

*please see page 1 (Addition)*

MR. MILLER: Please take your seats immediately. The meeting will come to order. The invocation will be delivered by the Reverend Vaughn Purnell, pastor of the Turn-of-River Presbyterian Church.

REV. PURNELL: Let us pray. *Please refer to attached page*

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Rev. Purnell. Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. I would now ask the membership to please rise for a moment of silence out of the respect for the memory of Joseph Mancusi, a former member of this board who passed away this week. The clerk will call the roll. There being 33 member present 7 absent, the chair declares a quorum. Would you now please cooperate in checking the voting machine. I would ask all of the members to vote up for yes. Thank you. Would you all please vote down now for no. Thank you.

The two pages this evening are Stephen Marvin who is a 7th Grade student at King School, and Richard Vogel a 7th Grade student at Turn of River School.

There is a letter dated September 7, 1977 addressed to the President of the Board. In order to devote more time to business and personal matters, I find it necessary to resign from the Board of Representatives at this time.

I would especially like to thank the people of Glenbrook for the privilege of serving them for the past six years. I am certainly going to miss working with the many dedicated and sincere people I have met on the board during my tennure.

May I at this time wish each and everyone the very best of luck in the coming years. Sincerely, Peter Walsh.

Mr. Walsh was a valued member of this board; I think we will all miss him. His district was certainly well served by his years of representation on this board. We will miss Peter, and we all wish him the best of luck. An order at this time would a motion to regretfully accept his resignation.

MR. SIGNORE: So moved, Mr. President

MR. MILLER: Moved by Mr. Signore, seconded by many.

MR. COSTELLO: Thank you, Mr. President. I would just like to say that Mr. Walsh was a real gentlemen and I enjoyed the pleasure of his company, and I think he did an excellent job while he was on the board. Thank you.

MR. SIGNORE: Mr. President; I would like to say I believe on behalf of my party, my Republican members, Mr. Walsh was probably one of the most conscientious, courteous, legislators we've had working with us during this term.

○

○

○

REV. PURNELL: Oh mighty God our heavenly father, we pause towards the end of an already full day with more work yet to do. We pause to remember that you are God, and creator, and the giver of all good gifts. We thank you for our nation and our town. We thank you for these women and men who work hard and give time to make our community work. We thank you for those who work with us. We thank you for even those we disagree, especially when they turn out to be right. God, direct this body as a whole, Lord God, and individually the member of it that what get voted and ordered will be agreeable and pleasing in your sight and keep us in your care, Amen.

ROLL ADDITION

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you

MR. MILLER:

There being 33 present

Seven absent - Mr. Morgan  
Mr. Hoffman  
Mr. Osuch  
Mr. Fox  
Mr. Derose  
Mr. Livingston  
Mr. Walsh





SIDE 1PAGE 2

MR. ZIMBLER: Just briefly Mr. President, I would like to echo Mr. Signore's sentiments. I think it was a privilege to work with someone of Peter Walsh's caliber, and I for one will miss him, and I enjoyed the four years I spent together with him.

MR. FLANAGAN: Peter and I came on this board together six years ago and it certainly has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with him, and he has been a sincere representative for his district, and a very valued member of this board. Thank you.

MR. DIXON: Mr. President, I would just like to say that Mr. Walsh certainly was a man among some of the most noted men I have had the pleasure of working with on this board. He served very faithfully on the Appointments Committee, and I'm sure that he will be missed. Thank you.

MR. BAXTER: I know Peter's listening, or I'm sure he's listening, and I would like to say to you and to him that I'm personally very upset that he won't be here with us any longer. I found Peter to be a man of uncommon common sense, able to cut to the quick of an issue and to see it in its real human dynamics. A man of patience, a man who patience spent two years with me, teaching me the ropes, and getting me to understand things. The city will sorely miss him, Glenbrook certainly will sorely miss him, and I last and certainly least will be very unhappy on having him at my right for the rest of these meetings. We will all miss him.

MR. MILLER: The motion before the board then at this time is to accept with regret the resignation of Peter Walsh, as a member from the seventh district. All those in favor say ay. Opposed, no. The motion is carried unanimously.

Nominations are now in order to fill the vacancy in the seventh district. Mr. Baxter.

MR. BAXTER: Thank you Mr. President. If it pleases you and the board, I rise to place a nomination, John Robie, Sr., 95 Maple Tree Avenue, Glenbrook, of the 7th district. Mr. Robie has been a resident of Stamford for 37 consecutive years. He is very well versed in the problems of the city and certainly of Glenbrook. He is a retired brick laying mason, a foreman of masons, he's worked on many of the public buildings that we have here in Stamford, particularly the school. He has the support and recommendation of both his committee men and myself, and certainly of Peter. We urge that you accept him. Thank you.



MR. MILLER: Is there a second to that nomination, it has been seconded. The name of John Robie has been place in nomination to fill the vacancy in the 7th district. Are there any other nominations. Are there any other nominations. If there's no objection, the chair declares nominations closed. It would be in order for a motion to be made that the clerk cast one ballot for Mr. Robie.

MR. BLOIS: Mr. President, I so move.

MR. MILLER: Moved and seconded. The question for the board is on the motion the clerk cast one ballot for John Robie as representative from the 7th district. Will all those in favor say ay. All those opposed, no. The motion is carried but it is not a unanimous vote so there will have to be a division on the machine on the vote to have the clerk cast one ballot.

We will take a division using the machine. Is there anyone who has not voted? There should be 33 members participating in the vote. The motion is carried by 32 yes and 1 no. The clerk will cast one ballot for John Robie. John Robie has been elected a representative from the 7th district. Will Mr. Robie please come forward.

We will now proceed to the agenda for the meeting acceptance of minutes.

MR. BLOIS: Mr. President, I move that we accept the minutes of September 13, 1976 regular meeting.

MR. MILLER: Is there a second to that motion. Moved and seconded. The question is on the acceptance of the minutes of the regular meeting of September 13, 1976. There is a question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to bring to the attention of the board that in the minutes that we have received, and I'll say it for September 13, so it won't have to be said for the rest of them, the votes were recorded saying 22 in favor 6 against, 5 abstentions, what have you. The names should have been recorded. Those who voted for, against, and those who abstained, and I spoke to our administrative assistant and she will attach to the ends of the minutes that were are currently ready the list of names on each vote, and we'll make it a policy in the future minutes to include the list of names.

We probably ought to include that as a correction so that it's clear.





MR. MILLER: With that correction then there is a motion to accept the minutes of September 13. All those in favor say ay. All those opposed, no. The motion is carried unanimously.

MR. BLOIS: Mr. President, I would also like to move that we accept the October 5, 1976 meeting minutes.

MR. MILLER: With that same provisos, moved and seconded. We're dealing now with the meeting of October 5, 1976. All those in favor.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask, how can we just receive these minutes yesterday, today, how can we, we haven't read these minutes, yet accept these minutes as read.

MR. MILLER: It is my understanding, Mr. Blum that this the last set we are going to vote on tonight, although other sets of minutes are available on your desk, this is the last one we will approve tonight.

If you wish to vote against acceptance, of course, that's your privilege.

MRS. COSENTINI: Also, that these we did get in advance.

MR. MILLER: We did, yes. All those in favor say ay. All those opposed, no. We'll take a division using the machine. Up for yes or down for no. The motion is carried by a vote of 32 yes, 1 no. I believe there's nothing further under minutes. Committee reports. Steering Committee, Mr. Blois.

MR. BLOIS: Mr. President, I move that we waive the Steering Committee Report.

MR. MILLER: Is there a second to that motion, moved and seconded. All those in favor say ay. All those opposed, no. The motion is carried unanimously. Appointments Committee, Mr. Dixon.

MR. DIXON: Mr. President, The Appointments Committee met Thursday, September 1 at 8 p.m. in Democratic Caucus Room. Those present were representatives Robert Costello, Mildred Perillo, George Ravallese, Leo Carlucci, Sal Signore, and myself, Handy Dixon.

The one and only name on the agenda, Mr. President is that of Mrs. Mary LaVelle, who is seeking confirmation of her appointment to the Environmental Protection Board.

Mrs. LaVelle is a Democrat, she resides at 60 Sea Beach Drive, and has been a resident of Stamford for nine years. Mrs. LaVelle is a homemaker, she attended public and private schools in the state of Illinois and Vermont, and has an excellent educational background.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

(1) MRS. MARY LAVELLE (D)  
60 Sea Beach Drive  
(Held in Committee-on  
vacation -Reappointment)

31 YES  
1 NO(G.Ravallese)  
1 ABSTENTION(M.Perillo)

Term Expires:  
Dec. 1, 1979

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met Thursday, September 1st at 8:00 p.m. Those present were representatives Robert Costello, Mildred Perillo, George Ravallese, Leo Carlucci, Sal Signore, and myself. The one and only name on the agenda is that of Mrs. Mary LaVelle. With six committee members present, the vote was 4-2 approving Mrs. Lavelle's appointment, and I would now so MOVE.

MR. MILLER: SECONDED by Mr. Signore. There will be a DIVISION taken using the machine. Mrs. Perillo wished to be recorded as an abstention on this vote.

MR. LOOMIS: Mr. Miller, could you correct my vote, I meant to vote yes.

MR. MILLER: Although it appears on the machine as a "no" vote, let Mr. Loomis' vote be recorded as a "yes" vote. Mrs. LaVelle has been confirmed by a vote of 31 YES; 1 NO (G. Ravallese) 1 ABSTENTION (M. Perillo).

MR. BLOIS: At this time I'd like to SUSPEND THE RULES for the purpose of bringing up the two Walden Book referrals under Planning and Zoning Committee, item #12.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - George Baxter

(12) THE TWO WALDEN BOOK REFERRALS - PLANNING BOARD'S DENIAL OF APPLICATION MP-228.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED to SUSPEND THE RULES to immediately consider the two Walden Book referrals. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. BAXTER: In two or three minutes I'm going to turn this item over to Mr. Sal Signore, the Deputy Chairman of this committee. Before I do, I'd like to make two observations. The first is there have been some questions as to why there are two Walden Book referrals, and those of you who have the Charter, if you turn to Section 522.5, you'll see that there are two alternative methods for people to petition for the approval of a application that has been denied by the Planning Board. The first method is for more than 50% of the owners of the property within the land to be affected. The second is for owners of more than 50% of the land within 500 ft. outside the property to be affected.

Both of these two separate groups have chosen to refer the matter to us, and that is why you see two different referrals. The subject matter of both referrals is identical and can be handled as one.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BAXTER (continuing) Now I would like the record to reflect that I have taken no other than these words, I have taken no part in the committee discussion of this matter, nor in its vote, I absented myself from the committee meeting. After I turn this over to Mr. Signore, I will also absent myself and take no part in the discussion or vote of this Board.

MR. SIGNORE: As acting Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Board, we had a public hearing on August 8th, at 7:30 p.m. to hear the application of Walden Book Company in its desire to change the master plans land use category residential single family lots, less than one acre, the commercial or industrial design districts. We heard the Walden Book side and then we heard members of the Planning Board give their opinions and their side of the issue. We then had our committee meeting vote on this particular item on August 30th, and the same four members were present, Sal Signore, D. Blum, L. Wider, M. Hawe, Mr. Baxter was not present. We were guided by, which was a quorum incidently, the Charter, City of Stamford, Chapter 52, Section 520, Powers and Duties of the Planning Board. I shall read it to you, and if you have a copy of the Charter in front of you, you might follow.

It says the Planning shall:

1. Keep and from time to time revise the official map of Stamford.
2. Prepare, adopt, and amend a master plan.
3. Have the power of approval or disapproval of the sub-division of land.
4. Make detailed plans for the improvement, reconditioning, or redevelopments of areas, which in its judgement, contain special problems or show a trend toward lower land values.
5. Prepare each year a list of desirable capital improvements together with financial program for their execution, one covering the next fiscal year, and the other covering the next six years, which shall be forwarded to the Mayor for submission to the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives.
6. Review report on Public Works proposals.
7. Prepare an annual report and file a copy thereof with the Connecticut Development Commission.

Now these were our guidelines. We discussed the pros and cons, and then we voted 4-0 in favor of Walden Book's application, for a change in the master plan. Some of the reasons given, we felt that the Walden Book go within the Ridgeway, Bulls Head area are specified on the planning map. We felt that the land was not economically feasible for the use of homes, because of the topography of the land was not really what we think would be adaptable to homes.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SIGNORE (continuing) We felt that, as one member of the Planning Board said, he would like to see forty, \$100,000 houses there, it would be kind of crowded. We also took into consideration that approximately 100% of the neighbors were in favor of having Walden Book locate there. The possible loss of 250 jobs was considered, because Walden Book has been looking for three years to find a location, and if they couldn't find a suitable location, they would move out of Stamford.

We also took into consideration that they have been a good citizen of Stamford for some thirty years, we thought that this should be a consideration. At some point along the line, we put the point that the human element of zoning is also very important. So on that basis, we voted to recommend to the Board of Representatives tonight that we accept the wishes of Walden Book to amend the master plan for land use category, residential single family lots, less than one acre for commercial or industrial design districts, for the High Ridge site that they have chosen. I'd like to make the motion that we do so.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED.

MR. WIESLEY: I would like to have a little more clarification if possible through you by Mr. Signore or anyone else who might answer this. It relates to the possibility of precedent setting. Many of us are concerned, maybe all of us, of how much further this could go up Long Ridge or High Ridge if this were approved. We heard some statements made that it won't be. Certainly, in my estimation, I think that what would have to be developed would be the extreme unusualness of this particular site that Walden Book have asked. which would render it not usable for hardly anything but a Walden Book-type of a building. Basically, to be sure that we don't get the "me too's" on Long and High Ridge when another piece of property comes up. In other words, it can't just be a plain X number of acreage that anybody can build on. Mr. Signore, I would like to hear more discussion from you as to how you feel and what you feel is so special about this piece of property.

MR. SIGNORE: Walden Book has looked at 101 sites. They've talked to fifteen brokers and they've chosen this site primarily because it is the best affordable one they could find after a four year search. The site is located in the commercial design district. CBS is immediately north to it and if you look at the Planning Board map that we have, it shows that the Bulls Head, Ridgeway area has set forth in the Planning Board as calling it Ridgeway, Bulls Head as bordered on the north by High Clear Drive which is north of CBS. On the west by Strawberry Hill, on the east by Stillwater Road, on the south by West Board Street, North Street, now it falls within that area.

We felt that a fall within the area that also holds up companies such as GE, Olin, CBS, Lord & Taylors, Fidelity Bank, and a few other companies. I think these were valid reasons why the site is suitable for Walden Book.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON: Once again, my telephone has been flooded with calls and I received a stack of mail from people all over the City of Stamford. I'm persuaded to support what I believe to be what the better thinking people of Stamford are supporting on this particular issue. But having to act on an appeal of this nature, confirming or denying a decision made by one of Stamford's major Boards is certainly not the most pleasant thing for this Board to do.

With the benefit of hindsight, showing clearly the loss of factories and businesses over the past fifteen or twenty years, which prior to that time provided Stamford with a flood of revenue and Stamford's people with employment and money to spend. This vote cannot risk as Planning Board has clearly done, losing another force of revenue for our City and employment for our City's people. In terms of employment, Stamford is not at all progressive, but is rated among the nations highest in terms of unemployment. We have opened the front doors and in fact, are bending over backwards trying to get new businesses to fill the voids created by URC.

Walden Book Company has been in Stamford for nearly thirty years, and during that time it has made a tremendous contribution to this City, having 250 employees with a two million dollar annual payroll, they're only asking us for a chance to stay here, and to build for themselves a new home, and may I add, a new pipeline through which more than \$80,000.00 will flow into our tax base.

All those who were born and raised in Stamford are fleeing to other cities in search of full employment, housing and opportunities that they should be able to find right here. If I shall have the good fortune to live in Stamford for another forty years, I assure you that they will be spent trying to make this City a better place to live. I intend to start now by voting to overturn the Planning Board's decision and give Walden Book my blessing.

MR. MILLER: The Chair would ask that everyone present refrain from applause, so we can proceed with this matter as quickly as possible and with as much dignity as possible. The Chair would also note that the "no smoking" signs are up, and that means that there is to be no smoking both on the floor of the Board and in the gallery.

MR. ZIMBLER: Mr. Dixon said it so beautifully, I think it will be a tough act to follow. I will, therefore, make it brief. When we were first faced with this case, I already found myself on the haunt of a dilemma sort of between Scylla and Charibdis, so to speak, because on the one hand, the admiration for a company like Walden Book which has been in town for many years and has served the community well.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZIMBLER (continuing) On the other hand, admiration for the Planning Board, certainly one of the better thinking and more responsible Boards serving this City. It was really a hard choice to make until I started thinking what are we really doing here, what is our function on this Board. That is we are representatives of the people. We are not here to force our thinking upon these people but rather, we are here, as a reflection of the people who elected us, both in our district and City wide.

The feeling of the people in this town, I feel has been so overwhelming in favor of Walden Book. The people in the neighborhood surrounding this plot are almost 100% in favor of the application. Really, who is opposed to it. When you look at the people who are sitting here tonight, who are employees of Walden Book, who are neighbors residing in the area, when we see that they have come out on this hot night in this brutally hot room, and waiting to see what their representatives are going to do, how can we possibly go to them and say "no", we're opposed to it.

How can we possibly, this company has been in town for thirty years, they've been downtown, they've paid their dues. They deserve the right to improve themselves, and I think we should give them that right, and I urge all of us to vote in favor of the Walden Book's application.

MR. LOBOZZA: Normally something like this, I would be against it, but I think we have something different. We speak of setting a precedent. We have CBS but also we have High Ridge Park that no one has spoken of. I think some of the important pieces is that number one - the people in the neighborhood want it, and I think that is the most important thing. I think we have to take into consideration the jobs and the tax revenue that the City desperately needs, that's another important thing. This whole thing is line up to be a battle between the Planning Board and the people of this City. For years, we've been catering to outside corporations, and now that we have a local corporation trying to stay in Stamford, we're fighting it. I'd just like to take the side of the people this time.

MRS. McINERNEY: This is not an easy act to follow. But I'd like to begin by commending the Planning and Zoning Committee of our Board for the hours they spent in hearing testimony and in reaching a decision on the issue for a change in the master plan and zoning, which would allow Walden Book Company to locate their corporate headquarters on High Ridge Road.

I realize the difficulties they must have had in wrestling with the favorable decision for one spot of land which will in essence be a landmark decision, I feel by our Board a political entente for other parcels of land not presently zoned for business.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing) They will develop the parcel in a manner that will be pleasing to the neighborhood, they will stagger business hours in an effort to alleviate the heavy traffic congestion. The biggest reason is that they feel pre-existing zoning for business development in the Bulls Head area has committed the rest of the residential land north of Summer Street and the intersections of High Ridge Road and Long Ridge Road to be zoned for business development. They have shown they are indeed a good corporate neighbors, however, the issue before us is not whether or not Walden Book should stay in Stamford. To my knowledge, nobody in City government has even suggested that they want Walden to leave Stamford. On the contrary, we should do our best to make sure they can be accommodated into a new location which is appropriately zoned for business.

The issue, in fact, is that do we in Stamford need a comprehensive plan for orderly growth and development for our City using a master plan that was three years in the making which is directed at accommodating businesses in areas already zoned for business as well as the retention of our residential communities for people in lower, middle and higher income brackets. Or do we throw out the entire master plan with one application which will change the zoning throughout the entire City.

Quite frankly, I get tired of explaining to constituents how numerous buildings were allowed to be constructed throughout the residential districts in our community, despite zoning regulations. Certainly, we have all expressed a concern over Stamford's growth pattern. Past trends in zoning clearly indicate the necessity for an overall comprehensive plan for development for all 39.1 square miles of Stamford.

But why will we need a master plan, if we are willing to allow a change in zoning which is contrary to orderly development, and which will establish a precedent for further acception in zoning changes in Stamford? What does this type of zone change and development mean to the taxpaying public, and the demand for more City services? After all, progress and growth go hand and hand with the need for expanded City services, but what is the cost factor for those added services?

We are presently concerned about the lack of space for adequate housing in Stamford for our senior citizens; our low income families and our middle income families. Does this Board want to bear the responsibility for driving the middle class homeowners out of the City of Stamford, and the disappearance of Stamford as a healthy viable City composed of various classes of citizens by voting to change residential districts. I do not think that is our intention.

However, I do believe that in voting for a change in the master plan in zoning, we will surely put the seal of doom on our middle class residential homeowners. If we approve this zone and master plan change tonight, we must look at the ramifications of our judgement.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing) We will not be able to deny any future zoning changes to accommodate other businesses, either here or in the courts, and we can look at our master plan as nothing more than a nice plan to which acception can be made at the drop of a hat. Need I say more, the issue as previously stated is whether or not we want to uphold the zoning integrity in Stamford in our newly adopted master plan. I will cast my vote in favor of maintaining a reasonable zoning plan for Stamford, and if it were not a change in zoning, there would be no need for any action by this Board tonight. I conclude, with quoting my fellow colleague, who sits in back of me from the 16th District, Mr. Zimbler who two months ago stated 'a vote to down-zoning in any area stinks. And this is down-zoning, pure and simple.

MR. BLUM: I sat at the hearing and asked numerous questions. I too, favor a master plan, but I do favor page twenty-nine of the master plan. I read it very thoroughly, I knew where Bulls Head area was at one time, but the master plan tells me that its someplace else, and that's how I voted with master plan. At the top of the districts are Olin, Lord & Taylor, CBS, Rippowam High School. All situated in the midst of single family developments, generally on quarter acre lots.

I asked someone on the Planning Board if this was not industrial, what would it be used for. We can use it for 40 - \$100,000.00 homes. Is this for middle class people? To me, this is not a middle class income housing. For the taxes that we might loose for Stamford, for the community work that Walden Book does, I will vote in favor of Walden Book this evening.

MR. BLOIS: Being a representative in the 14th District in which area this referral lies in, I would like to relate to this Board, to my colleagues to my left, and my own Democrats sitting in back of me. The people of the neighborhood of the immediate area surrounding this area, the people throughout the better part of the 14th District are all in favor of it. I don't think I got one phone call against it, and I have many people calling from Walden Book, very interested in keeping their job in the City of Stamford.

Now I think if we put things in perspective, we may understand this piece of property better than we do. First of all, I would be against what I call spot-zoning. I think years ago the Planning and Zoning Board allowed City designs in the immediate area. I think you'll find one company adjacent to this piece of property that has fifteen acres in the immediate rear of it, which I think are designed for the same purpose. I think if we look at the picture again, we do have commercial design in the immediate area and I don't think we're changing the character of that neighborhood one bit. If you have a residential district, strictly residential, then I think you'll have to look at a piece of property twice.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLOIS (continuing) But when you have a commercial design property right along side of you, and Walden Book Company want to go up there, they're willing to spend money and pay taxes in the City of Stamford, and the people are willing to go up there and work, by God, I think we have to consider them also. I don't think they're going to run wild on this piece of land we're talking about, using the small portion of this land for their building, the rest of it for a parking lot. I don't think its going to interfere with the neighbors in the immediate area. I think they welcome that bit of it, because they know on a weekend there isn't that much activity in their neighborhood, and they're not looking for traffic congestion. I urge all my fellow Board members to vote in favor of this this evening.

MR. FLANAGAN: In all due respect to the management of Walden, the employees, and all the good people here, I'm in favor of this application, but not because of the reasons that have been generally stated. I think this site is only fit for Walden, and if it where an outside company coming to this town, I would still be in favor of it. There is a letter from the Planning Board that sights the increase of traffic on High Ridge Road, already the busiest road in the City, except for the Parkway and the Turnpike.

I would suppose from that statement that they assume that all the employees that are presently working for Walden, which is south of Bulls Head, or south of the Thruway, and that they do not have to go through the central business district to get to the site on Ludlow Street I assume that probably well over half of the Walden employees go through Bulls Head area, and by stopping before they get to Bulls Head, they might very well relieve some of the traffic problems, and has been intimated by the Planning Board letter. It says that the factors Walden is willing to pay \$1,000,000.00 for eight acres. Who would pay such a price for eight acres of raw, underlined, residential land? Somebody should dictate land values. The fact is, that it is not fit for residential development.

We talk about a new master plan. Let's remember the master plan they came out with before, it was so bad that they buried it. When I came here, the site was owned and operated by the Water Company as a garage and storage area for pipes and trucks. It had a yellow brick building on it, and to the best of my knowledge, certainly by the use, whether it was non-conforming or not, it was really an industrial type use, not even a design commercial use. So I don't believe that you can say that that site ever was residential. It had a resevoir on it, we heard that the topography is bad, the resevoir beds makes for nice recess parking area, but certainly not for homes. I really think that somehow or other, the Planning Board has gone off the track on this site. I think this is perhaps one of the better decisions that this Board could make tonight in over-turning the Planning Boards 2-1 with two missing decision against Walden.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER: Now to check in the Charter, chapter 520, also the Planning Map, which I can't understand how it was done, it seems to be against itself. I feel very bad that I have to speak against the Planning Board. Nevertheless, we must use some tact in doing this and a little common sense. I'm a little upset our planners didn't see it a little different. Because, if I had been sitting in with them, I think I would have spoken against even drawing the line the way they did. I also considered a few other things. As I'm their district representative, I hate to see them leave the South End. I also went to High Clear Drive and talked with a few people, and they seem happy to have Walden Book relocate in their area.

So as one of the people that's charged with the responsibility to overlook a part of the legislation that deals with the City of Stamford, I find myself in a kind of off position that I must support Walden Book Company application, due to the fact that these people have expressed their desire in big numbers to help the company relocate its headquarters up there. But, tonight we have the responsibility of taking care of people's business. So I'm asking you to keep these people's jobs, and satisfy the people who came here and work and serve at Walden Book Company.

MRS. HAWE: In answer to Mr. Wiesley's question of quite awhile ago, he asked why this piece of land is different from any other piece of land along Long and High Ridge that could also be developed. It seems to me that the main reason for voting for this change in zone, is that this land is not conducted as a single family housing which it is zoned for. Walden, however, plans to build near the front of the property, and their going to use this depression in the land as a parking area and therefore, it would provide a natural screen from the surrounding houses, and I hope maybe that will help Mr. Wiesley.

MR. HAYS: If Pitney Bowes were to come to us and say they were going to leave and take all their employees with them, unless they could get property and leave it north of Rippowam High School rezoned, I would vigorously oppose it. I am concerned that some of the reasons we are hearing tonight are doing what we don't want to do, setting up precedents of rezoning to keep an industry here. Now, as to the essence of the subject application or referral, I'm implying to favor Walden's application. But I am implying to favor it, because of the peculiarities of the site itself. You see, I think, unlike our body, the Planning Body some-time ago may have inadvertently errored. Maybe they should have been in the master plan, zoned for commercial, the fact that it's practically surrounded by some form of commercial.

It is impractical to plan this property for residential development. It's economically unfeasible, and most important, I think the people who are most directly affected, the neighboring landowners, and those nearby should have the most powerful voice as opposed to those from miles away. Again, particularly because of the peculiarity of the site, I think we must limit the merits of that to why we're voting on this, because I'm very concerned that we do not create a precedent.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. COSTELLO: I think we should put things in their proper order, the main thing here is that Stamford needs Walden more than Walden needs Stamford. We've already forced a number of major companies to leave Stamford, and I think it's our duty and responsibility to keep Walden in Stamford.

MRS. RITCHIE: I have a bit of sentiment attached to my decision. I don't like to down-zone, but the head of this corporation is a home town lad. How can we turn our backs on him and say, we don't want you here, we don't want your company here. All I heard from the people who work for this company is that their pleasant to work for. Some of them are constituents of mine. If the homewoners in the area want the company there, let's keep them happy, they are paying the taxes also.

I believe that the company is going to be an asset to the area. It will be well landscaped. So I say lets comply with the wishes of the local residents and allow these people to stay here.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG: I intend to vote "yes" on Walden Book. It's my feeling that the plus factors outweigh the negative aspects. Walden employees, many Stamfordites, more increased jobs to come. It helped our City to grow and I'd like to see that growth continue. They sponser many worthwhile community activities, which I don't think anybody has mentioned. I think maybe we should thank Walden Book rather than acting unfavorably upon this for taking this site. It's not suitable for housing, as we said in the past, and maybe we should thank them for taking it.

MR. LOOMIS: Everybody in this City and many on this Board over the past several years has deplored the lack of a comprehensive plan, a comprehensive plan of development in the City. The Planning Board after three years of intensive study and work prepared and delivered to us a master plan, which is generally received a strong accolade, not only in the state, but throughout the region.

According to those who prepared that plan, and contrary to those from Walden Book to have chosen to interpret parts of that plan, the plan does not permit further development, commercial development north of Bulls Head. They came up with this decision or part of that plan for good reason. First of all, there is 1.8 million sq. ft. of developed commercial space in the Long and High Ridge areas already, and if those who are currently in those areas exercise their rightful options to develop more, we could eventually have 7.3 million sq. ft. of developed commercial space, which is quite a bit of congestion, traffic and office building accommodations.

Two other things. First of all, the campus type development scheme which is being promoted and advanced by Walden Book, is generally regarded by most planners as the most inefficient in terms of moving business away from those who most need jobs are located, most inefficient in terms of convenient traffic, transportation access, and of course, in the process of all this, creating more pollution and traffic.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LOOMIS (continuing) Secondly, I think we really need to strengthen the South End, need to strengthen the business climate and the vitality of our downtown area. This move obviously is not going to encourage that strategy. We've invested many, many thousands, millions of dollars in this parcel land facing us across the way, the Urban Development track. I do think would be a very attractive place for a business like Walden Book. I understand that there are problems in terms of money, but I think that John Smith and the Planning people are more than willing to try to work out alternative locations for Walden Book.

Another argument has been related to jobs. The intensive pressure for office facilities to come into this City offering jobs, I think we are entering a development period. We will have many more jobs being offered by firms who are coming in. I guess in summation, what we're really taking about here is the quality of life of this City. The Planning Board is really charges, and the key agency with enhancing and preserving the quality of life of the City. I do believe the Planning Board acted wisely and I will support their vote and their decision.

MR. ZELINSKI: This is indeed an extremely difficult question to vote on this evening. My 11th District board is the district where this property lies. Me, on the Board represent the people of Stamford, and they must be listened to now and always. If anyone of us were looking for a home, would we not want to buy and live where the cost is right, and the area is desirable. Well, Walden is looking for their home. This particular site has been for sale since 1966, and actively marketed since 1972. In those eleven years, there has been no interest on the part of any developer to purchase the property for single family homes, why?

One needs only to walk through the property to realize that the cost of building single family homes would be prohibitive. The low reservoir area is approximately two acres in size, and as much as fifteen feet deep. To control fill this area is estimated to cost in the excess of \$100,000.00. The rear of the property slopes at a 25% angle. After carefully considering the pros and cons and personally walking the property yesterday, I have decided to vote in favor of Walden Book application and urge my fellow Board members to do so as well.

MRS. PERILLO: Thank you, Mr. President. I thought you forgot me behind the pole over here. I too, received many, many calls, all in favor of voting for Walden Book Company. I'm very surprised that the Planning Board has chosen to close the door on a local firm, forget this City, opens its arms and bends over backwards for out-of-town firms to come into this City. I don't consider this down-zoning. I have a map in front of me that clearly states Walden Book Company is in the planning district. I attended the public hearing and a big thing from the Planning Board was on the traffic that was going to be in this area.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. PERILLO (continuing) Well, I'm wondering, who are they planning for. Are they just concerned about traffic in one section of the City. I also have a letter in front of me that the Planning Board wants us to act on an industrial service road in another area of town. Well, I'm very concerned about the traffic there with the trailer trucks and everything. So, if there going to plan, plan right, and plan for this City, for the whole City, and for the local residents here.

MRS. COSENTINI: I would like to say that in view of the statements that proceeded my opportunity to speak here, I think it's very clear that Walden Book will be supported. However, I have a very special interest in this and I have to, I think clarify my point of view on this, and some of my concerns. My district, the planning district the Westover, Cedar Heights that is directly contiguous to the Ridgeway, Bulls Head district, and it encompasses much of my 13th voting district, therefore, I feel it's necessary for me to explain my position here.

The wedge between Long and High Ridge that comes down between the two major areas there, there is a wedge of land in there that is an extremely vulnerable piece of land at this moment. In my district alone, we have had some spot-zoning that was originally supported much by the resident in the area until they sought developed and now there's some consternation about the way it has gone. So that while I'm always extremely swayed by the wishes of people in an area of down-zoning, I know there have been instances where they thought they were going to get better than what some other possibilities might be and it has not turned out necessarily to their satisfaction. I think that is the consideration to watch here.

My overall feeling is this, I look at this area and I thought, this is an uphill battle in this wedge between Long and High Ridge to keep this a residential area. Up all the way near the Merritt Parkway and we have already had spot-zoning. Can the Planning Board, and can the City of Stamford, and does it indeed have to resolve to keep this a residential area? The Planning Board did come with a plan to limit the further development, which I and most of my constituents applauded heartily. Now, the question remains, is this one parcel as Mr. Hays - also aptly goes to the heart of the question, and adequate acceptance to the rules, did they goof in looking over one spot? I think that we have to consider the Planning Boards innocence until proven guilty on this issue.

I was very carefully listening for a strong argument from expert testimony as to why this particular parcel would be an exception to the rules. Much of what, I walked the site also, I am probably as expert as anybody else in this room who has walked this site in terms of what site development can or cannot take place. Which is to say, not a very sophisticated an expert, okay. Therefore, I was very curious and I would still throw back to the committee the question, what expert testimony did you have to indicate, indeed that this parcel of land must be so exceptional that it cannot be the first step in holding the line on further developing in this highly vulnerable area?

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. COSENTINI (continuing) Topography has not held any other developers back in any other area as far as I know. However, the overall principle here does cut right accross literally and figuratively into my distriat. The question here is, has somebody taken the time to thoroughly prove that this should be an acception, or do we really begin gritting our teeth and holding the line now.

MR. CONNORS: I made it my business a week or so ago to take a ride down and look it over, it looks like their bulging at the seams. You could see they have no place to go, they can't expand anymore, if they do, I don't know where there going, they'll end up in the canal. But I do say, we as members of the Board should vote for Walden Book Company for the simple reason they do hire local help. I feel that Walden Book Company, over a period of years, has built up a wonderful association with the City of Stamford, pays their taxes, minds their business, and runs a very nice organization.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I feel that I owe my constituents an obligation to relate to them why I'm going to vote the way I am on this matter. I have thought for the last two years very strongly and at many public hearings against changing in our zoning laws. I have worked very hard to preserve the character of this particular area. On this issue I'm going to vote with Walden Book, and for a very good reason. The reason is not because it's run by a native, as much as that is wonderful and that native is a constituent of mine, it is not enough of a reason to go against a new well conceived of master plan.

Nor is it enough to go against this new master plan because the people who work at Walden Book are happy people. I mean, I'm really glad they are. But don't change the master plan for that. However, Mr. Zelinski, I feel best delineated the reasons for, in this circumstance modifying the master plan, and he said it very well, and I don't have to repeat it, and that is why, in this particular case, I feel secure in voting the way I'm going to vote.

MRS. SANTY: MOVE the QUESTION.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, with 33 members present, let the records indicate that Mr. Baxter left the floor at the beginning of the Walden Book discussion, but Mr. Fox joined the meeting, prior to the vote of moving the question. Mr. Fox, and I might note with Mr. Robie, that would make it 34 members present. There has been a request for a roll call vote. Since one-fifth of the members present desire a ROLL CALL vote, the vote will be taken by ROLL CALL.

MR. PERILLO: Are there two issues involved here?

MR. MILLER: There have been two referrals, we are technically voting on only one. We are voting on the motion made by Mr. Signore



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

THOSE VOTING YES:

M. Perillo  
K. Zimble  
H. Dixon  
G. Hays  
G. Ravallese  
A. Perillo  
S. Signore  
M. Hawe  
J. Loboza  
J. Santy  
J. Fox  
M. Ritchie  
W. Flanagan  
J. Schlectweg, II  
S. Goldstein

L. Lowden  
T. D'Agostino  
L. Wider  
G. Rybnick  
J. Blois  
C. Nizolek  
J. Zelinski, Jr.  
D. Sherer  
R. Costello  
L. Carlucci  
D. Blum  
G. Connors  
J. Sandor  
J. Robie  
F. Miller, Jr.

THOSE VOTING NO:

R. Loomis  
V. Wiesley  
B. McInerney  
A. Cosentini

Mr. Baxter not  
participating.

-----  
MR. ZELINSKI: At this time, I would like to ask for SUSPENSION of the Rules, so we can consider the Personnel Committee, item #1.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. With Mr. Baxter returning to the floor, there are now 35 members of the Board present.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

- (1) PROPOSED TWO-YEAR LABOR CONTRACT WITH FIREFIGHTERS UNION for period 7/1/77 thru 6/30/79; 2% effective 7/1/77; 4% effective 1/1/78; 6% effective 7/1/78.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Personnel Committee met on Tuesday, August 30, 1977 to discuss the Firefighters Contract with Mr. Leary, who is president of the Local 789 of the International Association of Firefighters, and Mr. Barrett, who is our labor negotiator spoke to the committee about the contract. The committee vote UNANIMOUSLY to accept the contract as presented. The Firefighter's contract itself covers 195 firefighters of all ranks, there are actually 205 firefighters, we have 10 vacancies. The item pleased the Personnel Committee most was the productivity game that the City got in this contract.

The other significant thing that the Personnel Committee discussed with the firefighters was something we would like to see found and adhered to in all the subsequent contracts that come to us, is the compensatory clause. It is not followed in every other union, and that is, all compensatory time must be taken within the frame work of one year. We were told that the Chief does not permit compensatory time to extend beyond the year. So that all firefighters do take their time within the frame work of the year.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN (continuing) We would like to see this adhered to in all other contracts too. We were generally pleased, we thought it was a fair contract, and I MOVE its ratification by the Board.

SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

July 1, 1977-----2%  
Jan. 1, 1978-----4% ----total-\$122.445  
July 1, 1978-----6% ----total- 254.735  
                    12.4% cumulative

FRINGE BENEFITS

	<u>To Jan.1,1978</u>	<u>July 1,1978</u>
Overtime-----	\$1,212	\$2,521
Shift differential	5,131	10,674
Stand-by-time	969	2,017
Holiday time	8,686	18,070
	<u>\$15,998</u>	<u>\$33,282</u>

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST (Salary & Fringe) \$138,443 ----\$288,017

Productivity Change --More effective deployment of Personnel based on machine not firehouse.

Layoff Clause--Last man hired-first layed off.

MR. MILLER: No report on behalf of the Fiscal Committee or Health and Protection Committee.

MR. SHERER: After going through this contract and hearing the report of the Chairman of Personnel Committee, I can only say that I too, am extremely pleased and proud of our firefighters. As you all know, this is only the first of many contracts which will be negotiated which will come before us for our approval. There are so many elements in this contract which please me, but rather than go into them all, I would just like to point out the one I'm extremely happy with.

That is the opening of the Woodside Fire House. The Woodside Fire House was completed about the time Mildred Ritchie and I were elected in the 10th District. The Woodside Fire House is central to our district. It was something that pleased almost everyone that we met when we campaigned two years ago, and as pleased as we were then, is how disheartened we have been for the last two years to see it empty or perhaps if you want to call it, used by the civil defense.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SHERER (continuing) Throughout these years, I can see from Mildred and I know myself we have spoken with the Fire Commissioner on a number of occasions and impressed upon them the need for this service to be open. Thank God for the men of the firefighter service who have answered our request and the request of our neighbors and have acquiesced and for the first time that I can recall, a union contract has been negotiated to the point where the members have given up something for the benefit of the community.

I think our hands have to get out to the firefighters, because I hope this is a precedent. Tonight we were talking about precedents that will be set. Let's see other unions come in, and have the guts and say Stamford, I know your hurting, we want to help, we are residents here, and we want to help the community. Once again, I can just say on behalf of the neighbors of the Woodside Fire House, I thank all the firemen for approving this, and urge you all to approve it tonight.

MR. BAXTER: I would like to compliment both the City negotiator and the firemen for what it appears to me to be an excellent example of bargaining in good faith and a reasonable accommodation of the interest of both sides into a solution that overall will benefit the City. In particular, you know whether or not we agreed with their prior work rule, as Mrs. Goldstein pointed out, of having men assigned to a building. Nonetheless, they had that rule and it took giving up something to get to the truck concept that allows not only a new fire house to be manned, but also in my non-professional, I'm not a fireman, but it appears also, to allow the fireman to give a more professional level of protection to the City, but with more beneficial work rules. It isn't easy for a union in 1977 to make a concession where they give up something and we, and I'm really proud of them in doing that, and I think the City will benefit for it, and I'd like to compliment both sides on it.

MR. ZIMBLER: In my working life in the field of industrial relations I've been privy to many contracts and negotiations, and really must compliment both Mr. Barrett and the negotiating team for the firefighters union for this contract. Because this is a contract that really follows in the best principles in basic tenants of the field of collective bargaining, namely give and take, and it's really there in both terms.

The City gives in the form of an increase that I think it's fair in keeping with the City's fiscal situation and with the increase in the standard of living, but at the same time, the firefighters union has also given in the way of increased productivity and in changes in their work rule.

MRS. SANTY: I sat on the Personnel Committee and I was very impressed with their presentation, but primarily, I was impressed with the fact that this fine group of men put their concern and love for Stamford first, and I think we should all congratulate them on this.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. D'AGOSTINO: I MOVE the question.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. There is a request for a ROLL CALL vote. The Clerk will call the roll. There are 35 members recorded as present. The MOTION is CARRIED, by a vote of 34 YES, 1 NO.

THOSE VOTING YES:

M. Perillo  
K. Zimble  
H. Dixon  
G. Hays  
R. Loomis  
G. Ravallese  
A. Perillo  
S. Signore  
V. Wiesley  
M. Hawe  
J. Loboza  
J. Santy

J. Fox  
M. Ritchie  
W. Flanagan  
J. Schlechtweg, II  
S. Goldstein  
L. Lowden  
T. D'Agostino  
L. Wider  
G. Rybnick  
B. McInerney  
J. Blois  
G. Baxter

C. Nizolek  
J. Zelinski, Jr.  
D. Sherer  
R. Costello  
L. Carlucci  
D. Blum  
G. Connors  
J. Robie  
A. Cosentini  
F. Miller, Jr.

THOSE VOTING NO:

J. Sandor

-----



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

FIVE MINUTE RECESS.

MR. MILLER: The meeting will come to order. Let the record indicate that there are now 34 members present, Mrs. McInerney has left the meeting, because she doesn't feel well. Mr. Carlucci has left the meeting also, there are 33 members recorded as present. It is the Chair's understanding that there will be another motion for SUSPENSION of the RULES.

MISS NIZOLEK: Yes folks, I'd like to ask for SUSPENSION of the RULES so that we can give you a report on how we have divided up the questions for the ballot come this November.

MR. MILLER: There is a motion to SUSPEND the RULES for that purpose. It is the Chair's understanding that this ought to be done, because there is a deadline of September 8th. There is a suspension to take it out of order on the agenda. The MOTION is CARRIED.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Christine Nizolek

(1) REPORT ON CURRENT STATUS OF PROPOSALS.

MISS NIZOLEK: We met briefly this evening before our general meeting, and I'd like to thank in advance Ralph Loomis and George Baxter, who met privately to go over all the aspects of this very complicated issue. I'd like to mention that there will be no vote taken this evening. We're just going to point out on what Mr. Loomis and Mr. Baxter had worked so diligently on. We do have a deadline to give this information to Lois Pont Briant this week. So I'd like to refer now to Mr. Loomis, who will give all the details.

MR. MILLER: Miss Nizolek yields to Mr. Loomis.

MR. LOOMIS: On August 29th, Mr. Baxter and myself met at the sub-committee of the Charter Revision Committee. We went through the entire report issued by the Charter Revision Committee and over every single one of the recommendations. We had two things in mind. Number one, accommodating the changes within twelve spaces that are allotted to us by Lois Pont Briant on the ballot. Number two, ordering inoperable after voters act upon the questions. That is to say, we did not want to put certain changes in certain ways so by defeating one question and approving another, for example you might be continuing the Parking Authority while creating a new Transit Department, who had the difficult problems.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LOOMIS (continuing) So as a consequence, no matter how many of the six questions we ordered go down or go up, government will still go on and there will be no real problem conflicting authority or power between agencies, commissions or boards. As Miss Nizolek indicated, the Town and City Clerk must report these questions to the Secretary of State tomorrow, and that is why I am going to report to you what these questions are and then tomorrow we'll be giving them to her.

1. Technical Charter Revision changes, that would be yes or no.
2. Charter Revision changes regarding boards, commissions and departments.
3. Charter Revision changes regarding elections and elected officials.
4. Charter Revision changes regarding fiscal matters.
5. Miscellaneous Charter Revision changes.
6. Consolidation of the Stamford Golf Authority and Hubbard Golf Commission in a new commission.

On each one of these a voter would vote yes or no and thereby approve or disapprove of the commission's recommendations, of course as altered by us. My final comment is that we met with the committee before we began our meeting here tonight, and agree on these changes, the five members of the committee that were present.

MR. MILLER: It's not necessary to take any vote.

MR. FLANAGAN: It sounds like the committee did an excellent job and it makes a whole lot of sense to me.

MR. MILLER: We'll now proceed with the regular agenda. The Fiscal report is to be given by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Rybnick.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Vice-Chairman, Gerald J. Rybnick

- (1) \$ 5,500.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 77-78 BY ADDING A PROJECT ENTITLED "PURCHASE OF SIX WALKIE-TALKIE UNITS" to be financed through funds which are available in the 76-77 Capital Projects Budget known as #450.111 Fire Alarm System Modernization - (In effect, a transfer from 76-77 Capital Budget to 77-78 Capital Budget). Mayor's letters 5/2/77 and 6/8/77; Chief Vitti's and Mr. Oefinger's letters 4/1/77 and 6/8/77. Board of Finance approved subject to favorable action by Planning Board. (Planning Board's letter of 6/8 requests clarification by the Mayor) Held in Committee 7/18/77 and 8/1/77.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RYBNICK: I would so MOVE.

MR. BLUM: Health and Protection did not meet on this.

MR. MILLER: This matter is over \$2,000, so therefore, it would have to be considered by a Secondary Committee. There would have to be a motion to SUSPEND the RULES. MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. We'll now proceed to vote on the main motion. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) \$ 55,146.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - 100% Prepaid Grant to continue ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM for fiscal year 7/1/77-6/30/78. - CODE 862.0000 - Funded by State of Conn. per 7/13/77 letter of B.R. Reed, Supt. Business Affairs. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RYBNICK: I would so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: Education, Welfare and Government concurs.

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

- (3) \$ 23,000.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - 100% Prepaid Grant - Code 861.0000-  
100% Prepaid Grant to continue ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PRO-  
GRAM for fiscal year 7/1/77-6/30/78 to be funded by Federal  
Government as per letter 7/13/77 of B.R. Reed, Supt./Busi-  
ness Affairs. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: We concur.

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

- (4) \$ 8,596.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Code 859.0000 - 100% Prepaid Grant  
under State Act for Disadvantaged Children to continue.  
to SADC Project REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM in eligible  
non-public schools for fiscal 77/78 per B.R. Reed's letter  
7/13/77. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: We concur.

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

- (5) \$202,964.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Code 858.0000 - 100% Prepaid Grant under  
State Act for Disadvantaged Children to continue the SADC  
Project COMPENSATORY INSTRUCTION FOR EDUCATIONALLY DISADVAN-  
TAGED STUDENTS in the public secondary schools for fiscal 77-78.  
per letter of B. R. Reed 7/13/77. Board of Finance approved  
8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: We concur.

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

- (6) \$755,500.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Code 853.0000 - from State of Connecticut  
as 100% Prepaid Federal Grant under Title I of Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act to continue Title I - E.S.E.A. Project-  
ASPIRATION-EDUCATION for fiscal year 77/78. Per B.R. Reed's  
letter 7/13/77. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: Concur.

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

- (7) \$ 87,715.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Code 852.0000 - 100% Prepaid Grant from State under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to continue the Title I - E.S.E.A. Project ASPIRATION-EDUCATION for fiscal 77/78. Per 7/13/77 letter of B.R. Reed. Approved by Board of Finance 8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: Concur.

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

- (8) \$ 70,782.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.0101 - SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund, under TITLE II PUBLIC WORKS, the filling of six of the Fire Department's current sixteen vacancies, as well as all increments and longevity payments. Mayor Clapes' letter 8/5/77; Chief Vittli's letter 8/5/77. No impact on mill rate. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.

PERSONNEL and HEALTH AND PROTECTION concurs.

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

- (9) \$ 300.00 - HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION - Code 113.1701 Gas Allowance-Auto Operations & Maintenance - Mayor Clapes' letter 8/2/77; quoting Woodrow Glover's letter. Board of Finance approved 8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. MILLER: SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. PERILLO: It says gas allowance and auto operations and maintenance. Where does this person go to use this car? Maybe John Zelinski since he served, could inform me on this. Does he use this car just for Human Rights, or does he take it home for personal use?

MR. ZELINSKI: The money is used for gasoline to go on the various complaints that are received in the office, and is used strictly for business, not for personal use.

MR. MILLER: The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (10) \$526,476.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM - Code 750.0000 - per Mayor Clapes' letter of 7/29/77 and Mrs. Jeanne Ellis' letter and statement of 7/25/77. Additional Appropriation to be totally reimbursed as follows:

Fees	\$ 50,780.00	
PTA Contribution	500.00	
Lunch Program - Day Care	40,000.00	
Dept. of Community Affairs	<u>400,196.00</u>	\$491,476.00

State of Conn. Dept. of Education for cost of lunches prepared by Day Care Program Kitchen for children of Child Care Center & Head Start Program		<u>\$ 35,000.00</u> <u>\$526,476.00</u>
--	--	--

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: EWG concurs.

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

- (11) \$ 500.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 301.0103 Administration - Over-Time - per Mayor Clapes' letter 8/5/77, and DPW Commissioner John E. Canavan's letter which Mayor quoted; needed to meet contractual obligations. Board of Finance approved \$500.00 and deferred \$4,500.00 on 8/11/77. ORIGINAL REQUEST was for \$5,000.00.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. PERILLO: Public Works Committee met on September 1st. A committee with twelve members, only two were present, Mr. Perillo and Mr. Wiesley. Four other committee members were present in the building, but at other committee meetings. Six other committee members never showed up. Public Works Committee regrets it does not have a report on this issue.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Personnel concurs.

MR. BLUM: Is this going to come as an additional appropriation - is the City going to pay this?

MR. PERILLO: No, this is all a new appropriation. It's all new money that is for administration of Public Works. This involves that program down on Magee Avenue, the transfer station. They have to work on Saturdays, which was requested by this Board, each man is to get \$60.00 per. day. There's three of them involved.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER: I expressed concern in our committee meeting on this with Mr. Canavan, on this little squawl request. If he spent over \$2,700.00 over the past two months, it looks unreasonable for him to come in and ask for another \$5,000.00 to last a total year. I asked him a question at some length as to why we couldn't get some kind of realistic figure to vote on. I would like to see a better plan made in getting this money appropriated.

MR. PERILLO: Mr. Canavan took over the operation kind of in the middle. When he found only \$2,700.00 in that account, and more than half of it is depleted at this time, this \$5,000.00 will carry him to probably to the end of December, not to the end of the fiscal year.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask through you, to Mr. Perillo - is this for the Saturday work, for the additional on the land fill there?

MR. PERILLO: This is for the two men at the transfer station, a town keeper and possibly clerical workers that have to stay overtime and do some extra work.

MR. BLUM: On Saturday?

MR. PERILLO: No, overtime, it doesn't necessarily have to be on a Saturday. It could be a regular working day.

MR. MILLER: We'll take a DIVISION using the machine. There should be 33 members participating in this vote. The MOTION is CARRIED with 25 YES; 1 NO (L. Wider), 7 ABSTENTIONS (M.Morgan, L.Hoffman, A. Osuch, J.DeRose, B.McInerney, J.Livingston, L. Carlucci)

(12) \$ 400.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 311.1902 Tool Allowance - Bureau of Highways & Maintenance - Division of Equipment Maintenance - Letter of Mayor Clapes 8/9/77. Board of Finance approved this on 8/11/77 under Suspension of Rules.

MR. RYBNICK: This is a contractural obligation, and I so MOVE.

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

(13) \$ 2,400.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 690.0805 -BUSES - additional appropriation to implement a playground bussing program -100% reimbursable under TITLE XX FUNDS - Mayor's letter 6/29/77; Supt. Giordano's letter 6/17/77. Deferred by Board of Finance 7/14/77. Approved by Board of Finance 8/11/77.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. SANDOR: Due to the mixup in the mail, I received my information late and never had a meeting.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: We'll have to have a SUSPENSION OF THE RULES in order to consider this matter, since it is over \$2,000.00. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. PERILLO: Before we take a vote, could I ask a question on this? Is this program already started? I have two pages of letters with this item. One tells me there is no impact on the tax rate. The second page has that there is an impact. Does this mean the City is giving money to this?

MR. RYBNICK NOR MR. SANDOR could give Mrs. Perillo any information.

MR. MILLER: The Chair believes Mrs. Goldstein could respond to the question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is 100% reimburseable grant on Title XX, and there will not be an effect on the tax rate.

MRS. PERILLO: Did you get the second page, it does have an impact on the tax rate.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, because we are of the understanding that there is no impact, because it is 100% reimbursable grant.

MR. MILLER: The Chair will recognize Mrs. Goldstein for a report on this matter.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is a clear contradiction in the same letter. There is no question about it. Even if it is deposited in the general fund, if we get the money back, there is no impact on the tax rate. Therefore, I say that there was some mixup or some contradiction coming from the Mayor's office in relation to this particular item.

MRS. PERILLO: Mr. President, may I suggest that we put this back into committee, so we can get the answers to this before we vote on this. We're voting on something that may cost the taxpayers.

MR. MILLER: The Chair would suggest to the Board that there was confusion in the Mayor's office as what was intended. It seems that the intention is that this is to be considered a 100% grant, but clearly there is a contradiction in the material coming from the Mayor. It's up to the Board to determine what the Board wishes to do at this point.

MR. ZELINSKI: Does Mr. Rybnick know that if we do not vote on this tonight, if it will be lost - is there any time element for this particular item?

MR. MILLER: The Chair doesn't know if there is any problem of that type, Mr. Rybnick would you know?

MR. RYBNICK: No, I don't know.

MR. MILLER: The Chair really feels that the Board would be safe in voting on this as a 100% grant.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: In that case, I would like to, there's no time to expedite this, I would MOVE that we TABLE it until we get further information.

MR. MILLER: SECONDED by Mrs. Perillo that in effect would put it back into committee. It has been MOVED and SECONDED to TABLE this matter. The MOTION is CARRIED.

- (14) \$ 4,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - additional appropriation - Code 351.0103 - BUREAU OF SANITATION, LANDFILL AND REFUSE REMOVAL - OVERTIME - This is balance of original request of \$5,000.00. \$1,000.00 was approved by Board of Finance on 7/14/77; and now the balance of \$4,000.00 was approved 8/11/77. (Bd. of Reps. approved the \$1,000 on 8/1/77, item #10, Fiscal).

MR. PERILLO: Public Works Committee - no report.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Personnel concur.

MR. BLUM: This is the item that I had reference to in which on the overtime other departments we voted on came from Title I, Public Works money that came out of grant money. This one is an additional appropriation. I would like to know through you to the Fiscal Committee, why this same grant wasn't used in this case on overtime from Title I money, as opposed to an additional appropriation from the City.

MR. RYBNICK: I have the correct answer forms, and why this was taken out of Title II.

MR. PERILLO: Again, in midstream, Mr. Canavan could give us the the correct answer on this.

MR. MILLER: Well, the matter is before the Board for a vote.

MR. BLUM: I don't know if it's in order, but I'd like to TABLE this for further information.

MR. MILLER: Motion made by Mr. Blum, SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski to TABLE item #14, which in effect would return it to committee. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (15) \$ 45,000.00 - BOARD OF FINANCE - additional appropriation for the auditing of the City's books for year ending 6/30/77 by Arthur Young & Co., for a sum not to exceed Forty-five Thousand Dollars.

MR. RYBNICK: I so MOVE.

MR. WIESLEY: EWG concurs.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM: A plain report, if this can be done cheaper, then I think we ought to look into this. Do we actually need these covers that we get. Can't we have just a plain report, with no cover on it, with no beautiful indentation.

MR. WIESLEY: The \$45,000.00 figure is a figure that the Board of Finance froze about four or five years ago. This is a figure we use in getting an annual audit taken for the City. We cannot afford spending more money on that, if you fellows want to audit the books, you do it at \$45,000 and they held that figure now for four years, which I think with the inflation going on, it's indicative, if it's a reasonable figure and other people I've talked to, feel that this is not bad for the type of accounting job.

MR. SIGNORE: Just a clarification on that. If there are any other controllers or accountants in the audience, you'll find that 99% of this fee is for the actual work done by the auditors, not the books or the covers or what have you. There is a lot of long hours and work involved in an audit.

MR. WIDER: I also saw one of the Arthur Young's reports which was quite a bit late. The money doesn't sound too bad, but the content of the auditing report that was put together, wasn't quite up to, what I expected to see from an auditor in the way of reading. So, I'm wondering if someone could make some of those copies available to us so we could see them when they come out.

MR. ZIMBLER: This is not in answer to Mr. Wider, but simply a statement of fact. Arthur Young & Company is one of the big CPA firms, there are eight national CPA firms, these are more or less the crem de la crem. They hire the top people, they recruit from the best schools. Their people generally are the top accounting graduates from the top accounting schools, and they are paid top salary, you get what you pay for. When you want top people, this is where the money goes, not for fancy covers.

MR. BLOIS: I noticed to the left hand side of the \$45,000 you have a plus or minus. When it says for a sum not to exceed \$45,000, does anybody know the exact amount we're going to pay? What is the total bill for the audit?

MR. WIESLEY: I have that question, and what was emphasized to me was the fact that it was definitely not to exceed.

MR. BLOIS: Not to exceed, I can very clearly read that, but you have a plus and a minus, and then it says not to exceed. What is the actual dollar?

MR. HAYS: I only want to say, regardless of which auditing firm we use, it certainly should be one of the big eight, and I think you'll find the price just about the same, regardless of which one of those firms you use.

MR. SHERER: I MOVE the question.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED. Mr. Connors has left the meeting, also Mrs. Cosentini. There are now 31 members recorded as present.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER (continuing) There will be a DIVISION using the machine. The MOTION is CARRIED with 26 YES; 2 NO (D.Blum, J. Sandor) 3 ABSTENTIONS (J.Lobozza, G. Baxter, J.Robie)

- (16) APPROVAL REQUESTED TO FILE PRE-APPLICATION FOR \$20,000,000.00 (TWENTY MILLION DOLLARS) AS "URGENT NEEDS REQUEST" FROM HUD FOR URC COMPLETION via Community Development Department's efforts; Mayor's letter 8/17/77; Nancy Mitchell's letter 8/18/77; Congressman McKinney's letter 8/15/77 to Lawrence Thompson of HUD's Hartford office; and Mrs. Sherman's letter 8/15/77. Presentation in detail.

MR. RYBNICK: No action is required on this item, because this was sent to the Board for information purposes only. At a later date this Board will have to approve the application filed with HUD for urgent needed funds.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - No report.

- (17) APPROVAL REQUESTED FOR PRE-FILING RESOLUTION for State Dept. of Community Affairs Program Budget Form 125 Application for Title XX Supplement of Stamford Day Care Program to permit the serving of additional pre-schoolers in the 10 day care centers and 7 family day care homes. To be funded 100% under United States Public Law 94-401 for fiscal 1978 (10/1/77-9/30/78) in net sum of \$186,320.00.

MR. RYBNICK: No action taken, held in committee.

MR. WIESLEY: No report. - EWG

- (18) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO PERMIT APPLICATION FOR PILOT FUNDS FROM DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS (DCA) Form 126.14 - for \$575, 127.58 representing total tax levy (63.2 x \$9,100,120 assessment) - Payment-in-lieu-of Taxes for State Financed Moderate Rent Housing. Per Mayor Clapes' letter 8/18/77.

MR. RYBNICK: Board of Finance approval is not required, and I so MOVE.

MR. MILLER: No report from Housing and General Relocation. MOVED and SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: Speaking on this proposed resolution, it come to us always at a time when it's a must, it's being forced down our throat the last minute. No time to really study it. What has the Housing Authority done and the commissioners to bring the tenants into the moderate income housing and have a say in regard to this money and where it should be used? As far as I know, nothing has been done. Yes, they have and they falter, because of hard regulation, tenant associations, but it's only done because of a federal law. HUD so mandates and so they have tenant association, but there is no one or any tenant representatives sitting on the Board or commissioners so stating how to use this money for the benefit of the tenants at the four moderate income housings.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM (continuing) I don't intend voting for this, and I would like it to be TABLED to find out further facts about whether the Housing Authority has tenant representation on the Housing Authority. In other words, using their input and how to use this money in regards to their living standards.

MR. MILLER: Are you making a motion, Mr. Blum?

MR. BLUM: I'm making a motion that it be put back into committee to get further information.

MR. MILLER: SECONDED by Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. PERILLO: Maybe I'm confused. Are we on item #18, the tax levy? Well, that has nothing to do with inputs from the tenants, does it? The tax levy of the moderate rent housing, what does this consist of Mrs. Goldstein, do you know?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would think that having a general relocation would be able, the committee, the Fiscal Committee voted in favor of this item.

MRS. PERILLO: I'm only asking, because I have no information whatsoever on this.

MR. HAYS: I don't know who's on our Housing and General Relocation Committee that should answer that, but I'm concerned to put this back into committee may void it. As I recall, the date is highly critical, and I'll point out to Mr. Blum, this is merely a resolution authorizing an application and thats all. He could study it and satisfy himself in this problem before the money is spent, should we be successful in having the application approved.

MR. SHERER: I MOVE the question.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED. What is your point of personal privilege, Mr. Blum?

MR. BLUM: I'd like to answer Mr. Hays.

MR. MILLER: That's not a personal privilege.

MR. BLUM: Well, he asked me a question, didn't he?

MR. MILLER: We'll proceed to a vote on your motion, which was to put item #18 under Fiscal, back into committee. The Chair is in doubt. We'll take a DIVISION. 31 members being recorded as voting. Let Mr. Blum's vote and Mr. Rybnick's vote be recorded as a "yes" vote, although it appears to be a "no" vote on the machine. The MOTION is LOST, there are 21 NO votes; 3 YES, and 7 ABSTENTIONS.

29

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

THOSE VOTING NO: (21)

M. Perillo	J. Fox
K. Zimbler	M. Ritchie
H. Dixon	W. Flanagan
G. Hays	S. Goldstein
R. Loomis	T. D'Agostino
G. Ravallese	L. Wider
A. Perillo	G. Rybnick
S. Signore	J. Blois
V. Wiesley	C. Nizolek
M. Hawe	F. Miller, Jr.
J. Santy	

THOSE VOTING YES: (3)

J. Zelinski, Jr.  
D. Blum  
J. Sandor

ABSTENTIONS: (7)

J. Loboza  
J. Schlechtweg, II  
G. Baxter  
D. Sherer  
R. Costello  
J. Robie  
A. Cosentini

-----

MR. BLUM: There's a state law called a Pilot Program that has certain stipulations. Last year I talked about this same program, payment in lieu of taxes. In other words to get these taxes the Housing Authority has to do certain things. The resolution will go through and they'll apply for this tax abatement and they'll get it. I wish to God that I had some say in where my taxes went to.

MR. SHERER: I MOVE the question.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. We'll proceed to a vote on item #18 under Fiscal. There will be a DIVISION. The MOTION is CARRIED with 24 YES; 2 NO (D. BLUM, J. Sandor) 4 ABSTENTIONS (J. Fox, J. Blois, G. Baxter, J. Robie)



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (19) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO PROCESS APPLICATION TO CONN. STATE DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES FOR FUNDING UNDER TITLE XX OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT - \$101,716 is to be requested in resolution submitted, to permit reimbursement for certain social service programs provided by the City. Mayor's letter 8/22/77, plus supporting papers.

HOLD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. WIESLEY: EWG concurs with holding.

- (20) FIVE RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MAYOR CIAPES ET AL UNDER DATE OF 8/22/77 IN CONNECTION WITH STAMFORD AREA CETA ADMINISTRATION REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE as follows:

- A. Consortium Agreement with Greenwich and Darien.
- B. Prime Sponsor Agreement.
- C. Title I Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 1978. (\$1,310,964.00)
- D. Title II Application for Federal Assistance for the period from April 1, 1977 to Sept. 30, 1978, (\$903,301.00); (10/1/77-9/30/78, \$1,186,671.00).
- E. Title VI - Annual Plan for the period from Feb. 1, 1977 to Sept. 30, 1978, \$4,437,959.00.

MR. RYBNICK: This item is being HELD also.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Because there is a deadline in relation to this CETA request that is before the Board tonight, and because the Fiscal Committee was unable to meet on the request, it will be necessary for the Board as a whole to meet in a special meeting before September 30th. So, we will have to announce a date for a special meeting and a date for a Fiscal Committee meeting, so that we can meet on the items.

MR. MILLER: It is the Chair's intention, and we do have a problem with the date, because of the primary election and religious holidays. It is the Chair's intention, if it is necessary to call a special meeting for the evening of September 20th. The Fiscal and Personnel Committee could be meeting on this on 19th of September then. Now if it is the will of the Boards to adjourn the balance of this regular meeting, it could be adjourned to that evening of September 20th. We do have to re-assemble during this month of September, anyway. It's up to the Board as to what it wishes to do. We have completed the Fiscal agenda.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

MR. SHERER: Whether or not it's a religious holiday that night, there are certain preparations that we have to do either the night before or the night after. I think it's an inconvenience that there's an upset for a few days during that period. There's not much left on the agenda, I'd like to see that we complete it tonight. Those of us that can't be there for the next meeting, and I for one can't be there.

MR. MILLER: There is no motion to adjourn before the Board.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - John Wayne Fox

MR. FOX: The Legislative and Rules Committee scheduled a meeting for August 25th and for September 1st. Unfortunately, we did not have a quorum on either of those dates, and consequently, although we discussed a number of items, the committee was unable to vote on any item. All of the items under Legislative and Rules Committee will be HELD with one exception.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Fox, the Chair will assume then all of the Secondary Committee go along with that, unless the Chair hears otherwise.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING PENSIONS FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS AND ASSISTANT REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Approved for Publication 8/1/77. Public Hearing to be held 7/31/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - THE MATTER OF DISTRICT #2 BEING HARRASSED BY TRUCKS, ETC. ORDINANCE NO. 14-17 TO BE AMENDED BY ADDING A PARAGRAPH TO TAKE CARE OF THIS MATTER. Held 8/1/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) PROPOSED ORDINANCE re 25 ft. x 490 ft. easement requested by Stamford Water Co. along one boundary line of Sterling Farms Golf Course per letter from Atty. Gordon Paterson. This Board approved this request 8/1/77; however Sec. 488 has some further technical requirements to be filled we are advised by the Law Dept., such as approval of Mayor, Board of Finance and Planning Board.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) REQUEST FOR REVISION OF SECTION 18-79 OF CODE OF ORDINANCES, which is entitled Release of Performance Bond; Executing Maintenance Bond, submitted by City Reps. Vere Wiesley and Audrey Cosentini, who will provide text. Held in Comm. 7/18/77 and 7/25/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) THE MATTER OF APPOINTING A SAFETY COUNCIL IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by City Rep. David Blum and concurred with by Mayor Clapes. Held in Committee 7/18/77 and 7/25/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO FOOD SERVICE SANITATION AND SETTING LICENSE REQUIREMENTS, FEES FOR SAME, AND PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS. Approved for publication 7/18/77. Held in Committee 7/25/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (7) PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND TOWN OF GREENWICH FOR USE OF CHARLES R. McREDMOND TRAINING CENTER for training firefighters per letter of Deputy Corp. Counsel Barry Jay Boodman 7/13/77. Held in Committee 7/25/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (8) REQUEST FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR UNION BAPTIST CHURCH AT 28 ADAMS AVENUE from Atty. Fraser of Fraser, Bello & Lapine 7/1/77. Rec'd 7/7/77. Held in Committee 7/25/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (9) PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORD. NO. 199 SUPPLEMENTAL RE FIRE DISTRICTS proposed by City Reps. Donald Sherer and Mildred Ritchie, 10th District.

"Professional use in pre-existing wood frame structures shall be a permitted use in the Fire District #2 and said use shall be designated as Outside Fire Limits. To take effect upon its enactment."

MR. FOX: Item #9 - I would like to MOVE out of committee for the purpose of publication only.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED. The question is on taking item #9 out of committee.

MR. FLANAGAN: Could I ask the Chairman if the committee met and discussed the implications of this proposed ordinance, and has your committee had any discussion on this?



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: There has been some discussion about the item. At that time, there were four members of the committee present. Chief Vitti was present at that meeting to discuss it with those members present. Again, I would emphasize that this is for publication only. If you want to get into the merits on it, I would suggest that I yield to Mr. Sherer, who has proposed it.

MR. FLANAGAN: I would personally like to hear it, because I would not like to see something like this even published without first having a lot more input in it. Because it has extreme implications on the development of streets such as Summer Street. Prior to the fire rulings against converting single family frame dwellings into professional buildings, there are a lot of them done, and since this has been prohibited, instead of having old fire traps made into offices; we have had some substantial and taxable buildings constructed, which I believe otherwise would not, because they were not being done prior to the prohibition of conversion. It's a form of down-zoning almost, because it is allowing things to happen which can't under the present regulations.

MR. SHERER: If I can just address myself very briefly in the interest of the late hour, I will point out first of all that I don't think that this is a question of down-zoning. I think that it's a reaction to many recent decisions by this Board based on constituents reactions to proposals that have come before us. For example, we just approved about two months ago a \$15,000 grant for Architectural Conservancy Study. The purpose being, we want to see what buildings in the downtown are worth saving and restoring. We have over \$100,000 Block Grant under the Community Developing Fund purposely earmarked for Architectural Restoration. We voted on this a couple of months ago.

We overturned a ruling on the Schlesinger property based on the substantive issue concerning the quoted "monstrosities" and over-development of Summer Street and Bedford Street areas. One can't help but notice the deteriorating conditions on Bedford, Summer, and Hope Streets, and some areas of Waterside, which are all relative to bringing about this proposal by Mildred Ritchie and myself.

I will point out that this was brought out with the concurrence of Fire Marshall Hennessey, and Fire Chief Vitti, who both of them are certainly concerned with fire traps and with the concurrence of Building Inspector Sotaire, who in fact proposed the original fire district in 1970. So certainly the controls concerning fire traps are there by the Building Department and the interest of safety is there by the Fire Department.

The main purpose of this is to kind of revitalize the downtown area, and respond to the yelling and screaming of the people who say "what's happening to Stamford". This will never allow, for example, an empty lot to have a builder come in and build a wood frame structure for professional use.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SHERER (continuing) It just means whatever is there now, if it meets building requirements, and if it meets all the safety requirements of the zoning office, then it can be made into professional use, and certainly, we're going to have a public hearing on it. So, I think the reason Mr. Fox requested this to come out of committee is because there is a publication period, then a hearing period and our last meeting is in November. This is the only item that calls for publication.

MR. MILLER: We didn't vote to take it out of committee yet, did we?

MR. FLANAGAN: No, I'm speaking against taking it out of committee. That would require two-thirds to take it out of committee, is that correct, to suspend the rules?

MR. MILLER: No, we're not suspending the rules. We're voting on taking it out of committee, so that the Board might act upon it tonight, at least for PUBLICATION. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FOX: I would then MOVE for PUBLICATION of that ordinance as amended.

MR. MILLER: Health & Protection and Planning and Zoning Committees - No reports.

MR. FLANAGAN: Very often when we look at a sheet like this we see along preamble, we miss the point. I see absolutely no zoning restriction in that ordinance.

MR. SHERER: If Mr. Flanagan was familiar with the building code, he would know that the fire districts are strictly for building code purposes, and have nothing to do with zoning whatsoever. When something is zoned, then the building code takes over after that.

MR. ZELINSKI: Very briefly, I think we're all aware of the recent rash of fires in a lot of the buildings in Stamford. So I would be very concerned in that regard number one. Number two, I would be very concerned as far as speculators coming into residential homes now to be changed in business and professional use, and thirdly, I think we're putting the cart before the horse by doing what Mr. Sherer would purpose tonight, and I would urge my fellow representative to vote this down.

MRS. RITCHIE: Our main concern here is neighborhood preservation. We feel that some of the delapidated homes in our district, in particular, probably could be salvaged by a prosperous or very good lucrative tradesman, a professional man who could come in and bring this house up to standards. That is our desire mainly.

MR. ZIMBLER: I MOVE the question.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: The motion has been SECONDED. The MOTION is CARRIED. We'll proceed to a vote on publication of the proposed amendment to Ordinance #199. Necessary for approval a majority of those present and voting. There is a request for a ROLL CALL VOTE. There is an insufficient number. There will be a DIVISION using the machine. The MOTION is CARRIED with 17 YES votes; 9 NO votes (M.Perillo, R.Loomis, G. Ravallese, W. Flanagan, J.Blois, J. Zelinski, R. Costello, J. Sandor, A. Perillo) 4 ABSTENTIONS (G.Hays, T. D'Agostino, G. Rybnick, P. Walsh) In order for a publication, you need a majority in voting to finally adopt an ordinance, there must be 21 votes.

- (10) REQUEST FROM MRS. MARGOT WORMSER OF STAMFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY REGARDING AMENDING EXISTING COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THEM AND THE CITY TO PERMIT ADDITIONAL HOUSING. An additional 250 units to be included.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (11) REQUEST TO WAIVE BUILDING PERMIT FEE FOR GLENBROOK ROAD ELDERLY HOUSING SITE PROJECT - from Housing Authority Commissioner Daniel McCabe.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (12) PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL RE CONDEMNATION PROCEDURES.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. SIGNORE: May I ask Mr. Fox the present state of item #3, the easement requested by the Stamford Water Company.

MR. FOX: I received a message from Mr. Frattaroli of the Corporation Council Office to hold that for the time being. Mr. Patterson, who represents the Water Company is away, they want to have some additional discussion on the precise wording of that.

MR. MILLER: Miss Nizolek, Mr. D'Agostino, Mr. Hays, and Mr. Rybnick have left the meeting, there are now 26 members present.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

- (2) THE MATTER OF THE EIGHT CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS TO BE INVESTIGATED FROM A LIST COMPILED BY FORMER ADMINISTRATION. Held in Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The committee voted on August 20th unanimously to present to the Board our Personnel Committee report in relation to this. What the Personnel Committee has to do was to investigate fifteen allocations as put forth by former Mayor Lenz, well over two years ago. Now the survey of Civil Service practices, this series of allocations is on the last page of the report that you have so you could refer to it.

MR. ZELINSKI: What is the heading of the report?



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is called the Report of Personnel Committee of the 14th Board of Representatives Regarding Eight Classified Service Employees. I will read the conclusion of the report and not read into the records the body of the report, since everybody has a copy.

MR. MILLER: Will you please give your full attention to this very important report, which is about to be presented by Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would say that after the amount of work that was put into the report, and the different opinions in relation to the different people who came before the committee, it represents a fair assessment of what we could reasonably do in relation to this particular investigation.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Loomis and Mrs. Hawe have left the meeting, there are now 25 members present.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It appears that the allocations made in the Mayor's statement of July 18, 1975 run the gamut from truth to unfortunate innuendo. In those cases that reflect innuendo, unnecessary aspirations will cast unqualified public servants. The majority of the correct allocations, however, reflected distasteful procedural inconsistency by the Personnel Department during the years 1968 to 1973. That is totally alien to the concept of the merit system.

The committee found technical violations to have occurred in relation to all of the eight appointments. The irregularity were of a procedural nature and reflect calling on a personnel system that permitted such deviations to occur. I would say, that that was the most significant thing the committee found. We were appalled by the total lack of consistency on the part of the Personnel Commission during these five years, not only commission but Personnel Department too.

The Personnel Committee's recommendations regarding the six items were presented to the Personnel Department in its report of February 20, 1976. I would say that we try very hard to be fair without whitewashing or accusing unjustly, and the thing that was most distressing, more than, almost more than the appearance of what might be irregularity was the fact that the Personnel Department during the year mentioned, and the Personnel Commission during those years was so loose and followed the regulations so irregularly, that it was impossible to determine very much.

MR. ZIMBLER: I think the crux of this report, which I think was really great, and I would like to commend the committee for it. I think the crux could be summed up in the first sentence in item #9, referring to the lack of professionalism that existed in the Personnel Department. I think that really sums it up entirely. This is something that the Personnel Committee of the 13th Board first came across during its investigation into the unfortunate appointment for a former Parks Superintendent, that was the tip of the iceberg. This report, I hope is the final report on this. I think corrective measures have already been taken and once again, I would like to commend this committee for its fairness and thoroughness.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FLANAGAN: I think as a member of the 13th Board the one thing that sticks out the most in my mind, and I think the thing the 13th Board can be most proud of is initiating investigations which resulted in changes in personnel practices and changes within the Personnel Department.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein, this was long overdue. I was part of the Civil Service Department in the City of Stamford for some twenty-five years, and have investigated quite a number of complaints, especially from minorities who take the test. I'm glad that this Board had the full sight to have the Personnel Committee of this Board look in depth to what was happening.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think we on the Board and the Stamford taxpayer owe a great debt to the Personnel Committee and I would like to thank the committee and especially the Chairperson, Mrs. Goldstein for an outstanding job.

(3) MAYOR'S REQUEST TO CONSIDER REMAINDER OF APPENDIX B EFFECTIVE 12/1/77.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Personnel Committee in May voted unanimously to include Appendix B people and it has come up virtually every month, the Mayor has submitted it again. And I so MOVE.

MR. MILLER: MOVED and SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO: Are we taking a vote on this now?

MR. MILLER: We're going to.

MRS. PERILLO: I would vote for Appendix B if Commissioner of Public Works, Commissioner of Finance, the Executive Aide and Corporation Council was taken out. These men are appointed by the Mayor. They do not have to accept the positions if they do not wish to, they know what it involves, they know the pay, and I will not vote for this package with those positions in it.

MR. BAXTER: In view of the hour, I will be brief. We have discussed this ad-nauseam in previous meetings. But since the radio station thinks there's somebody out there listening who may not have heard the previous discussions, I would like to respectfully, and I mean respectfully disagree with Mrs. Perillo.

My thought is, either the jobs that these people are doing are worth what this report says their worth, or they are not. If our judgement is that the report was an error, and these jobs are overpriced, that's one thing, and we should turn them down forever, not just to December. In order to fairly compensate those people who hold these jobs and also insure that we have quality people, we should have it effective not only in December but now. While I'm sure it has not entered into Mrs. Perillo's thought, I think there are some people around who might be voting against this based on other than considerations of the job itself and the salary level that goes along with it.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MILLER: The question is on approval of the remaining personnel on Appendix B. There will be a DIVISION. The MOTION is CARRIED with 18 YES votes, 5 NO votes (M. Perillo, A. Perillo, L. Wider, J. Blois, J. Zelinski) 2 ABSTENTIONS (R. Loomis, J. Robie)

(4) PROPOSED CIVIL SERVICE REGULATION CHANGES.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The committee submitted a five page list of what we found wrong with the Personnel Department changes in the Civil Service regulations. To sum it up very briefly, because I shall not read what we said, instead I will have the administrative assistant send to all the members of the Board a copy of this.

We found that this chief inadequacy with the new Civil Service regulations was the lack of checks and balances that the new regulations provided. You must have a Personnel Commission who can check and balance the Personnel Director. You must have a Personnel Director who can check and balance certain decisions of the Finance Commissioner. You must have a Board who can check and balance new pay plans.

This is important, this is indicative to our system, and this is what was left out, along with some other things, but that really is the salient point. I will have Helen send everybody our recommendations. That concludes the Personnel Committee's report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - George Baxter

(1) THE MATTER OF THE INDUSTRIAL SERVICE ROAD a/k/a Viaduct Road.

MR. BAXTER: In view of the hour, and for the tenuous quorum that we have, I will try to finish these eleven items in less than eight minutes, assuming that the item that is to come to a vote does not take extended discussion. That item was discussed somewhat moderately at the last meeting of the Planning & Zoning Committee, which was one week ago. It has been discussed a number of times previously, we expect to bring it out of committee for a vote next month and I'll let you know about that. For now, it's in committee.

(2) THE MATTER OF MORATORIUM ON CONDOMINIUMS AND MULTIPLE DWELLING UNITS BECAUSE OF DEMAND ON CITY SERVICE from Courtland Terrace Assn.

MR. BAXTER: The committee voted unanimously, with Mr. Blum absent. We decided that Mr. Smith's answer to the Courtland Terrace Association, dated November 18, 1976, which you all have copies of sufficiently outlined and answered the questions of this association. We have taken it out of committee. There's no action requested of us.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) LETTER FROM PITNEY BOWES regarding RE-NAMING OF WALNUT STREET to WALTER H. WHEELER, JR.

MR. BAXTER: This item was assigned to Mr. Lathon Wider, in whose district this is. He is investigating the name that the company would like and then the procedures for getting that name changed, and that will be HELD in committee until he's completed that investigation.

- (4) ACCEPTANCE OF LIBERTY PLACE as a City Street.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BAXTER: The acceptance of Liberty Place is awaiting a certification from the City engineer as to the acceptability of the design and construction of that street. So it's HELD in committee until we receive that.

- (5) ACCEPTANCE OF WALLACE STREET as a City Street.

MR. BAXTER: The committee voted 4-0 to recommend for acceptance to this Board. The Wallace Street was about twelve years ago part extended as part of the hurricane barrier, and as an agreement to do that, the owners of the land gave to the City certain parcels of land and the City gave them back pieces- it was intended to accept the entire street. There was a contractual agreement with the owners to do so by the City.

In order to correct the technical error of ten years standing, the owners have petitioned us to, there's been more deeds back and forth, the City engineer certifies that - a) the deal was made and it was the City who tried to do and failed to do what it is now being asked to correctly do. b) The street is correctly constructed to City standards since the City did the street itself.

It certainly did it to its own standards. On a vote of 4-0 in favor, Mr. Blum was not present, the committee recommends it and I now so MOVE.

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

- (6) ACCEPTANCE OF PIN OAK CIRCLE as a City Street. Petition dated 7/29/77.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BAXTER: Item #6 is waiting for the City engineer's certification as to its acceptability and will be HELD in committee until it's received.

- (7) PETITION that CROSBY STREET be discontinued as a Public Street at the request of PITNEY BOWES, from Atty. Richard Tobin of Cummings & Lockwood under date of 7/28/77, as they expect to short own all property bounding both sides of Crosby Street.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BAXTER: Petition for Crosby Street to be discontinued as a public street as a request of Pitney Bowes has again been referred to Mr. Wider to explore. Let me just say to you that if that is a difficult problem, more than it may appear on the surface, and I don't know that it will be ready to come out at the next meeting, but I know that he will make every attempt to have it ready for us to vote on. It is now HELD in committee.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - No report.

(8) ACCEPTANCE OF CATOONA LANE as a City Street.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BAXTER: Acceptance of Catoona Lane as a City street is waiting for the City engineer to inspect and certify, and is HELD in committee until such time that happens.

(9) THE MATTER OF X-RATED MOVIE HOUSE LOCATED ON WEST PARK PLACE. AMERICAN-ITALIAN ASSN. AND COURTLAND TERRACE ASSN. HAVE OBJECTIONS.

MR. BAXTER: This item was unanimously voted by the committee to delete from its agenda do to the existence in the Legislative & Rules Committee of which an abscenty ordinance and which a public hearing had been held last year. It is my personal intent to add that to the agenda for the October meeting and ask it to come out on the floor, and consequently pending the action of the Legislative & Rules Committee in this Board we have deleted the x-rated movie ordinance from our agenda.

(10) PETITION FROM ARTHUR PLACE RESIDENTS RE TRUCKS, ETC., OPERATING FROM A RESIDENTIALLY-ZONED AREA; unpleasant conditions emanating from 10 Crescent St.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BAXTER: A letter has gone to the Zoning and Forcement Officer asking his investigation of an alleged zoning violation and its subsequent correction if that's the case.

(11) MAY 19, 1977 LETTER FROM SHIRLEY A. WALTER RE DARTLEY ST. AND DARTLEY ST. EXTENSION, easements, maps, drawing, etc.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BAXTER: Item #11 is a very interesting deal, where a road which goes to a dead end up to the applicant's house was accepted. The road was accepted as a City street up to 181 ft. from the man's house and the last 181 ft. to get to his house is not accepted, although it gives every external appearance, according to the applicant of being of similar construction and everything else was the part that was accepted. The City is waiting for a report from the City engineer as to accepting the remaining 181 ft.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Alfred Perillo - No Report.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - David I. Blum

MR. BLUM: I do want to announce that tomorrow night there will be a public hearing on the Consumer Protection Agency. I do hope those who are interested in consumer protection will be here tomorrow and so state.

- (1) PROBLEMS ON BRACEWOOD LANE AND AT RIDGEWAY GARDEN APARTMENTS; Mrs. Parshall and others complaining.

MR. BLUM: We heard from Mrs. Parshall, but not Barry Boodman. Carl Neering and Dr. Gofstein were invited. We received a letter from Barry Boodman, due to other commitments he could not be here, but he did discuss the injunctive powers which he does intend to talk to this committee about. We do intend to have a special meeting with Mrs. Parshall at a later date and also with Mr. Boodman.

- (2) COMPLAINT OF MR. DAZZO RE STERLING FARMS SLEDDING IN THE WINTER, BEING NOT SAFE FOR CHILDREN.

MR. BLUM: I'm happy to report this evening that a meeting will be held between the Board of Recreation and Sterling Golf Authority sometime next week.

- (3) PROGRESS REPORT FROM HOUSING AUTHORITY RE PEST CONTROL FOR ALL MODERATE INCOME HOUSING.

MR. BLUM: We received a letter from Mrs. Wormser, the Acting Director of the Housing Authority in regards to Pest Control and she will come to our meeting in regard to Pest Control in the moderate rentals.

- (4) PROGRESS REPORT RE VASSAR AVE. AND UNITED BANANA AND COMPLAINTS OF RESIDENTS.  
HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) COMPLAINTS RE DILAPIDATED HOUSING ON SUBURBAN AVENUE WHICH IS DANGEROUS; THERE HAVE BEEN FIRES RECENTLY, VANDALISM, ETC.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) GARAGE AND DEBRIS STILL BEING DUMPED AT HAIG AVENUE PUBLIC WORKS GARAGE SITE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - John Sandor - No report.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Vere Wiesley - No report.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Thomas D'Agostino - No report.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE - Jeremiah Livingston - No report.



MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Robert Costello - No report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Lynn M. Lowden

- (1) LETTER OF JULY 1, 1977 FROM MR. FISH OF EPB RE FORMER GERIAK PROPERTY ON INTERVALE ROAD; ALSO JON SMITH, PLANNING DIRECTOR, LETTER OF 7/5/77 RE SAME MATTER.

No report.

MR. PERILLO: Environmental Protection is taking action on that first.

MR. BAXTER: No report from Planning & Zoning.

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Gerald Rybnick - No report.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE - John Schlechtweg, II - No report.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE

PETITIONS - NONE

RESOLUTIONS - NONE

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARD and INDIVIDUALS

- (1) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUARTERLY REPORT FOR PERIOD APRIL 1, 1977.  
Comprehensive report dated 8/18/77.

MR. MILLER: This report has been received.

OLD BUSINESS - NONE

NEW BUSINESS - NONE

MR. BLOIS: I think that we have to call a Special Meeting for September 20th. I think you should inform the Fiscal Committee to meet on the 19th also.

MR. BAXTER: Mr. Miller, in the interest of efficiency in saving the taxpayer's minor postage that it would cost you to send out a notice of a Special Meeting, would you be amenable to a motion to adjourn this meeting to the 20th, at which time we could suspend the rules to cover the item that's not on the agenda since we know what it is.

MR. MILLER: The problem is not that the item is not on the agenda, the item is on the agenda, as I understand it. I would suppose it would be necessary to send out a reminder anyway, it's a good point.

MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

ADJOURNMENT:

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:50 P.M.

---

Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative  
Assistant and Recording Secretary

APPROVED:

---

Frederick E. Miller, Jr., President  
14th Board of Representatives

NOTE: The above meeting was broadcast  
in its entirety over Radio Sta-  
tion WSTC.

WSTC  
14th Board  
1977  
51