 30-day review and that must be March 12th, and they do take first action on April 15th, and final on June 28th. I'm talking about, but it must be in their hands by the 12th of March, and I see it impossible to have anything, to have it being lost, and I am probably not happy with it either, but I AM voting for this project."

MR. SIGNORE: "If I understand Mr. Rybnick, correct me, he said they have been working on this for nine months to a year, and then they turn around and drop it in us a week or so before it's due. You know, that's holding a gun to our heads again and they say the next time they won't do it, next time comes and they do it all over again and this is a continuing thing. I think unless we put a stop to it somewhere, it's just going to keep going on."

MR. BLOIS: "Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I've heard it said that there is \$150,000 amount in there for administrative purposes. I've also heard it said that there are only three people involved. Can anybody explain that to me?"

MR. MILLER: "I think Mr. Hays did. I think Mr. Hays can explain it."

MR. HAYS: "Yes, Mr. President and Mr. Blois. There are three salaries of the particular department in there, but in addition there are the administrative costs of that department and a legal firm on retainer and the several consultants that they use to negotiate the various programs through the course of the program."

MR. LOOMIS: "I was the one who made that statement, three salaries, and note that was the specific answer that was given to us by Nancy Mitchell, you see, and there was some illusions to, as George says, some consultants and then they said well, we need secretaries, and someone, but it didn't even then add up to us to be \$150,000, so we asked for a breakdown, which obviously they had, or they certainly should have, and we didn't get that. My point was that this was the type of dialogue that was going on, we weren't getting the kind of answers we were seeking and, true, the \$150,000 appears to be more than three persons, but I, for one, cannot tell you what it does cover, what it doesn't cover, how much the consultants get, how much of a time period they work for and what the legal counsel was. There is some confusion and question about the type of legal counsel that we needed and what amounts of money they were getting. So I hope I added a little bit in answer to the question raised on the floor here."

MR. BLOIS: "Thank you, I have the breakdown in front of me, it looks like it's broken down in two different sections. 52 weeks and 64 weeks. Now, can anybody tell me, it says salaries, total for 52 weeks, \$75,710.54. How many people are represented in that \$75,000, is what I'm interested in, three?"

MR. MILLER: "Can anybody answer that? Mr. Rybnick or anybody else? Apparently not. I'm going to go to Mr. Loboza, then to Mr. Glucksman."

MR. LOBOZZA: "First, I'd like to say that I think this is a pretty rotten report, to say the least. To propose something like this before the Board, the sense I get now that it's going to go through, we have no choice of putting it through. I'll have to vote against it, but I think it's a disgrace that something be put before this Board with so much hearsay answers to so many questions. I just think it's a disgrace!"

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "In answer to this issue of the administrative costs, we were told that the Government (Federal) allocates as much as 2% of the entire funding to administrative costs, and 2% would be over \$400,000. They're keeping it well below that, so I don't think we can take issue with that item."

MR. COSTELLO: "I was going to ask for a breakdown as was previously asked, but I see no one has the answer. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Blois has the breakdown."

MR. BLOIS: "If you just want to listen for a minute, I'll give it to you...."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Where di you get it from?"

MR. BLOIS: "This is from the City of Stamford Community Development Program Administration 15-month program. It must come from Nancy Mitchell, doesn't it?" (much laughter)

MR. MILLER: "Mrs. Clark asked Mrs. Mitchell for this material. Mr. Blois will read it."

MR. BLOIS: O.K. Now, under the 52-week period, it says Salaries, total \$75,710.54; Fringe benefits - 15% includes medical, life insurance, education and withholding, \$11,356.58; sub-total \$87,067.12. Now, overhead which includes stationery, postage, overtime, premiums, telephone, telegraph, maps, prints, petty cash, convention, conference and training, dues and subscriptions, new equipment, hearing and meeting rental, travel, mileage - Overhead total \$12,672.54. Professional Services including legal, accounting, rehab and park design, \$21,600, Total \$121,349.66. That's for a 52-week period.

"Now for the 64-week, 15 months, the salaries would be \$93,182.20; the fringe benefits \$13,977.30; sub-total \$107,159.50. The overhead, as I read before, will be \$15,840.50. Professional Services will be \$27,000, for a total of \$150,000. It seems that it's broken down in 12 months and 15 months, but I would still like to know how many personnel are included in that \$75,000 and \$93,000."

MR. COSTELLO: "Thank you, Mr. President, a breakdown of individual salaries is what I actually meant."

MR. DIXON: "The fact of the matter now is that we have no alternative and it appears that we simply must pass this. Now, we could go on and on, just talking about the various parts here that we are displeased with. The Mayor certainly has the responsibility to the City of Stamford and I'm sure he is aware of that. Now, if we lose this money, we will simply be penalizing the citizens of the City of Stamford, perhaps because of our displeasure with something that the Mayor either did or did not do. I think it all boils down to the fact that we've got to pass this tonight, and I think we ought to get on about doing that, and then I think we have to follow with the necessary measures to assure that this doesn't happen again. Thank you."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SIGNORE: "I don't agree with Mr. Dixon; there are too many questions on the floor as to this report, as you can see by the discussion that has been going on; but I think if they didn't do the job properly, then it should have gone back to Committee. Now you stand a choice of either YES or NO on this item and you'd be better off if you'd sent it back to Committee. They could have studied it a little further and you could have come out with the answers you don't have tonight. Now you're again forced into voting on something you really don't know about. You really don't know what it's all about, and you're being forced into something. You've got a \$150,000 item on the list and they're giving you vague numbers. They've got \$100,000 Contingency and they don't explain what a Contingency is. They've got items of \$10,000 for street furniture, nobody told you what a piece of street furniture was. It's a bench, you know, it's a bench now. Some of you didn't know what street furniture was. It's ridiculous. It should have gone back to Committee, and called a Special Meeting."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Mr. President, since we must give approval on these forms tonight, I know that HUD will finally let us know whether or not some of the items in here are allowable for these monies, but I would only give my vote now contingent on the fact that Mrs. Mitchell will give us monthly progress reports on the disbursements of the funds and the project development reports along with it."

MRS. COSENTINI: "Yes, I see on this list that Mr. Blois was kind enough to show me, that there are listed under the salary accounts, the following titles: Director, Assistant Director, Social Planner, Administrative Assistant for Accounts, Secretary I, and Interns, and I cannot resist marvelling at the fact that we have six (6) people to run one department of \$2 Million plus dollars, and we have only one (1) secretary running the Board of Representatives that spends all the money in the City."

MRS. HAWK: "Thank you, Mr. President, there are several aspects about this Community Development appropriation that disturbs me. One of them is the fact that Mr. Glucksman brought out, the elimination of funds for some of the Urban Renewal areas, particularly the Elm Street underpass and Exits 7 and 8, which are sorely needed. Another thing that bothers me is the fact that not enough adequate information is given by this Community Development Office. Any information that we do have is given so late as to preclude detailed research and input by the members of the Board. Third, as Mr. Rybnick has said, in the past, with the exception of Rogers School neighborhood restoration program, and a few bus stop benches, the East Side seems to be noticeably lacking in reception of these funds. However, the fact is that some of the programs that will be funded by the Community Development are very worthy. Others, however (something lost here as Tape side D ended) we can ~~that~~ next year these proposals and these breakdowns come to us much earlier than they have this year so we will be adequately able to study on it before we vote on it. Thank you." (START OF TAPE SIDE #E)

MR. LOBOZZA: "We're talking about breakdown reports after the fact, I think we have to realize that. I think it's the responsibility of everyone of us as representatives here to send this back to Committee and if we have a special meeting, let's have the special meeting. We're not talking about \$2,000 or \$3,000, we're talking about over \$2,000,000 (Two Million Dollars), and I think it's our responsibility to take the time and to come back here and to set this thing up and get it going right so it's right for everybody, especially the taxpayers of this town that have to foot the bill in the end."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. PERILLO: "I MOVE THE QUESTION I withdraw the motion."

MR. RAVALLESE: "What puzzles me, the last Board voted for the Lawn Avenue Project. I don't see anything on Lawn Avenue yet. Now how much money does the East Side have, and if so, when will we have our recreation done?"

MR. MILLER: "Is there a request here for recess?"

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, I would just like to state that my initial reaction this evening in regards to this item was to approve this appropriation because I think we've gone really so far with it that I think it would be ludicrous to turn it down at this point and lose some Two Million Dollars. However, I certainly can find fault with the fact, as so many others have here this evening, with the fact that this was turned in to us at the very last minute and puts us under an awful lot of pressure. By the same token, I suppose if we call a special meeting we can still perhaps clarify certain questionable expenditures and still be able to approve this. However, before we go any further with this, I'd like to make a MOTION that we have a brief RECESS."

RECESS BEGAN AT 10:14 P.M. and ENDED AT 11:05 P.M.

MR. MILLER: "Everybody please take their seats. The meeting will resume please. I believe we can resume this meeting. Ladies and gentlemen of the Board, let me say it's five minutes after eleven and we haven't completed FISCAL. We do have important matters under LEGISLATIVE & RULES, we have a very important report under PERSONNEL, there are other matters before the Board, we must give our full attention to what's going on, or else whether or not we have a special meeting, I foresee this meeting continuing into next week! So, it's up to you people. I believe we are now in the midst of Item #14 under FISCAL. This item was reported out by Mr. Rybnick, we were in the midst of a debate on whether or not this ought to be approved. There was a motion to send this Back into Committee which was rejected. We are now on the MAIN MOTION, if there is no further discussion, I would proceed to a vote, but if there is any discussion...."

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, during this recess, both the Republicans and Democrats met separately in their own caucus rooms, and then jointly. It is the consensus of this Board, after our deliberation, we feel that this item will hopefully pass this evening; but by the same token, there were several objections that were raised. We would hope, when and if this passes, that our Mayor would use the power of his office, and we strongly urge him to use the powers of his office, to overcome some of these objections in order that this will not re-occur at some future and later date when they once again come in.

"We have had this out before; we have been through it before. Forthcoming will be a Sense of the Board Resolution and that resolution will contain such objections as this:

'We feel that in the future there ought to be a line-by-line itemization as to the work to be done under this funding. We would hope, and we can't stress this enough, that any future requests would be presented to us with adequate time for us to peruse it and give any of our input. We would also like to see to it that any salaries that are entailed in this would be spelled out for us. Any jobs that may result in the future, we should have specific job specifications for that particular job that they decide to put into effect .. any new jobs that come into being, that is. We would hope that the Mayor would take heed of this and not look lightly upon our suggestions. We would like a quarterly progress report on the status of all projects."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. COSENTINI: "Yes, as Mr. DeRose stated, the Republicans concur with this position."

MR. SIGNORE: "May I also concur, and I am ~~very~~ upset with the results."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, I would also like to add to what Mr. DeRose said, that if possible we could put a little statement on that saying that we'd like a monthly progress report on the status of all projects."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. DeRose, would you agree to that?"

MR. DeROSE: "It was my understanding that we were to receive a progress report. I don't know if it was on a monthly basis or not. I certainly would not have any objection to that, although I'm not so sure that a month may be too soon."

MR. MILLER: "I just want to be sure we know what we're doing. You're making a MOTION, Mr. DeRose?"

MR. DeROSE: "No, it's just a question of what we want spelled out in the resolution. We just wanted to stress that point here this evening."

MR. MILLER: "Well, we have Item #14 before us, now the intention of the Leadership on behalf of the Board seems to be that if we approve Item #14, we want to make it known clearly to the Mayor and the Community Development department headed by Mrs. Mitchell that we feel these recommendations are in order. Now, would you want a separate resolution after we pass Item #14, if we do? All right, why don't we make Mr. DeRose's comments then in the form of an amendment to the main motion?"

MR. SIGNORE: "Just one question. Mrs. McInerney's statement on that motion about the monthly report, because you can't assume anything from what I can gather by seeing what came out of this."

MR. MILLER: "O.K., then we'll accept Mrs. McInerney's suggestion of a quarterly report. So we're voting on this amendment before we vote on the main motion. The amendment was MOVED and SECONDED. All those in favor say AYE, all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED with ONE NO vote. We will now proceed."

MRS. SANTY: "What are we voting on now?"

MR. MILLER: "No, we are not voting on the main motion. In other words that if indeed we do approve Item #14, it is with those conditions. So, we still have Item #14 with those conditions in the amendment. So, I think if there is no further discussion, Mrs. Cosentini?"

MRS. COSENTINI: "Those conditions are for a future budget?"

MR. MILLER: "Yes, um, future. O.K. then, I think we can proceed to a vote on Item #14, is that right? The question is on Item #14 -- \$2,034,000 Community Development Act - Application for Funding with the amendment put forward by Mr. DeRose and adopted by the Board. All those in favor say AYE, all those opposed NO. The MOTION IS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RYBNICK: "Mr. President, at this time I would like to move for a Suspension of the Rules in order to consider a request related to the funds just passed for the Public Works Department. It is in regard to a letter sent to Mr. Clapes in January. May I read this?"

"Dear Mr. Clapes: On January 26, 1976 I outlined the need for emergency repairs on the 1973 Incinerator in a letter addressed to the Commissioner of Finance, copies of that letter were sent to the members of the Board of Finance, and also to the members of the Fiscal and Public Works Committees of the Board of Representatives. In that letter I mentioned that, while consulting engineers concurred with the cost estimates of the work involved, they cautioned that the demolition proceeding the repair may uncover the need for more intensive work. This has occurred. Three additional sections have been uncovered where the anchors and spacers have broken and sidewalls must be replaced. This is not the type of a situation that could have been anticipated since this information was not available until demolition had taken place. This necessary work will require an additional \$11,000. Will you please therefore initiate a request for the Fiscal Board for \$11,000, to be allocated to the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Incinerator and Sewage Treatment Plants. Yours truly, Vincent J. Rotondo."

"But, since the \$11,000 was asked for, the Board of Finance cut it to \$10,000, so this will mean that with this related article, it will be a total of \$31,000; that is, Item #10 plus this new item."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Rybnick, will you first make a motion for Suspension of the Rules?"

MR. RYBNICK: "My MOTION is to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider this item No. 15 for \$10,000 for the Public Works Department." MOVED, SECONDED, AND CARRIED.

- (15) \$10,000 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Furnace Repair - Additional Appropriation to carry out emergency refractory repairs to the 1973 Conventional Incinerator (Mayor's letter 2/4/76) Board of Finance approved March 1, 1976, reducing from \$11,000 to \$10,000.

MR. RYBNICK: "Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor, and I so MOVE."

SECONDED. MOTION is CARRIED.

MR. RYBNICK: "Thank you, Mr. President. That concludes my report."

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - John Wayne Fox

MR. FOX: "The Legislative & Rules Committee met on February 11, 1976 at which time seven members were present; on February 17, 1976 at which time five members were present; and on February 26, 1976 at which time nine members were present, although not present for each and every vote because of the heavy schedule of committee meetings on that evening.

"The first two items on the Agenda for this evening relate to Charter Revision. Unfortunately, there are still some unresolved questions relating to this. In spite of the fact that the members of the Legislative & Rules Committee are very anxious to pursue this particular question, this item, by a vote of 5-0, was Held in Committee. That would apply to both items 1 and 2."

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION - INITIATION OF ACTION BY BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR APPOINTMENT OF A 10th CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION - (Under provisions of the Home Rule Act as amended - Adoption of empowering resolution calling for appointment of such a Commission, whose duty it shall be to consider revisions and/or amendments to the Charter, as directed by the Appointing Authority (the Board of Representatives)).

This item HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION - CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS OF A 10th CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD UNDER PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 99 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut - (Initiated this date) (May be from 5 to 15 members with office holders not more than one-third to hold any other City Office, and not more than a bare majority of the same political party). (Also must be appointed within thirty (30) days after adoption of Resolution No. ___ under provisions of Home Rule Act)

This item HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. FOX: "Item 3 relates to a proposed ordinance concerning "Freedom of Information". You all, I believe, have received copies of this proposed ordinance. The Committee, over the last several months, has done a substantial amount of work in connection with this ordinance and spoken to and gotten feedback from many organizations. In particular, Barbara McInerney and Marie Hawe have done a substantial amount of work in drafting this particular piece of legislation. At this point, Mr. President, we are simply moving for publication of this ordinance, in light of the fact that it is a controversial question and there will be a public hearing on this. At this point, I simply MOVE FOR PUBLICATION."

- (3) PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION" - Amendment to the Code of Ordinances Section 2-4, Town & City Clerk, Custodian of Records; regarding the filing, with the Town Clerk, of minutes of regular meetings, special meetings, and every emergency special meeting, within a certain specified time after such meetings are held. (Presented by City Representative Barbara McInerney; also letter dated 9/25/75 from Lois Pont-Briant; and others) (Held in Committee 11/8/75; also held 1/5/76)

MR. MILLER: "This item has been MOVED, SECONDED, so the question then is on publication of the proposed ordinance concerning Freedom of Information. Is there any discussion?"

MR. DIXON: "Yes, Mr. President. I've run into some problems and I have some doubts perhaps because I don't fully understand the State law on this, on this Freedom of Information. Now, I have been criticized for one thing, first for having a closed meeting some time ago and then I've been criticized recently in the news media for not revealing certain information which perhaps could have or should have been made public under this law. What I would like the Legislative & Rules Committee to do is to get an interpretation of that law from the Corporation Counsel perhaps for the benefit of the various committees that are holding meetings here monthly. Now, I don't know if all of the provisions of this law, the State law, affect, have the same impact or effect on committee meetings or not. I was also asked very recently for information pertaining to how the individual members voted.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON (continuing): "Now, I gave the overall results of our last Appointments Committee meeting to the news media and then I was asked further for information on how the individual, each individual of the committee, voted. Now, I think this may be stretching it a little bit, but by withholding that kind of information, I want to know if I am in violation of any State statute and I would like for that to be looked into, because I don't have any intentions of violating anything. I would just like to get some clarification on that so I will know from this point on just what to make public and what to withhold from the public, if anything at all is necessary."

MR. MILLER: "I would suggest, Mr. Dixon, rather than go in the direction of getting a Corporation Counsel's opinion at this point, that the Legislative & Rules Committee, which does have four lawyer members perhaps have a meeting on this question and I think what we probably need is some sort of an informational meeting for the members of this Board. I do know, and I did once discuss this with the present Corporation Counsel, and the Deputy Corporation Counsel, I do know that there is a real open question on whether or not the Freedom of Information Act applies to sub-committees of a municipal legislative body and I think almost anybody who reads through the Freedom of Information Act will come up with a real question about that because you just don't find anything on it in that Act and you just have to surmise that when the Act was drafted, they were not really addressing themselves to that question and it seems to me that is a very basic question, but I would suggest that the Legislative & Rules Committee look into this. We have tried to provide the Board members with information; we have provided each member of this Board with a copy of the full text of the Act, and also a copy of a summary of the Act which has been published by the State of Connecticut."

MR. FOX: "I would just like to second your suggestion, Mr. President. There are some very definite questions of interpretation with respect to that Act, and I can fully understand where many people, including myself, are having some problems with it. I think the Legislative & Rules Committee would be most happy to take some time and sit down and try as best we can to answer any questions various members of the Board might have on it. With respect to the proposed ordinance, I believe that motion was carried, Mr. President."

MR. MILLER: "We didn't vote on it yet. (Laughter) So, we have a motion on the floor for publication."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. If I may, I am planning on attending a workshop in Stratford on the Freedom of Information Act, and the implications to the cities and the towns, and I would be very happy to bring these questions up again at that meeting."

MR. MILLER: "We are not unique; people all over the State are having real problems with the Freedom of Information Act, and the Freedom of Information Commission itself is having problems because they have a budget of only \$10,000. Their annual budget is only \$10,000 and I understand they have been flooded with all sorts of complaints and requests for opinions, and it is not a smooth operation at all, and there are all sorts of issues, unanswered questions, and so on; but we'll get back to Mr. Fox's motion which is for publication of item #3 under Legislative & Rules."

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS: "It states here that within a certain specific time after such meetings are held, how long is a specific time?"

MR. FOX: "Could you give me some idea of where you are referring to there?"

MR. BLOIS: "Item #3 in proposed items concerning Freedom of Information, if you read down the 4th line, it says within a certain specified time after such meetings are held, you know to report your minutes to the Board members. What is the specified time, you don't relate to a specific time."

MR. MILLER: "Mrs. McInerney, can you answer?"

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. Blois. That's referring to executive sessions and according to the State Freedom of Information Act, an executive session must have minutes filed within a one-week period, and any vote taken should be filed within 48 hours. That's right in the Act itself, the State Act. Yes, 48 hours for a vote, one week for minutes."

MR. FOX: "I'm sorry, I was looking at the proposed ordinance; you were looking at the agenda. I think that is set out in the proposed ordinance. I do want to emphasize, however, that all we are doing now is asking for publication of this. There is a definite possibility I think that some of the time limits set out in here could well be changed subsequent to a public hearing on this."

MR. WALSH: "Mr. President, as a matter of time requirement, there is a request on the desk from the Zoning Board if we would try to make it a 30-day time requirement, but if it's a State law, I don't know how we can amend that."

MR. MILLER: "I haven't read that. It's on the desk tonight from the Zoning Board? Well, this is only publication and we'll give the Zoning Board people an opportunity come in and present their case. I can't answer your question, Mr. Walsh. Anything else on this proposed ordinance?"

MR. HAYS: "Yes, Mr. President, to Mrs. McInerney or Mr. Fox, the proposed ordinance calls for filing the minutes at a certain time after the meetings to which they minutes are minutes of, I just want some clarification. Are minutes really minutes until they are approved by the body after the fact, in which case then would it take meeting to approve those minutes before they became official enough to be recorded?"

MR. FOX: "That is obviously one of the problems. We have had information from many of the Boards that the time period set out in this particular ordinance is simply not sufficient. If you look at page 2 of this ordinance, it does have a provision for filing of unapproved minutes and that gives any particular board or commission an additional period of time in which to file approved minutes. I'm not sure that that answers your question, but what you are alluding to is very definitely a problem, the time question is not resolved; we have to have more input on that in order to resolve that point."

MR. HAYS: "Thank you. I'll wait until you get your later input before I ask more questions."

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SHERER: "As Mr. Fox, the Chairman of Legislative & Rules, has stated a number of times, the purpose of this discussion is what we felt was just for a motion of publication and then it was the intention of the L&R Committee to go one step further, which is procedural, to have a public hearing. Many of the very definitions which appear in that proposed ordinance are of concern to us because they are too difficult to define at this time. Once we get the publication approved, and then we can start the public hearing we'll be able to answer those questions. Thank you."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. If I may, this ordinance was written and fashioned 90% after the State Freedom of Information Ordinance, so in fact it is a duplication of State Act 75-342. We have some question about the filing time on minutes, but minutes should be filed and then subject to approval. Now once the minutes are accepted and approved, then you send that copy to the Town Clerk's Office and they can remove the previous copy."

"It's a simple task, but we want this, and we knew that we had something good and that we probably would have to revise certain sections so I would suggest that any of you who have any other complaints to come to our public hearing and I think both Mrs. Hawe and I felt that it was very reasonable for all government agencies and officials charged with public business to keep an accurate record of minutes to have them filed in one central place. I think that perhaps at the time of our Public Hearing, we may even have more information from the State as to what in fact this Board is supposed to comply with."

MR. MILLER: "Can we proceed to a vote on this, there is a motion on the floor for publication of Item #3 under L&R proposed ordinance concerning Freedom of Information. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTALCONCERNING DESIGNATION OF A CENTRAL LOCATION FOR FILING MINUTES
AT THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE IN REFERENCE TO CONN. STATE PUBLIC
ACT NO. 75-342, "AN ACT CONCERNING FREEDOM OF INFORMATION."

NOW BE IT ORDAINED IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

(1) a. The public policy for the City of Stamford shall be that each public agency shall be required to comply with Conn. State Public Act. No. 75-342, "An Act Concerning Freedom of Information" and set up procedures to provide public access in a Central Location to minutes of meetings of such public agencies.

b. These minutes shall adequately set forth the nature of the meeting and the proceedings occurring at such meeting and any vote taken.

c. These minutes shall be available to the public at a Central Location which is designated herein to be the Town Clerk's Office; and shall be accurately accounted for in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

(2) Minutes of a public meeting of any public agency as defined in Conn. Public Act No. 75-342 now on file as required in the respective public agency office, shall also submit a copy to the Town Clerk's Office in written form over a signature within one (1) week, or a tape recorded copy shall be submitted with a written abstract over a signature also on file until such time as complete written minutes shall be submitted within a period of no longer than two (2) weeks; at which time the tape recorded copy will be removed.

(3) In the case of executive session of any public agency; the vote of each member upon any issue before said public agency shall be reduced to writing and submitted to the Town Clerk's Office within 48 hours; excluding any Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday; and shall also be recorded in the minutes of the session which is required to be on file at the Town Clerk's Office within one (1) week of said meeting.

(4) Minutes submitted as unapproved must be noted as such, and shall be on file subject to the filing of approved minutes. Approved minutes must be received within five (5) weeks of the meeting.

(5) All minutes are available to the public and upon written application to the Town Clerk's Office; a written copy will be supplied for a fee not exceeding administrative costs.

(6) The following words are defined as follows:

- (a) "Public Agency" or "agency" shall mean any city board, commission, bureau, committee, or agency, or official, or any subdivision thereof.
- (b) "Executive Session" as defined in Conn. Public Act. No. 75-342.
- (c) "Meeting" as defined in Conn. Public Act No. 75-342.

(7) Penalties in accordance with Conn. Public Act No. 75-342, and in addition:

- (a) A violation of any provision of this ordinance or loss or absence of any minutes required to be on file by this Ordinance shall be punishable in accordance with the penalty provided in Section 1-8 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Stamford.
- (b) Officials of any public agency may be treated as personally responsible for violations of this ordinance.

(8) This ordinance shall take effect upon enactment.

* * * * *

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: "There is another item on which I would ask for SUSPENSION OF RULES. It is not on the Agenda. I would ask for a Suspension of the Rules so that we might consider it tonight. This is a proposed ordinance concerning the control of pigeons. It seems that a great many people are amused by that whole question. However, I can indicate from what our Committee has heard to date, to many individuals, it is a very serious problem. The proposed ordinance has been sent, as I understand it, to all members of this Board. I would direct your attention to a couple of aspects of it. First of all, I think the proper Motion would be for a Suspension of the Rules so that we might consider it tonight."

MR. MILLER: "All right, is there a SECOND to that MOTION? SECONDED. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

MR. FOX: "Getting down to the ordinance itself, let me first of all say that Rep. Donald Sherer did a substantial amount of work. He is actually the one that drafted this particular ordinance. There are two technical changes I would bring to your attention. The ordinance refers to a particular chapter in the Code of Ordinances. This indicates that this will be a particular section of that ordinance. I would ask that you delete that at this time. There also should be added to this proposed ordinance, a date on which it is effective. That also would have to be added. Here again, all we are asking tonight is for publication of this ordinance, in light of the fact that it can be a controversial issue, we want to give the public the opportunity to give us some feedback on this, in spite of the fact that we have heard a lot about it and about the problems presently existing in the City. So right now, Mr. President, I would simply move for publication of this ordinance with the two changes I have noted."

MR. MILLER: "All right, the MOTION is MADE and SECONDED. The question is on approval for publication on what I will call the "pigeon ordinance". All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL
CONCERNING THE CONTROL OF PIGEONS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

For control purposes and in order to prevent the increase in the number of uncontrolled pigeons, which roost and make their nests on the roofs and in the recesses of the various private and public buildings and structures within the City, the Director of Health is hereby authorized to issue licenses for the purpose of trapping any pigeon or pigeons, in a manner acceptable to the Connecticut Humane Society.

Any pigeon or pigeons found in any of the said traps so set up, placed or permitted to be so placed for trapping purposes shall be disposed of in a manner prescribed by the Connecticut Humane Society and all injured pigeons shall be placed in the charge or custody of said Society.

Whenever Antwerp or homing pigeons, wearing a ring or seamless leg band with its registered number stamped thereon is found among such trapped pigeons, the same will be immediately released from custody or placed in the care or charge of the Connecticut Humane Society for disposition pursuant to law.

The Director of Health is hereby authorized to issue licenses for the trapping of pigeons within the City of Stamford and within the regulations established by the Health Department.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon its adoption.

* * * * *

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: "Again, Mr. President, I would ask for a SUSPENSION OF THE RULES to deal with another item that is not on the Agenda this evening. This is an item relating to the establishment of flood encroachment lines along a portion of the Mianus River between Long Ridge Road and Riverbank Road. Here again, I believe that all of the members of the Board have received copies of this ordinance. I think it would be appropriate, first of all, to MOVE for a SUSPENSION OF THE RULES, so that we might deal with this item, and I SO MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED. The question is on Suspension of the Rules. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED to Suspend the Rules."

MR. FOX: "Just in light of the hour (End of Tape Side E)

(Start of Tape Side F) ... contingent upon the passage of this ordinance. This ordinance sets out certain boundary lines, certain encroachment lines. If you look at the ordinance itself, you will see at the very bottom that it says 'this ordinance shall take effect upon approval of the aforesaid map by the Environmental Protection Board'. I can represent to you, I have been informed by the attorney for the people involved, that the Environmental Protection Board this evening did approve these encroachment lines. There is . . ."

MR. MILLER: "In that case, could we change the effective date?"

MR. FOX: "We could; there's not an effective date here as yet; we could make it effective as of passage, yes sir."

MR. MILLER: "Well, that would be ten days after the Mayor signs it. If you just put into the ordinance to take effect upon enactment, that means, really, ten days after the Mayor signs it. Now is that a problem with you?"

MR. FOX: "That is, at this point, that is not a problem. No sir."

MRS. COSENTINI: "Would you clarify that for me? The last I heard was that subject to the approval of the Environmental Board, what was the addition?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, it was thought, Mrs. Cosentini, that this matter would be taken up on Monday. Of course, the Environmental Protection Board wouldn't be meeting until this evening and the passage of this ordinance was to be contingent upon approval by the Environmental Protection Board of this matter, and the Environmental Board has already approved it this evening. Am I right, Mr. Fox?"

MR. FOX: "Yes, sir, they have."

MR. MILLER: "So, I didn't like that language to begin with about passing an ordinance contingent upon approval of the EPB. So, now since we know they've approved it, the better language would be just 'to take effect upon enactment.' which means, actually, ten days after the Mayor signs the ordinance, if he chooses to sign it."

MR. FOX: "At this point, I would MOVE for a WAIVER OF PUBLICATION."

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: "All right, MOVED and SECONDED. The question is on Waiver of Publication for this ordinance. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

MR. FOX: "At this point, Mr. President, I would MOVE for approval and passage of this ordinance, with the change that was noted, yes sir."

MR. MILLER: "All right, fine. The question then is on FINAL ADOPTION of the ordinance. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY."

ORDINANCE NO. 330 SUPPLEMENTALESTABLISHING FLOOD ENCROACHMENT LINES ALONG A PORTION OF THE MIANUS RIVER (EAST BRANCH) BETWEEN LONG RIDGE ROAD AND RIVERBANK ROAD (STERN PROPERTY)

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD that in accordance with Section 7-147 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, flood encroachment lines are hereby created and established along the easterly side of a portion of the Mianus River (East Branch) located between Long Ridge Road and Riverbank Road, Stamford, Connecticut, which flood encroachment lines are shown on a certain map entitled, "Map Showing Proposed Flood Encroachment Lines Along A Portion of the Mianus River (East Branch) Between Long Ridge Road and Riverbank Road", certified by Rocco V. D'Andrea, Engineer and Surveyor and dated March 1, 1976, and which map is to be filed in the office of the Town Clerk of said Stamford. Said flood encroachment lines are located and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the westerly side of Long Ridge Road being formed by the intersection therewith of the boundary line between land of Achille A. Presti et al and land of Jane Meyer Stern, running thence the following courses and distances:

South 57°55' East, 442.00 feet; North 87°00' East, 232.00 feet;
South 85°15' East, 131.00 feet; South 59°15' East, 220.00 feet;
South 16°15' East, 243.00 feet; South 59°30' West, 132.00 feet;
South 12°00' West, 140.00 feet; South 8°00' East, 124.00 feet; and
South 16°00' West, 290.41 feet to a point on the southeasterly side of Riverbank Road.

The following are the owners of land affected by said flood encroachment lines:

Jane Meyer Stern.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon its adoption.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

- (1) INQUIRY INTO CIRCUMSTANCES CONCERNING CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS WITHIN THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM - Re: Appointants in the Law Dept.: Barry J. Boodman, Deputy Corporation Counsel, requiring testimony from former Personnel Commission members and former Corporation Counsel, also Atty. Frank LiVolsi (continued from 13th Board)

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Thank you, Mr. President. The Board has already voted on Items 2 and 3 on the Agenda, so we just have to consider Item #1 which is the inquiry into circumstances concerning certain appointments within the Civil Service System, to wit, the appointment of Mr. Barry J. Boodman. The Personnel Committee met . . ."

MR. MILLER: "I just want to say, before you go on, Mrs. Goldstein, that the CHAIR thinks it appropriate, because of the importance of the question, that this report be read in full by Mrs. Goldstein, and if there is a minority report, I think that report should be read."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Yes, sir, well, at any rate, on February 11, 1976 all members were present at a Personnel Committee meeting where we heard testimony from three former, actually from two former members of the Personnel Commission, and well, just let me begin again."

"On February 11, 1976 we heard testimony in relation to this area. All members of the Personnel Committee were present. On February 24, 1976 we heard Mr. LiVolsi, we heard the Police Contract, and then we voted on the Contract, and at that meeting we had Mr. Blum, Mr. Connors, Mr. Livingston, Mrs. Ritchie, Mr. Wicloy, Mr. Osuch, Mrs. Santy, Mrs. Goldstein present. Mr. Lowden was excused for that meeting, and at that meeting we voted 7-1 to accept the report which was submitted to the Board to-night. (Note from Staff: At end of meeting, Mrs. Goldstein requested that the record show that the one dissenting vote was that of Mrs. Jeanne-Lois Santy, as this information was not on the tape recording.)"

"I would like to say that this report deals with the chronology of three years. The Committee debated the issues at length, heard many people, and I would just like to thank every member of my Committee for the hard work that was put in. The questions asked of the people from whom we heard testimony and the research that was done, it was really a pleasure working with everyone on the Committee for this. Now, if you would like, Mr. President, I will read the report, all eleven (11) pages of it."

MR. MILLER: "I think it might be the will of this Body, Mrs. Goldstein, if you would try to summarize or read parts of it."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Yes, Mr. Miller, I fully concur with the will of this Body. I would just like to read a few other items in addition to the conclusions and what exactly it was that the Personnel Committee set out to do. As you know, we were continuing the investigation of the 13th Board and what the Personnel Committee decided its course of action would be, was, first, to examine the circumstances surrounding the waiver of qualifications for the position of Deputy Corporation Counsel. The second thing was to examine the procedures followed by the Personnel Commission and the Department of Civil Service as related to the recruitment, examination, and certification of the aforementioned position; and three, to recommend changes in the procedures or practices of the Personnel Commission and/or Department, if changes were deemed warranted."

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN (continuing): "We devoted three complete evenings solely to the questioning of witnesses, and we heard really more than nine hours worth of testimony. I think it is important to note who was present at these testimony hearings. We saw Richard Comerford, Mr. William Napolitano, and Mrs. Jacqueline Frisbie, all former members of the Personnel Commission. We saw Mr. Robert Bromley, who was the former Corporation Counsel, Mr. Barry Boodman, who is now the Deputy Corporation Counsel, and Frank LiVolsi, Jr., who is a former member of the Law Department.

"The report proceeds to outline a chronology of events dealing from August 5, 1970 to the time that the position was filled on March 13, 1973. We drew conclusions based on the testimony we heard, and we came up with recommendations and I do believe that that is the most important item of the report because that is where we, this Board, can really have input into changing those things that we saw as, loose, oh really, very loose procedures in the Personnel Commission and Personnel Department. We will be submitting this, as well as to the Board, we will be submitting this to the Personnel Commission, to the Personnel Department, and to the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Personnel Practices.

"Every item we mention in our Recommendations is based on testimony that we heard. The first item deals with job specifications and announcements.

ITEM I:

1. Department Heads should have maximum input into the writing of original job specifications and the revising of old specifications. In addition, any and all changes made in job specifications, by the Personnel Department, should be approved in writing by the Department Head. Unfortunately, there were instances that we found where this type of thing was not done.
2. All original specifications and revisions of specifications should be approved by the Personnel Commission and clearly stated as such in its minutes.
3. Any non-typed (pencilled) notation on minutes, or job specifications, should be clearly initialled and dated.
4. All job announcements should be posted and advertised in places that would insure the maximum exposure for those people likely to apply for any particular position.

ITEM II deals with equivalency:

1. All specifications containing the equivalency clause should be rewritten so that they are clear and unambiguous. Now that in itself might sound ambiguous to the Board. However, we felt that we could not outline just exactly how an equivalency clause should be stated, but there must be some way that the Personnel Department and Commission can come up with equivalency clauses that have meat to them and have meaning to them.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN (continuing):

ITEM III - Qualification Waiving:

1. When the Personnel Commission waives a qualification that appreciably lowers the specifications for a particular position, the job should be reposted to afford an opportunity for others who might then qualify for the job. This was really a major thing with our Committee, because in this particular instance, a job specification was waived and it really changed the nature of the job and other people could have applied.
2. When the Personnel Commission does waive a qualification, the minutes should clearly state for whom and the reason the qualification was waived. Our Committee spent many hours trying to determine who was meant by certain phrases in the minutes of the Commission and every name should be spelled out.

ITEM IV - Grades:

1. Open, competitive examinations should have posted minimum passing grades. I will say that when we met with the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Panel, and when we spoke to the Personnel Department, they did differ with us. They feel that a flexible passing point is the latest thing and very highly recommended. We feel that that kind of flexibility might really lead to problems and it has certainly in the past led to problems.

ITEM V - Examination Panels:

1. To comply with the Civil Service regulations in designating an oral examining panel, this Civil Service Department should make certain that there is no connection between any member of the examining panel and any examinees that could influence the results of the examination. It seems that that should speak for itself; however, living in a city that is not composed of a million people, people know each other, and sometimes it is difficult to get totally unbiased examining panels for all examinations. However, it is the Committee's feeling that where there has to be a panel, we should go out of town to get people to serve on these panels so that there is no conflict of interest.

ITEM VI - Miscellaneous:

1. All Personnel Commission minutes should be accurate and detailed, that should go without any question. However, we have found this not to be the case.
2. Because of the heavy work burden placed on the Personnel Commission, this Committee feels that the Charter Revision Commission should propose an increase in the number of members on the Personnel Commission from three to five.

That's it."

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. MILLER: "Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein. The CHAIR would just remark that Mrs. Goldstein has presented the report of the Committee and that concludes the work of the Committee on that particular item. There need be no motion to accept the report. The report is received by the Board when it is given to the Board. A Committee report, which is a report of the majority of the Committee in most instances has a status superior to that of any minority report, in that a minority report is inferior, or there is no right to have a minority report presented to a body.

"It is a privilege, but the CHAIR would now recognize any member of the Personnel Committee who wishes to read a minority report. Is there a minority report? All right, then, we have received a Committee report; as I said, all we have to do is just to receive it and that has already been done. Now if someone wishes to make a motion to adopt the report, or if someone wishes to make a motion somehow relating to that report, that would be in order."

MR. SIGNORE: "I accept it as written, with my own personal reservations. However, I do hope this is the end of any investigations. I just hope it's the end of it, because I think too much time has been taken up on investigations and many people have been dragged through the coals, so to speak, and I think it is unfortunate. That's all I have to say, Mr. President."

MR. DeROSE: "Mr. President, I personally would like to congratulate the members of the Personnel Committee for the expedient report that they gave. I'd just like to add that originally this question arose under the 13th Board of Representatives, and the Personnel Committee of the 13th Board, under the direction of Mr. Leonard Hoffman, spent some five months on this, and for one reason or another, was unable to get it off the ground; and I'm happy that once and for all, that we've finally reached some conclusion here.

"I think that this report vividly points out that there certainly were some irregularities with regards to the selection process under the current Civil Service System. I would hope, and it's my understanding that Mrs. Goldstein will pass on these findings to the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Committee, who is charged with the responsibility of suggesting improvements in our Civil Service System. It is my hope that they would pass on these irregularities to them so that we could avoid them in the future. Thank you."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Yes, Mr. DeRose, that is our intention. I would like to say, however, that some very good suggestions came out of the Special Investigating Committee that existed last year and they came up with some excellent Civil Service procedural suggestions also, and already some of these procedures have been disregarded within the Personnel Department, as I understand.

"When our Committee does turn this over to the Personnel Commission and Department, we certainly do intend to act as, a watchdog is a very poor word -- that is not our role, but we certainly do intend to see that some regard is paid to these suggestions. They were really very significant, they caused us---there were many problems that the lack of these items caused us, and would cause any City Government, and it is really to the detriment of our Merit System that there can be such looseness in our Personnel Department.

MR. MILLER: "I think that concludes, then, the report of the Personnel Committee, does it, Mrs. Goldstein? All right, I think we can move on then to Planning and Zoning. Mr. Baxter is not here. I don't think there was anything."

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE - No report.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Alfred Perillo

MR. PERILLO: "I have no report other than if I can get an approximate count on how many members would like to take that tour on Saturday, so that I can inform them of how many guys to have on hand."

MR. MILLER: "Can we have a show of hands? There seems to be eight or nine."

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Matthew Rose

MR. ROSE: "Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Health and Protection met on the evening of February 27, 1976. Item #1 under Health and Protection, Washington Boulevard Fire House."

(1) REPORT ON STATUS OF WASHINGTON AVENUE FIRE HOUSE NO. 5 - Requested
by City Representative Barbara McInerney in letter of Dec. 12, 1975.

MR. ROSE: "We had Commissioners Montgomery and Esposito attending the meeting. We discussed again the situation at the fire house and they said that they wouldn't come in for an appropriation. It had been felt that one of the Board members had asked them to come in for an appropriation, but after discussing it, they said that it wouldn't be feasible to come in for an appropriation at this time. What is happening is that the firehouse on West Main Street is going to be repaired and this work should start maybe in March or April, and when this work is being done, they are going to move some of the equipment up to the Washington Boulevard Firehouse and hopefully they will be able to come in to us with an appropriation for say in another nine months before the other contract comes up, the Fire Contract comes up."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "I'd like to thank you for all the time you spent investigating that, but I also wonder if you can get in touch with the Police Department and ask them, in fact, since we will not be using the fire house, whether they can bag the traffic lights that blink constantly. I would think that if we sent HELCO up with a meter reader, we would find out that we are spending quite a bit of money on these five blinking lights that are not serving any purpose."

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "I think they are using those firehouses. They are moving the West Side Fire Department down there temporarily until ..."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "I'm sorry then, I wasn't paying any attention."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Well, I want to clarify that. There's a Capital Projects Appropriation in and the work will not start until after July 1st, and they intend on moving the engines from the West Side Station down to the Washington Station for use while the West Side house is being repaired. That won't start until after July 1st, but they are using the building right now to store some traffic trucks and things like that."

MR. MILLER: "I think we can move on to Item #2."

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) REPORT ON CONDITIONS ON IROQUOIS ROAD CAUSED BY PATRONS OF "THE HUDDLE TAVERN" - Requested by City Rep. Marie J. Hawe in letter of Dec. 9, 1975, regarding complaints from her constituents.

MR. ROSE: "O.K., thank you, Mr. President. Item #3, the Huddle Restaurant, we discussed that at length and would suggest that we get a letter to our Corporation Counsel asking him about the feasibility of making suggestions from the Liquor Control Commissioner; and also we are going to have a meeting on March 17th in which we will have people from the neighborhood. I guess with the lawyers to discuss their, what, the progress they have been making. Mrs. Clark, will you relate on the letter that you were going to send?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, first I would like to say that a letter has gone out to the Law Department asking that either Mr. Wise or a member of his professional staff come to the March 17th meeting, and I outlined some of the problems, namely, two, the question as to whether or not it would be appropriate for this Board to adopt a resolution making a complaint to the State Liquor Control Commission, and also the question as to whether this Board could take some action concerning declaring THE HUDDLE a public nuisance; but anyway a request has gone to the Law Department asking for the presence of a lawyer from the Law Department at the March 17th meeting."

MRS. CLARK: "Yes, Mr. President. Also a little bit more on this. I've been in contact with the Police Commission, one member at any rate, and he has invited anyone from the area, as well as the two representatives from the District and the Committee and any representative to please come down on the 15th of this month and meet with the Commission because, in fact, this Commission has never received any information on this from any of the residents, and that's their report to me. I've been talking to this one Commissioner, I would say every other day now, he's been in contact, so for Dr. Lowden and Mrs. Hawe, we would like you to come down on the 15th to meet with the Police Commission as well as on the 17th."

DR. LOWDEN: "I'd like to make a brief comment on this issue on behalf of my constituents. This problem has been festering for many, many years. It's getting worse and worse every year. It was a campaign issue during the last election; in fact, as far as those residents were concerned, it was the only issue in that election. Mayor Clapes' administration, or at least the Mayor, is well aware of this problem down there. Marie Hawe and I last week came to the meeting of the Health and Protection Committee at which time Corporation Counsel Wise was to have been there, and members of the Police Commission, as I understand it. Neither the commissioners nor the Corporation Counsel appeared at that meeting, and therefore little could be done by the Health and Protection Committee."

MR. MILLER: "I think it should be said that Mr. Wise was on vacation, by the way."

DR. LOWDEN: "I didn't know that at that time. I believe there was some other objection that was brought up that he had, or the Law Department had, as far as showing up was concerned. At any rate, that's over the dam. I'm glad to see that we have meetings scheduled for this month to get together with the Corporation Counsel and to get together with the Police Commissioners in order to deter-

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

DR. LOWDEN (continuing): "mine, perhaps whether or not the City can finally exert its corporate powers under the Stamford Code; one of the corporate powers of this City is to preserve the public peace in good order and to prevent quarrels, riots, and disorderly assemblages and to prevent disturbing noises. I assume that since the City has that power, they also have the obligation to use it when necessary. This is what we want to talk to Corporation Counsel about, and I'm very glad that he'll be here next month to discuss it with us. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "I doubt that he'll be here; we're asking him to be here (laughter)."

MRS. SANTY: "I want to just repeat what Dr. Lowden said. I was under the assumption as Vice Chairman of that Committee, that Mr. Wise would be at that meeting, and I did not realize he was on vacation. I thought it was a technicality because he wanted it in writing, but certainly he could have sent Mr. Boodman if he could not appear himself. But I'm happy to see that, I hope, one of them appear. I think it's only fair to these Representatives, plus the people in the First District. I feel very strongly about this."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Right. A letter was sent to the Corporation Counsel and I think he should have sent a representative there at that meeting. Because we didn't have any representative there from our Legal Department, we really could do nothing. We hashed out a lot of things and we just absolutely got nowhere, and it seems that when we request their presence, we don't get it, but when we don't ASK for their opinions, it seems that we get them, and I think we have to set something up where the Law Department gets an understanding that if we want them, we'll ask for them, and they should come; and if we don't want them, they should mind their business."

MR. MILLER: "There is just one correction, there was not a letter sent to Mr. Wise. It was an oral communication with the Law Department, but anyway we'll see what happens in the future, but there was no letter sent prior to that Friday meeting."

MRS. HAWES: "Thank you. I just want to agree with what Dr. Lowden said about this problem down there, and I want to thank the Health & Protection Committee for looking into this and for doing so much work on it for us, and for the people in that district. Concerning the Corporation Counsel, we were disappointed he wasn't there, but as Dr. Lowden said, that's water over the dam, and we're very glad that, hopefully, he will be there on the 17th and will be able to give us a ruling on that issue. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "All right, anything else on the Huddle? O.K. We can move on to #3."

MR. ROSE: "What time will the meeting be for the Police Commission on the 15th? 8:00 p.m. at the Police Station? Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Eight o'clock at the Police Headquarters on Bedford St. That's on the 15th?"

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REPORT ON COMPLAINTS OF UNLEASHED DOGS AND PACKS OF "WILD" DOGS - Letter of December 30, 1975 from Mrs. P.E. Prince re her son who was bitten; etc. City Representative Leonardi Hoffman.

MR. ROSE: "O.K., Item #3 on the Agenda - Complaints about unleashed dogs. We also, on the 17th, are planning to have the Dog Warden in. I think we also need to have maybe the Corporation Counsel. Oh, I don't know, but someone to enforce the laws that we already have on our books about unleashed dogs. I think we have enough laws there to take care of this situation, if we can get them enforced, and I hope we can get some action on this item. That's all I have, Mr. President."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Julius J. Blois

- (1) INQUIRY INTO STONE WALL CONSTRUCTED ON EDEN ROAD AND HOPE STREET - Letter of January 14, 1976 from City Representative Barbara McInerney.

MR. BLOIS: "Oh Item #1, inquiry into stone wall constructed on Eden Road and Hope Street, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make this brief, and probably try to give you a little background..." (End of Tape Side #F)

(Start of Tape Side #G) MR. BLOIS (continuing): "On January 19th and January 27th, we had two meetings at which we invited Mr. Condon from the Parks Department who is Acting Superintendent, at the present time, at this present time, not at the time we are working on for the wall, and Mr. Morelli, who is engineer, assistant engineer is what his title is, and also Mr. Connell, who was the Superintendent at the time, and Mr. Berube. Of the four, Mr. Connell, Mr. Condon, Mr. Morelli; Mr. Berube was out of town that night, he was supposed to come to our meeting. Let's go on to the reason why they were involved; to begin with, from what we can gather, Mr. Connell, Mr. Berube, the Police Department, the owner of the land, and the contractor of the heavy equipment. They had a meeting at this particular corner, Eden Road and Hope Street, and they decided there was a hazard from what we heard. We don't think that our Committee denies that there was a hazard from what we heard. We would agree with the people that live in the area, because it probably originated from those people and a former member of the Board brought it to the Park Department's attention and probably also to the Public Works Department. Now they don't have any qualms about whether there was a hazard there or not.

"Now, when they got there, from what we can gather from our Committee, the questions that were asked, I believe Mr. Morelli was the first one who was with Mr. Fusaro, I believe, who is a stone mason; and this wall was approximately 70 ft. long, 2½ ft. in thickness. Mr. Morelli was instructed to sort of snap a line there and give them a new line and replace the old. But first of all, the way we can understand, they went there to cut a couple of trees down and some shrubs. Now after looking the situation over, I believe Mr. Connell stated that they came to the conclusion that the trees were not the hazard, that the bank and the wall were the hazard. So, consequently, instead of taking and removing the trees first, they removed the stone wall because in order for them to take the trees down, they had to get to the roots and remove the roots.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS (continuing): "To remove the stone wall, in the process, they had to cut the bank down behind the wall, which probably the way we understand, was the hazard. In the course of this, they had to hire two pieces of heavy equipment, one was a ten-wheel truck and one was a digger. Now, these two pieces of heavy equipment, this is a fact, and this is what we set out to find -- facts, cost \$1,416.00 for three days' work, eight hours per day for each piece of equipment. They did take the trees down, from what we understand; a lot of questions were asked, and a lot of answers came our way but some of them were vague, some of them were to the point, but as you can read in the report that you have before you, you can gather your own conclusions on a lot of the answers. Now, to go just a little further -- don't they have a copy of the minutes? Oh, my God! Well, first of all I have to apologize to you because we were all supposed to have a copy of the minutes. I don't know why you didn't. I found a copy on my desk and I assumed that everybody had a copy. I hoped everybody would have a copy two or three weeks ago, but our department is so loaded with work that Helen is so far behind."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Blois, does everybody have a copy on the desk tonight?"

MR. BLOIS: "I don't think so, Mr. Miller. I thought there was ... I assumed they did because I found a copy on my desk. I have to apologize. I don't know why. The copy I have is incomplete also; it only goes to 27 pages. So to get back to filling you in on this, we were at the point where we had a digger and a truck working for three days. Now, how much dirt they removed from this corner, I don't know, but they had two pieces of heavy equipment working for two full days, so with a ten-wheel truck I imagine you should be able to remove a lot of dirt."

"Anyway, to get back to the story, they removed the dirt, they put the wall back up, they put the wall back ten feet beyond the point of its original course. Well, there was grading done there and the work came from permanent help and seasonal help from the Parks Department. Now, actually how much money was spent on this particular project, I don't think I can tell you. I don't think the Superintendent can tell you. I don't think the man in charge, Mr. Condon, at the time, I don't think he can tell you, because they don't keep records of a particular job like this. First of all, we feel they stepped out of bounds when they took the complete job on. I think this was a Public Works Department job, not a Parks Department job. I think they were within their rights to go there to remove trees and shrubs, this I cannot deny because this is in their realm to do....."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Blois, I don't like to interrupt but I think we're a little confused. You are not prepared tonight for your final report on this Item #1?"

MR. BLOIS: "Well, Mr. President, I have to tell this Board something ----."

MR. MILLER: "Well, you're saying: 'I feel and so on and -----.'"

MR. BLOIS: "I think my Committee will concur."

MRS. McINERNEY: "I'm not ready to make any kind of agreement with you until after I see the full minutes."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS: "That's your prerogative, dear. Would you allow me to go on? Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Well, it appears, Mr. Blois, that this matter is not concluded and that we'll have to bring it up at the next meeting."

MR. BLOIS: "Well, don't I (several people are talking and Mr. Blois cannot be heard) the people are patiently waiting here, and I would just like to tell them, and when we have the minutes, they'll get a copy of them."

MR. MILLER: "We're taking a lot of time on something that isn't conclusive, and I think if we're going to take this much time, it should be the final report, because I wouldn't....."

MR. BLOIS: "As far as I'm concerned, this can be the final report. If any of my Committee wants to deny what I say, that's fine, that's their prerogative."

MR. MILLER: "Well, I think the full Board should know whether or not these conclusions are the final report because it is possible that after you give the final report, any member, or members, will want to make a motion to adopt the report, or a member might wish to offer some resolution pertaining to the report."

MR. BLOIS: "Can we gamble on that?"

MR. MILLER: "I think we have to, providing the Steering Committee puts it back on the Agenda again. I think we have to wait until the April meeting. Go ahead, Mr. Blois."

MR. BLOIS: "Thank you. We were at the point where they were grading the property in back of the wall, the wall went back up. Now, to make this a little short, the only thing that I can tell you at this particular time that are facts is that there was \$1,416.00 spent from the Cove Beach Sanding Account of which they were taking from and also I have a letter here from the City Engineer of which Mr. Condon requested, the Acting Superintendent, and it is dated January 30, 1976, and if I can be permitted to read it, it's very short, one paragraph."

"Dear Mr. Condon: In response to your letter of January 29, 1976 requesting a survey of the area at the corner of Eden Road and Hope Street, I am enclosing two copies of a map which shows this wall. One map is dated 1949 and the recent one is dated November, 1975. As you can see the between now and prior to new reconstruction that this intersection was on City property. However, there is a slight encroachment of a portion of the wall on Hope St. and that's from the City Engineer. In the beginning of our question, we could not determine whether there was a survey made of the existing wall prior to removal or whether there was a survey made after the wall was replaced. Now, in our final conclusions, by a vote of 4-1, we proposed a resolution which reads as follows: 'We have found that there are certain irregularities and specifications not followed.....'"

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: "I don't like to interrupt, but you're implying that we can't go forward because you don't have all of the minutes available for the Board members."

MR. BLOIS: "I didn't imply that, you implied, Mr. President. I said I'd be willing to gamble on the Board accepting it."

MR. MILLER: "Well, go ahead, Mr. Blois."

MR. BLOIS: "If any of my Committee wants to speak, they're welcome to it."

MRS. McINERNEY: "As a point of information, Mr. Blois, when did our Committee go over the minutes; when did we hash these out so Mrs. McEvoy could type them?"

MR. BLOIS: "We didn't, because I just got them myself tonight, dear. We didn't."

MRS. McINERNEY: "No, no, I meant the minutes prior to that."

MR. BLOIS: "We didn't go over it, because I didn't get the minutes back."

MRS. McINERNEY: "The ones that we didn't want to read last month."

MR. BLOIS: "Because they were all one-sided and you are very well aware of it, and I think the rest of the Committee will concur."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Weren't we supposed to meet and go over that?"

MR. BLOIS: "With all the minutes, yes."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Now, are we also going to include in our report the copies of the letters that were sent saying that the Public Works Department would do a certain portions; are we going to include all the information that we have?"

MR. BLOIS: "Where did you hear that, Mrs. McInerney?"

MRS. McINERNEY: "I only have that from all the records that were sent to us."

MR. MILLER: "I don't want any cross conversation here. Mr. Blois, the CHAIR would suggest that we leave this until next month. Can we do that? There seems to be some confusion as to whether or not the Committee has a final report to which all of the Committee members can agree."

MR. BLOIS: "Mr. President, Mrs. McInerney is presenting something here that didn't come before our fact-finding board, and I think, there were no letters presented."

MRS. McINERNEY: "If I may, Mr. Blois, I presented you a letter last week prior to our Board meeting with the two maps. Do you remember that? I happen to remember it."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: "All right, Mrs. McInerney. Mr. Blois, this should be settled in Committee, not on the floor."

MR. BLOIS: "Just a minute, Mr. President. I would like to clarify this because she's making insinuations that are untrue. The maps that she has did not come before our meetings. I want that clearly understood."

MRS. McINERNEY: "Mr. Blois, I said that the information was given to you last month prior to our Board meeting just before or just after I got there."

MR. MILLER: "Thank you, Mrs. McInerney."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Yes, Mr. President, thank you. I take it that this investigation is not finished then and I'd just like to ask one question on something Mr. Blois said. He said something about a \$1,400.00 expenditure for three days for two pieces of equipment, am I not correct? A ten-wheel truck and a digger, right? Now, I think that for everybody's sake that you'd look a little deeper into that for the simple reason I happen to know one thing, that a 30-yarder, I think the 30-yard is a 25-yard trailer dump, you can rent them for like \$220. a day, man, and diesel fuel, and that would leave you with a \$740. balance for three days for a digger which I think is a little cheaper to rent. So I think, really, if you're going to do a thorough investigation, I'd check into those prices."

MR. BLOIS: "In answer to that, Mr. Loboza, all bids are sent to the City once a year and the Purchasing Agent goes by the bids that are submitted and I can't question the prices because they are all submitted to Mr. Benevelli's office."

MR. LOBOZZA: "Was that a bid job?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, now are we through, Mr. Blois? Let me put it this way, can the Board just accept this as an interim report?"

MR. BLOIS: "Sure, if you want to."

MRS. COSENTINI: "For review I would just like to ask Mr. Blois when he has the final report to reiterate the charge to your Committee, such as was done in the Personnel report. I find that very useful to see what it was that you were charged to do and then to see what results you came up with, if you would not mind."

MR. MILLER: "All right, anything else on Item #1 under Parks & Recreation?"

(2) INQUIRY INTO STONE WALL CONSTRUCTED ON VERY MERRY ROAD - Alleged on private property.

MR. BLOIS: "Item #2, Mr. President, we didn't go into because we finish one stone wall at a time." (laughter)

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Connors is leaving and there are 34 members present now."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REQUEST TO RE-NAME "THE HUBBARD HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE: TO:
"THE E. GAYNOR BRENNAN SR. MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE." (Letter of 8/25/75
from Chairman Wm. Carlucci of the Hubbard Heights Golf Club Board; A
petition containing 140 names from concerned citizens requesting this
change; letter of 9/2/75 from Joseph E. Sherman, Linsly A. Pettitt,
Helen D. Conners, Julian Schwartz, Harold Yudain, Frank J. Daly)

MR. BLOIS: "Item #3 requests to re-name the Hubbard Heights Municipal Golf Course to "The E. Gaynor Brennan Sr. Municipal Golf Course". Mr. President, at this time I'd just like to read a short summary of E. Gaynor Brennan's background. Number one, he was a life-long resident of Stamford, born in Stamford July 12, 1902; died May 29, 1975. He was the son of the late Stamford Police Chief William H. and Margaret S. Brennan; and may I add that with that first sentence, we do meet the requirements of the former committee, I believe it was headed by Mrs. Clark, for setting the guidelines for the re-naming of municipal facilities.

"Number two, graduated Stamford High School in 1921; Rutgers, 1925; and Yale Law School, 1928. Former member of Rutgers University football team, and member of 1924 All-American selection. Number three, former prosecutor and judge at City Court at Stamford; member of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; former State senator and member of legislative council; chairman of the State Liquor Control Commission; member of the Connecticut Parole Board; Director of State Prisons; Commission member of the State Commission on Investigations; Chairman of the first Planning Board and member of the Charter Revision Commission; Chairman of the Board of Finance; Former president of the Stamford Bar Association and Connecticut Bar Association.

"Number four, expending an unlimited amount of time and effort without compensation on behalf of the City of Stamford, and the acquisition of the Hubbard Heights Golf Course as a municipal golf facility. Served as first chairman of the Hubbard Heights Golf Commission. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to read a resolution to re-name Hubbard Heights Golf Course as the E. Gaynor Brennan Sr. Municipal Golf Course. I SO MOVE, Mr. President."

(NOTE: The text of Resolution No. 1044 is immediately following the discussion on this item, below and on the next page.)

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED."

MRS. CLARK: "Yes, Mr. President. Mr. Blois, while I second this wholeheartedly; number one, as a member of the committee last year, this came before us I believe in September was the first time we got a letter on this; in fact, we did have to hold this for the period of one of the rules, and I do thank you for that; and I full-heartedly support this as I did know Mr. Brennan and I would be very pleased and honored to have a golf course in his name."

MR. BLOIS: "Mr. President, I failed to report that the vote of our Committee was 6-1; 6 YES, 1 NO."

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: "MOVED and SECONDED by Mrs. Clark and others."

MR. SIGNORE: "Mr. President, I oppose this re-naming of Hubbard Heights Golf Course, and refer to Ordinance #326 Supplemental under I(2)b, no City street or facility, shall be named to commemorate any person unless such person has been deceased for more than six months and only by a specific finding by the Board of Representatives that either no suitable geographical or historical name for such street or facility exists so that in the case of a City facility such facility has been made possible substantially through such individual's contribution to the community. I refer to the part that it already has a name, historical name, Hubbard Heights, and I don't believe that it should be changed and I know that previous Boards, they had the same problem where they were trying to change and name facilities after people that had passed away. They were turned down at that time."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Yes, Mr. President. Referring back to the same guidelines of that particular ordinance that says street or facility exists where that in the case of a City facility, such facility has been made possible substantially through such individual's contribution to the community. Now, I happen to believe that E. Gaynor Brennan was very active in the original acquisition of Hubbard Heights Golf Course and had dedicated his life to civic activities and community service and I think it would indeed be a very fitting gesture and tribute to his devotion to Stamford and his devotion to get this golf course for the City, which is now known as Hubbard Heights, to have it named after him, The E. Gaynor Brennan Sr. Municipal Golf Course."

MR. MILLER: "Mr. Connors has returned so there are 35 members present."

MR. CONNORS: "Mr. President, I feel honored to SECOND the nomination for Mr. Gaynor Brennan. I was on the Board when the City was fighting to purchase that and Gaynor Brennan was very instrumental in the purchase of that property, we got that property very reasonable from the original Hubbard Heights owners, and Gaynor Brennan worked really hard, and I feel that it is an honor and a privilege to SECOND this; and as far as quoting statutes, we have named parks after other people, too. We've done that in the past, we've done it, Scalzi Park, that was another name, now it's Scalzi Park, we have done it. No reason we can't change this to E. Gaynor Brennan, Hubbard Heights, what's the difference. I'll have you know Hubbard Heights is up there, but still we can name it after Gaynor Brennan. I think it would be a fine tribute to name the golf course after Mr. Brennan. Thank you very much."

MRS. CLARK: "Yes, Mr. President. In answer to a little of what Mr. Signore said. The guidelines do, in fact, say that either suitable geographical or historical land for such street or facility exists or that in case of a City facility, such facility has been made possible substantially through such individual's contributions to the community. I feel this has been fulfilled more so in this case than in any other case of re-naming in this community, and I could not think of any more suitable situation to re-name on."

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SHERER: "I would also like to support the group to have the name of Hubbard Heights Golf Course changed to E. Gaynor Brennan Sr. Golf Course. I'd like to point out, as one of the representatives of the 10th district, it would be most important for the representatives to know how the people in the area, especially those people surrounding the golf course feel about such a plan to re-name something which is very close to them, and they've always planned on living in the Hubbard Heights area. If you will note, most, I think all, Representatives have a copy of the letter in support of the change of name. There is a petition accompanying that letter which petition has a multitude of names and almost all of them are from the Hubbard Heights area. So I think that represents the opinions in the interest of those same neighbors. It shows they aren't opposed for the most part, and I think that you have to give them some consideration if they are the ones that will be most concerned by a change of name, and most definitely would not be hurting them, and because of that I would urge your support and because of the honor to Mr. Brennan. Thank you."

MR. SIGNORE: "I take exception to the part of 2b which says contributions to the community. Actually, if any citizen of Stamford makes a contribution to the community, you'd have to go around trying to find enough schools or parks or what have you, streets, to name something after, to put his name on. I don't think this is the right thing to do, and I think it was something similar to this was defeated, the previous Board, and I think this is starting a precedent that I think causes a lot, many problems in the future."

MR. MILLER: "We never voted on this specific item in the previous Board."

MRS. SANTY: "I'm looking over this petition here and I can't find two names from the Hubbard Heights area on it, well, there may be two."

MR. MILLER: "Before you go on, we have to have Order. Thank you, Mrs. Santy."

MRS. SANTY: "Through the CHAIR, I would like Mr. Sherer to answer why the residents in his area want it named after Mr. Brennan, because of his contribution to the community, or for other reasons?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, I don't know if Mr. Sherer wishes to answer that, but he can if he wishes to. Mr. Sherer, and then Mrs. Ritchie. Mrs. Ritchie is from the same area."

MRS. RITCHIE: "The people in that area have been fighting through the years to avert having an industrial area declared or a public housing area put on the golf course site. That has come up several times and we have fought it through our associations. That may be selfish, but we are looking for it to be memorialized, whether it be Mr. Brennan or someone else; in this case, Mr. Brennan might be the gentleman. It's certainly all right with me and with the people in the area."

MR. WALSH: "Mr. President, I would just like to concur with Mr. Connors wholeheartedly, and as far as starting a precedent, this is not starting a precedent because parks have already been named in honor of people years ago; I just wanted to state the fact that it's not starting a precedent, Mr. President."

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SIGNORE: "I'd like to state that the petition that Mr. Sherer refers to about the people living in the Hubbard Heights area, I see people from Glenbrook, the Cove . . ."

MR. MILLER: "He didn't say it was exclusively from Hubbard Heights, Mr. Signore. The final judgment rests with this Board. We can vote yes or no, each of us vote up or down, whatever we want to do."

MR. LOOMIS: "I MOVE THE QUESTION."

MR. MILLER: "We will vote on MOVING the previous question. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

"We will now proceed to the Main Motion, which is the Resolution read by Mr. Blois, that concurring with the petition that we received in September and the letter from Chairman William Carlucci from the Hubbard Heights Golf Club that the Hubbard Heights Municipal Golf Course be named the E. Gaynor Brennan Sr. Municipal Golf Course. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

MR. BLOIS: "That concludes my report, Mr. President."

RESOLUTION NO. 1044

TO RE-NAME THE HUBBARD HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE
AS "THE E. GAYNOR BRENNAN, SR., MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE"

WHEREAS the acquisition and establishment of Stamford's first municipal golf course, which was acquired by the City of Stamford at a fraction of its present value, was largely the result of the efforts of Attorney E. Gaynor Brennan, Sr., who died on May 29, 1975; and

WHEREAS the citizens groups which enlisted his services at the time the golf course was acquired in 1949, are of the unanimous opinion that without his efforts it is doubtful whether the said golf course would ever have become a reality; and

WHEREAS said proposed change has been unanimously approved by the Hubbard Heights Golf Commission, the Old-Timers Golf Club, and the Hubbard Heights Golf Players Club; and

WHEREAS said E. Gaynor Brennan, Sr., had a long and distinguished career of service to the City of Stamford and the State of Connecticut;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Hubbard Heights Municipal Golf Course be re-named and henceforth be known and designated as:

"THE E. GAYNOR BRENNAN, SR., MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE."

This resolution shall take effect upon its adoption.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Vere Wiesley

MR. WIESLEY: "No report."

SEWER COMMITTEE - Thomas D'Agostino

- (1) PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SEWER COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND NOB HILL ESTATES, INC. (former Roosevelt School property in Shippan).. Letter 2/10/76 from George Connors, Administrative Officer of Sewer Commission; Application to extend sanitary sewer system dated 2/11/75; contract agreement; construction plan submitted)

MR. D'AGOSTINO: "We have one item, Nob Hill Estates, formerly Roosevelt School located in Shippan Ave. They are requesting permission to extend the sewer line, the sanitary sewer line at their own expense. It's a gravity-fed line, Mr. President. A vote was taken, 7-0; 7 in favor, none opposed."

MR. MILLER: "You're moving approval, Mr. D'Agostino? Is there a SECOND to that MOTION? MOVED, SECONDED."

MR. LOBOZZA: "This will be at no cost to the City of Stamford. I think that ought to be put in there; that it's going to be done at the contractor's expense and there won't be any maintenance by the City."

MR. MILLER: "The question then is on approval on the proposed agreement between the Sewer Commission of the City of Stamford and Nob Hill Estates, Inc. All those in favor say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED. Anything else?"

PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE - Jeremiah Livingston

- (1) INVESTIGATION REQUESTED REGARDING RELOCATION OF FAMILIES in Urban Renewal Area progressing too slowly and unsatisfactorily. Report to be submitted. Also letter from Mrs. McInerney and questions in her letter 2/16/76 to Housing Authority.

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, as Chairman of this Committee, I feel that this calls for an explanation of the participation, my participation, with this Committee; and that explanation is that because of illness and other problems, I have not, as of this moment, been able to give the proper direction of this Committee, but my health problems are over with and I am working in the direction of moving this Committee. The Committee met and it was the decision of the Committee to entertain the letter that Mrs. Nancy McAfee..... (End of Tape Side G -- start of Side H)

"...with tenants' groups and with representatives of tenants' groups on this coming Monday to hear their complaints against the Housing Authority. Also in Committee, we are charged with, not investigating, but giving a report on the location of the Urban Renewal families. Unfortunately, this is after the fact and I believe that the Committee will take that. Mr. President, I feel bound that I should report to this Board of an anonymous letter that, as Chairman of this Committee, I received on my desk tonight.

EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON (continuing): "This letter was addressed to Mr. Robert Odell, Chief of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. Copies of this letter went to the Mayor of our City, our Governor, DCA, HUD, Washington, Stewart McKinney, Senator Weicker, and Senator Ribicoff. Mr. President, I would not normally, and I don't want to read this entire letter, but the letter is in reference to the Housing Committee and the Chairman and Vice Chairman specifically, and I would like to read one paragraph from this letter so that I would hope that my fellow Board members have a feeling for this kind of cheap shot that the two of us have received, and I'll read it.

"It says: 'At present, the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford is only considering a full-scale investigation of the Housing Authority. Attempts to have this action stopped are being made by several bigwigs, even the Director has contacted Board of Representative members asking them to keep things quiet. Two specific members who were contacted are Mrs. Barbara McInerney and Mr. Jeremiah Livingston'. And the letter states that this is a fact.

"Mr. President, I've always questioned the right of people to walk onto the floors of this room and distribute whatever they feel that they should distribute. Mr. President, as Chairman of this Committee, I have not entertained anyone from the Housing Authority; no one from the Housing Authority has asked me to keep things quiet. This letter, and I want to submit this letter to our Clerk so it will be distributed among our members.

"This letter is malicious, the intent of this letter is malicious, and very misleading. This kind of a thing cannot be allowed to happen, and for the coward type of person and I can say that because it says 'A Taxpayer of Stamford', but this kind of action cannot be allowed to keep happening. At this point, the unfortunate thing about this, I didn't even know the letter was on my desk. I was told by my Vice Chairman that I had received such a letter. Well, she asked me, did I receive such a letter, because she told me that she had received one. This letter is a threat and I would like to refer to Mrs. McInerney, please."

MRS. MCINERNEY: "Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I have to agree with Mr. Livingston. I take exception to the libelous statements that were made by an unidentified citizen. It is truly unfortunate that people accuse both Mr. Livingston and myself of having been quieted on the housing subject. The bald fact is that we have not been officially charged with this Board to investigate any charges against the Housing Authority at all.

"I, for one who has been a dissenter on that Committee last year as anyone who sat with me will readily agree that I was always badgering the Housing Authority on a problem of political pull, racial imbalance in housing units, problems at Fairlawn and Sherwood Sts., Southfield Village, tardiness of their operations of Section 8, I pushed for open lists in housing rentals, and more recently read this letter before you in February, I asked for status of the relocated and URC families; and only this week, in anticipating the possibility of an investigation being put before us by this Board, I wrote a letter to Washington and I did ask, in fact, just how far our jurisdiction could go on investigating of the Housing Authority since we do not, in fact, fund the Housing Authority any monies and they operate as an autonomous body of the City of Stamford, and fear that they do not, in fact, have to answer any questions to us. Therefore, I cannot sit

PUBLIC HOUSING & GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE (continue)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing): "idly here and listen to some unknown accusations. It's unfortunate people stoop to such levels when Hartford is working with the Housing Authority now to correct the maintenance problems. The Mayor has even charged people in his office to work with these problems. If this is a campaign to force us to try to lower the rents, they must be made to realize that we do not have the power to do this; and this I have tried and am now trying to obtain from Washington just what our powers are. I only wish whoever wrote this letter would have stepped in last summer when I asked several serious questions of the Housing Authority and helped me when I needed help!"

"I just can't believe that this person is going unidentified and is really taking cheap shots at some people. I told MITAC when they contacted me on the phone and they told me that they were very upset about the rents, that they, in fact, had to go to the State; and the Federal Government suggested that they get in touch with Mr. Weicker because we did not have any control over lowering the rents, and if they wrote us letters, we would be happy to entertain them; which I believe is all in the essence of this particular letter before us tonight on going into a full investigation, but still even if we vote for it, we are not sure what, in fact, we have the right to question. That is the problem and that is why perhaps Mr. Livingston and I are being singled out."

MR. MILLER: "Of course, this item was given by the Steering Committee to the Committee making its report at the present time, but it was not placed on the Agenda. I think we're giving a lot of attention to an anonymous letter and I don't think the person to whom it was directed will pay much attention to it, and I don't think we have to either, really. Is there any other comment?"

MR. LIVINGSTON: "Mr. President, our Committee and I felt our charge is simply to report to the Board of Representatives. We will meet with tenants' groups and also with the Housing Authority, and we will present to this Board our findings with recommendations. I did not feel as Chairman of this Committee that my duty was to hop off into an investigation. This Committee will see if there are causes for an investigation and we will ask this Board to approve it. That's the end of my report."

MR. MILLER: "Is there anything else? I think we can move on to Urban Renewal Committee."

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - L. Morris Glucksman

- (1) REQUESTS that Resolution be sent to the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut urging them to expedite improvements of Exits 7 and 8 of the Connecticut Turnpike in order to facilitate the completion of Stamford's Urban Redevelopment Area. This is funded through Connecticut's Department of Transportation (DOT).

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Thank you, Mr. President. As the Agenda states, I am proposing a resolution tonight from our Committee. For an introduction to this, I believe the need for the improvements to Exit 7 and 8 are very evident to any one who uses that road. When the Urban Renewal Project is completed, the traffic flows to and from the Connecticut Turnpike will be greatly increased, and therefore, the need for this improvement."

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. GLUCKSMAN (continuing): "Also, we have to keep in mind that one of the most important needs and possible demands of the Macy companies and its agreeing to come to Stamford is the improvement of the Thruway. I further believe that this improvement is greatly needed by the City and the Urban Renewal Project. SACIA has done a study in regard to this matter and they feel that improvement of the Connecticut Turnpike, along with the Urban Renewal Project, of course, will add at least 3,000 new jobs to the City of Stamford; about \$7,000,000 in new sales tax revenue to the State; and \$26,000,000 in increased personal income.

"The main problem we have, that since this road is a State road, it is under the auspices of the Department of Transportation, and therefore we are at the State's mercy. As such, I feel we must make the City's request for this funding clear to the State, and therefore I propose this resolution which I believe was on your desks on Monday. I don't know if you'll have it now. Shall I read it?"

MR. MILLER: "Well, we've all received copies of it. I don't think you have to read it, Mr. Glucksman."

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "The resolution was approved unanimously by my Committee and I SO MOVE."

MR. MILLER: "It's been MOVED and SECONDED. We will have discussion."

MR. SIGNORE: "I do hope, and I know the question was asked by other people, but I do hope that MACYS and I would like to see MACYS come to town, but I do, do hope it's not contingent on Exits 7 and 8. That just keeps it going around and around in circles, and they come in and they say YES, I'm coming, but what about 7 and 8? If it's not MACYS, it'll be J. C. Penney, and if it's not J. C. Penney, it will be somebody else, and it never happens."

MR. DeROSE: "Yes, Mr. President, I would just like to state it appears to me, at this point anyway, if we go ahead and vote for this resolution, and I think all of us ought to keep in mind that we just talking about the possibilities of improvements on Exits 7 and 8, and really there is no guarantee that MACYS or any other company is going to move into this town, so that when we do vote, I think we should just base it on its own merits, that is, should we or shouldn't we improve on Exits 7 and 8 without taking into consideration anything else. I know that MACYS has made this part of the stipulation, but there is still no guarantee that they are going to come here, and I just wanted to clarify that point. Thank you."

MRS. COSENTINI: "Yes, Mr. DeRose said more or less what I was going to say. We had discussed in Steering that we would like the Committee to let us know if they felt that the improvements were in and of themselves worthy, and I assume since they have voted it out positively that they felt that this was true. Is that correct, Mr. Glucksman, through the CHAIR?"

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Yes, that's correct."

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. LOOMIS: "Yes, I'd just like to point out that our delegation to Hartford has worked very hard and long for these improvements, and both the Republican representative and his Democratic counterparts, and our State Senator have been doing as much as possible to push this through the Transportation Committee and this resolution would be in support of their efforts; and I think it would be very helpful on behalf of them to demonstrate our support for what they are trying to do in Hartford."

MR. FLANAGAN: "Mrs. Cosentini asked the question and the answer is, our Chairman said is definitely yes. There is a traffic problem on Exits 7 and 8, regardless of the status of the downtown department store. It is still required for safety standpoints."

MR. SIGNORE: "It is upsetting, though, that MACYS has stipulated that they won't come unless 7 and 8 is put. I think that's wrong."

MR. MILLER: "Well, I guess they don't have to come if they don't want to."

MR. LOOMIS: "I MOVE THE QUESTION."

MR. MILLER: "We will vote on MOVING THE QUESTION. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED. We will vote on Mr. Glucksman's motion for the resolution on Exits 7 and 8. All those in favor, say AYE; all those opposed NO. The MOTION is CARRIED."

RESOLUTION NO. 1045

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the 14th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, requests the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut to appropriate the necessary funds to implement the improvements on Exits 7 and 8 on the Connecticut Turnpike.

WHEREAS the Connecticut Department of Transportation has studied and recommended such improvements, and

WHEREAS the need for these improvements is of vital importance to the Stamford Urban Redevelopment Project, and

WHEREAS the Stamford Urban Redevelopment Project, when completed, will add millions of dollars to State Treasury in the form of sales tax revenues, the Stamford Board of Representatives urges the approval of said expenditure.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 14th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford requests all State Legislators in both Houses who represent any portion of Stamford to work for the approval of this request.

* * * * *

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. GLUCKSMAN: "Yes, Mr. President. I have this short report of my Committee. I don't want to make it too long because I know the hour, but we had a joint meeting with all the Commissioners, as well as my Committee, and Mr. Bob Rich, on February 19th.

"I called this meeting to help the Committee get acclimated to the progress of the Urban Renewal Project, and its plans for the future, as well as anything they wanted of this Board in the time to come. I will give a progress report of the project by the Commissioners. I have a copy of this report and if anyone would like to see it, they could get it any time they would like to see it. Some of the things in the report, I think I should bring out, which might be of interest to people is that almost all of the land in the project has now been acquired by the U. R. C., and the knocking down of all the buildings is just about done; and as soon as that's done, it will be turned over to the re-developer and then again the land will get on to the tax roles.

"Also as of February 17th of this year, the last remaining families were finally relocated from the project area, so that part of the project is now concluded. They also told us that one of the most important things they will be wanting of the Board in the near future will be the need for us to approve the new Disposition Contract to provide for the changes in the past, and some of the needs for the future, with the new stores, etc.; and finally I would just like to state in regard to the matter which I brought up last time, regarding the attendance of the Commissioners, a week ago Wednesday, the Urban Renewal Commission met and all five Commissioners were present.

"At our special meeting on February 19th, Mr. Gluss stated that he intends to try to make every meeting from now on, and at the meeting, all five Commissioners were present. Mr. Boccuzzi assured me that from now on, and these are his words: "my attendance will be exemplary." Therefore, I hope this problem, too, is solved. Thank you."

MR. LOOMIS: "As Vice Chairman of the Committee, I just want to compliment our Chairman. I don't know what magic he exercised, but indeed last week, they all were there, and it was only after the commotion he stirred up here last month. I'm very pleased with the progress of the Committee and I think we are in good hands under our new Chairman." (much clapping)

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. MILLER: "Now we'll move on to the Special Committees.

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Mr. Rybnick.

MR. RYBNICK: "No report."

MR. MILLER: "We don't really have the other two committees on the Agenda, but I believe Mrs. Clark has a report."

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE - Linda D. Clark

MRS. CLARK: "Yes, Mr. President, two things. First, I think everyone received a letter in regard to March 18th, Drug Lib is in fact looking forward to meeting and talking with every Representative that can possibly be there next Monday night from 7:30 on. I think you'll find it quite rewarding because I know last year Mr. Costello and I spent, I think, six hours there in one night. It's a rewarding experience to go over there and see just what they are doing, and they are really doing a fantastic job, and to see what they themselves do to put into the house, because everything in the house is, in fact, made by all the girls and boys there. It's really something else!

"Right now they have a little boutique going; go over and spend some money. It's fantastic. They have a fellow there that makes these gorgeous, and I mean they are really beautiful, tables. I got hooked. I bought four! They're really beautiful tables. They take all kinds of donations, clothing, anything; and they right now have all types of furniture, all types of clothing, dishes, some jewelry -- it's a limited amount, but go over, it's really something to see; and I really hope with all my heart that all citizens do support the boutique because it's really worthwhile and this is the way they are proving to the citizens of Stamford that they, in fact, want to help self-sustain the program. That's it."

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Lynn M. Lowden

MR. MILLER: "Thank you. We don't have anything on Environmental Protection, do we, Dr. Lowden? No? There are no Communications from the Mayor, Petitions, Resolutions, Communications from Other Boards and Individuals, Old Business, New Business."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR: None.

PETITIONS: None.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: "Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, at this time, since the meeting is concluding, I would like to thank Mrs. Santy for my nice clear, clean, healthy, smoke-free lungs. (Applause). I would also like to say it is such a pleasure to see the faces of the members of the Board unclouded by the haze of smoke; that next month when this issue comes up again, as I'm sure it will, I am going to vote for her resolution." (more applause)

MRS. SANTY: "Thank you, Sandy, and I would also like to thank all the smokers who are suffering tonight; I really appreciate it for those with medical problems. Thank you."

MR. MILLER: "Before I entertain a MOTION TO ADJOURN, I have an announcement. I want to say to all of the members of the Personnel Board of Appeals, and all of the Alternates who are present, I want to meet briefly with all of you to talk about setting a date for us to meet with the Civil Service Committee appointed by the Mayor, and I also have to meet with all of the people who sat on the Maloney case to set another date for a meeting, so we can vote on that particular appeal.

"The meeting is ADJOURNED." (It is 12:55 A.M. March 5, 1976)

By

Helen M. McEvoy
Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Assistant
and Recording Secretary
Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Connecticut

APPROVED:

Frederick E. Miller, Jr.

Frederick E. Miller, Jr., President
14th Board of Representatives

HMM:ms

Note: Above meeting was broadcast
over Radio WSTC in its
entirety.