

MINUTES OF MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1979 REGULAR MEETING

15th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 15th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Monday, January 8, 1979, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 P.M. by the President, John Wayne Fox, after both parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Rabbi Elihu J. Steinhorn, Congregation Agudath Sholom, 301 Strawberry Hill Avenue, Stamford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President of the Board Wayne Fox

ROLL CALL: CLERK DIANE RAYMOND called the Roll. After the vacancy in the 18th District was filled due to the resignation of S. A. Signore, the final attendance was 39 present and 1 absent (George Hays).

THE CHAIR DECLARED A QUORUM.

MR. FOX said there are a number of Cub Scouts present this evening who are observing the meeting. He is pleased to have them here and hopes they can get some information about the running of the City from observing the meeting.

MR. BLUM said he would like to present something in memoriam to the late T. CARTER DODD who died this past month and was a proponent of housing.

MR. FOX said it is a matter of practice to take Moments of Silence up at the end of the meeting, and would Mr. Blum please remind him then.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Found to be in good operating order.

RESIGNATION OF S. A. SIGNORE (R) - 18th DISTRICT:

MR. FOX said the first item of business is the election of an 18th District Board member to replace Sal Signore who was elected by this body to the Board of Education. He read Mr. Signore's letter of resignation:

"Dear Wayne:

As you know, at the December 4, 1978 meeting of the Board of Representatives, I was elected by the Board to fill a vacancy which existed on the Board of Education. Because of this action by the Board, I am required to resign from the Board of Representatives as an 18th District Representative. I wish to thank the people in my district for having given me the opportunity and honor of serving them for the past three years; also please extend my best wishes to my former colleagues on the Board.

Very truly yours, Sal Signore"

MR. FOX said he had the opportunity to serve with Mr. Signore both on the 14th Board of Representatives and for half of the 15th Board. He was always conscientious and worked very hard, and this Board will miss his abilities.

MR. WIESLEY said he and Mr. Signore came on this Board together, the 14th. He was a very interesting individual to work with and they served on many committees together and he felt you could learn a lot by working with Sal on the committee activities; that Sal certainly did his homework in those areas and the questions he asked in interviewing people, such as on the Appointments Committee, in one thing or another, they have been on the same committee now for the two sessions, were excellent. He will be a very difficult man to replace and Mr. Wiesley appreciates the fact that he had an opportunity to work with him.

MRS. SANTY said Mr. Signore possesses the highest of ideals and always served the 18th District with humility, dedication and loyalty. We will all miss him.

MR. MORGAN said Sal did a fine job in the two terms he served here and will be missed. That they didn't agree on every single issue but reasonable men rarely do. He wishes him well on the Board of Education.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he, too, wishes Sal Godspeed, and that Sal was most dedicated in his service to the City of Stamford.

FILLING OF THE 18th DISTRICT VACANCY (REPUBLICAN):

MRS. SANTY placed in nomination the name of SALVATORE FIORDELISI of 41 Intervale Road. He was born in Stamford; was graduated from the University of Bridgeport; married, with two children; has 20 years of experience in financing and accounting. His resume is four pages long. Many people went into the decision-making of this selection and Sal was chosen unanimously by the many 18th District people consulted, she hopes the Board will honor this choice. SECONDED by Mr. Bernier.

MR. WIESLEY placed in nomination the name of JOSEPH KASTENHOLTZ, saying he was called yesterday and asked to put this name in nomination, and not knowing Mr. Kastenholtz, he went out to his home on Sunday and spent about an hour with him, interviewing him, meeting his wife, Louise, and discussing his reason for wanting to come on the Board and his qualifications. He has two sons, one in college and the other in Stamford High; born and educated in New York City; lived in Stamford for the past 11 years; is President of the Northeast Civic Assn.; and has a long list of fine credentials. SECONDED by MR. Ventura.

MR. FOX said a Motion has been made to close the nominations. Seconded. Carried.

MR. FOX said there will be a Roll Call vote on these two candidates; one being SALVATORE FIORDELISI nominated by Mrs. Santy, and the other being JOSEPH KASTENHOLTZ nominated by Mr. Wiesley.

MRS. RAYMOND called the Roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE FOR 18th DISTRICT VACANCY:FOR SALVATORE FIORDELISI (21 votes):

Bernier, Raymond
Ferrara, Richard
Hawe, Marie
Tiani, Charles
Perillo, Alfred
DeLuca, Robert
Sherer, Donald
Ccrbo, Fiorenzo
Pollard, Everett
Santy, Jeanne-Lois
Ritchie, Mildred
Markiewicz, Henry
McInerney, Barbara
Baxter, George
Blum, David
Zelinski, John
Boccuzzi, John
Carlucci, Leo
Perillo, Mildred
Dixon, Handy
Morgan, Michael

FOR JOSEPH KASTENHOLTZ (16 votes):

Darer, Stanley
Goldstein, Sandra
Loomis, Ralph
Feighan, Michael
Raymond, Diane
Schlechtweg, John
Wider, Lathon
Rybnick, Gerald
Ventura, Joseph
Livingston, Jeremiah
Summerville, Anne
Esposito, Paul
MacInnis, William
Wiesley, Vere
Fox, John Wayne
Parker, Lorraine

ABSTENTIONS (1):

Maihock, Audrey

ABSENT FROM MEETING (George Hays)
(and vacancy in 18th District)

MR. FOX said the CHAIR declares SALVATORE FIORDELISI as the winner, the vote being 21 for Mr. Fiordelisi, 16 for Mr. Kastenholtz, with one abstention.

SWEARING IN OF MR. SALVATORE FIORDELISI by PRESIDENT FOX.

MR. FOX administered the Oath of Office to Mr. Fiordelisi.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. MORGAN MOVED to WAIVE the READING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT.
SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

THE STEERING COMMITTEE met in the Democratic Caucus Room on Monday, December 18, 1978. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Wayne Fox at 8:00 P.M.

As the meeting progressed, all the Steering Committee members were in attendance except for one absence, that of George Hays. Also present were Robert DeLuca, Everett Pollard, and Richard Ferrara, and the Media.

(1) MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS:

The one name, that of Ed Greenberg for the Board of Ethics was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(2) FISCAL ITEMS:

All 20 items on the Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(3) LEGISLATIVE MATTERS:

Ten of the items on Steering were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA; also added to the Agenda was tax exemption ordinance for final adoption for the Jewish Center, and proposal to observe Martin Luther King's birthday as a holiday. HELD IN COMMITTEE were: the item for \$100.00 gas allowance for Board members; the proposed ordinance to appoint three alternates to the Board of Finance; and tax relief for the elderly; matter of security and time limit on bidding procedures; reconsideration of shellfish ordinance; registrars' request for a pension. The Sense-of-the-Board Resolutions were moved to RESOLUTIONS. Moved to Environmental Protection Board was the proposed ordinance re flood encroachment lines. Removed from the agenda was the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution re funding of garbage and refuse collection for condominiums and cooperative dwelling units; also commendation for Sgt. Pucci.

(4) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:

All three items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(5) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

Ordered Held in Committee was the question about rental of jacks.

(6) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a new item re Hawk Transportation. Ordered off the Agenda was the matter of looking into the bidding procedures re the new West Side Fire Station.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS:

Two items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Held in Committee was the matter of naming a park for Angus McKeithan, deceased. Withdrawn was the matter of renaming one block of Stillwater Avenue after Martin Luther King.

(8) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS:

Ordered into this Committee is an item appearing under Communications from Other Boards and Individuals (#2) relating to Mr. DeLuca's request for legal services for BOARDS and COMMISSIONS of the City.

(9) SEWER MATTERS:

The one item on Steering was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION MATTERS:

The first item on Steering re placing of Housing Authority commissioners under the Board of Representatives was ordered HELD IN COMMITTEE. Reports on Community Development was ordered ON THE AGENDA. Also ordered On the Agenda was an item transferred from L&R, #13, being the matter of a new State Dept. of Housing with Cabinet-level commissioner.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(11) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS:

One item was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA, transferred from L&R #20, being the matter of flood encroachment lines.

(12) SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE RE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT:

Request for Report ordered ON THE AGENDA.

(13) SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE RE STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY:

Request for Report ordered ON THE AGENDA.

(14) RESOLUTIONS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were Sense-of-the-Board Resolutions commending State Representative Ernest Abate on becoming Speaker of the House; congratulating Stamford Catholic High's football team; congratulating Constance Stevenson on being elected "Teacher Plus".

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon MOTION MADE, SECONDED and CARRIED, the Steering Committee ADJOURNED at 9:40 P.M.

JOHN WAYNE FOX, CHAIRMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON said he had no Committee report as the Mayor withdrew the name of ED GREENBERG for the Board of Ethics.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal met on Wednesday, January 3rd. Present were Representatives Rybnick, Hawe, Livingston, Ritchie, Wiesley, Zelinski and Goldstein. The non-members present were Maihock, MacInnis, Blum, Markiewicz, Alfred Perillo, Raymond, and Corbo. Everyone has received a copy of the Contingency Fund Summary. If all items are passed tonight, the Contingency Fund will have a balance of \$2,018,000.00.

The following items were placed on the CONSENT AGENDA: Fiscal #4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19. In each case where a secondary committee was involved, that committee concurred in putting the item on the Consent Agenda; and in those cases where there was no secondary committee report as required, those items were approved by Motions to Suspend the Rules and Carried.

Note: Mrs. Summerville ABSTAINED from voting on Item #16 for the Stamford Housing Authority; and Mrs. McInerney said she was voting NO on #18 and #19.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) \$ -663.84 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Code 290.1330 - MEDICAL INSURANCE.
221.28

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted to cut this to \$221.28 to reflect the period of Feb. 1, 1979 through March 31, 1979, to be funded by Title II funds and she has a resolution to that effect. Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED. She said this covers medical but NOT life insurance.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if this definitely was covered by Title II funding of the Public Works Act.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said it was.

MR. FOX called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

- (2) \$ 765.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PARKS - Code 620.1110 SALARIES.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this is a 5.5% Cost-of-Living increase for a position that was vacant when the increase was granted a few months ago. Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA asked how can a person who just started working get such a position adjustment when he has not had a chance to prove himself.

MR. BLUM ^{said} when the 5.5% was approved at the Oct. 4, 1978 meeting, some people received less than 5.5%. Some got 1.3%, or 6.4%, 0.3%, etc. What is this person's percentage going to be?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the \$765.00 equals the full 5.5% in this case. She said there are 80 members, a minimum of 85 members who are M.A.A. people and she does not know who are at the top of the scale the middle, or what step.

MR. DARER said we have a system in Stamford now where we really shouldn't talk about individuals. He doesn't understand why when we passed this before, it was not explained about the vacancies, as they should have been included, and not have them come up as individual items at future meetings. It seems to him that once we accept a plan, forgetting about individuals, that are positions, and these positions have a certain salary level to them, and that as long as we have that system it is a waste of time to go through each position as it is filled.

MR. FOX called for a vote, and the Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (VOICE VOTE).

- (3) \$ 1,356.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 550.1110 SALARIES 78/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED. This is 5.5% for the Director of Nurses and for the promotion to an Executive Secretary from Secretary.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (11) \$ 12,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS MAINTENANCE - Code 320.5550 - BUILDING MAINTENANCE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this is to cover cost of increase in service contracts such as maintenance of elevators, pest control, oil burners, etc. in our public buildings. Sonitrol is now a separate account. Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. PERILLO said Public Works concurred.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

- (13) \$100,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 314.2181 - SNOW AND FLOOD EMERGENCY - ROCK, SALT AND SAND.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this is to cover the cost of building an inventory of salt and sand for the winter. Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM said this material should have been purchased in June or July and at considerably lower prices.

MR. VENTURA MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said yet to speak for the first time are Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. Perillo, Mr. Livingston. A machine vote was taken and the MOTION WAS DEFEATED with 21 No, 11 Yes, and 7 Abstentions.

MR. BOCCUZZI said looking at the breakdown sheet, it appears the Mayor cut the departmental request from \$150,000.00 to \$100,000.00, so if you want to blame anybody, blame the Mayor as he knew the requirements from previous winters. It is poor planning on the part of the Administration and the Public Works Department for not taking care of this sooner. However he is in favor of this appropriation.

MR. PERILLO said we can stockpile sand right up to the moon and it will stay there. Rock salt will not hold up. The sun and the rain will wear that down.

MR. WIDER MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Mr. Blum yet to speak for the second time.)

- (14) \$ 1,876.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 550.1110 SALARIES 78/79.
(Rejected by Board of Reps at November meeting.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this is to cover the cost of adjusting the starting salary of Director of Nurses from Grade 10 Step 1 to Grade 10 Step 4. It is not a raise, it is a new starting salary. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and one against (Mr. Zelinski), and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI said in the past he heard some members say we have considered things that are silly and foolish items before this Board. His thinking this evening is that this particular item is silly to consider again since it was defeated on November 13th. He resents a City department head trying to push this through again, and not abiding by the Board's wishes. This practice should not be encouraged as then the same item could come back a third and a fourth time and so on, if defeated each time, and this precedent should not be established. Because, finally, after possibly various ways of persuasion, certain votes can be gotten and certain items can be passed; divide and conquer, if you will. The Personnel Committee members and I put a very great deal of time on this matter, going over facts, figures, checking and double-checking, during the past several months.

MR. BLUM said he took exception to this, as did Mr. Zelinski, because when it first came to the Board, it was for a sum over \$2,000.00, and the Personnel Committee was the secondary committee, and it was defeated. Now, the Health Department brings it in a second time for \$1,876.00 which is less than \$2,000.00 eliminating the secondary committee and he wonders if it was just an oversight or meant to be. He begs his fellow members to vote it down.

MR. DeLUCA said he is in the position of a bridesmaid, with everything being said already. He must vote no for several reasons, one being that he feels this position was created to deny a promotion from within the Health Department. Another is that it came in originally for \$2,690. and was rejected. Then the Health Director did some creative writing, admitted an error, and came in again for less than \$2,000.00. He urges his fellow members to reject this again tonight.

MR. DARER MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said still to speak for the first time are Mrs. Ritchie, Mrs. Goldstein, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Sherer, Mr. Dixon and Mrs. Santy.

MR. FOX said the MOTION TO MOVE THE QUESTION has been WITHDRAWN, and the Second is also Withdrawn.

MR. DIXON said we have always tried to approve and place well-qualified people in positions with responsibilities to assure the people of Stamford that we are acting in their best interest. We have demonstrated this a few times in the Health Dept. by giving Dr. Gofstein our vote of confidence when we voted to renew his contract to head that Department. That action on our part was an indication that we could rely on his judgment, competence, and ability to make decisions. He is doing his job, and we should approve this appropriation.

MRS. RITCHIE said this is not a raise, but is an adjustment in the starting salary for a candidate who was highly-qualified, being the difference between Step 1 and Step 4.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said she is disturbed at the mis-statements in this discussion. At the Fiscal meeting last week, Mr. Zelinski questioned Dr. Gofstein about the first paragraph in that letter and it was that the 5.5% had a likelihood of being passed, not that it would definitely be passed. Mr. Zelinski took Dr. Gofstein over the coals on that statement, and Dr. Gofstein answered to the satisfaction of the entire committee, but apparently not to Mr. Zelinski's. And when Mr. Zelinski was still not satisfied, the Committee deferred to Dr. Hoffman, who comes to sit in on the meetings, who said at that point in time that every department head who was advertising a position told the applicants that in all likelihood there would be a 5.5% increase and indeed that is what happened. What really saddened Mrs. Goldstein was not the sin of commission but the sin of omission that has occurred. You may not want to give this person the increase, and Mr. Zelinski may think he'd like to be earning this salary or whatever, but perhaps if he had an MPH from Yale University as this woman has, and came in second on the exam, and was chosen, he'd have that position. That's the first thing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the second thing is, as Chairman of Fiscal this past year, she has seen any number of errors, and when they find an error, they correct it. The Committee does not say that the department head has intentionally committed an error. She doesn't think Dr. Gofstein, or any of the department heads, is busy doctoring up the books, but the Committee treats people who come before them as good, decent Civil Servants, and not as people who are out here to trick or deceive them, or anything else like that. She is very thankful Dr. Gofstein picked up the error, because this went to the Finance Board who didn't pick it up, and it was not picked up by this Board last month when the appropriation first came here. The job was advertised twice before they finally got a taker. The salary had to be increased to meet competition. This item should be approved.

MR. MORGAN MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX said yet to speak are Mr. Sherer, Mrs. Santy, Mr. Zelinski for the second time, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Loomis, and Mr. Blum for the second time.

MR. FOX called for a machine vote on the \$1,876.00, Item #14 Fiscal, for the Health Department. MOTION APPROVED with 26 YES, 13 NO. (2/3 of 39 present).

- (16) \$90,000.00 - STAMFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY - GLENBROOK ELDERLY HOUSING PROJECT - AMENDMENT TO THE 1978/1979 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET -
Additional funding needed to proceed with this project for 44 units of elderly housing, due to inflation since land acquired in 1970.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said \$60,000.00 was already appropriated previously for this project, and this \$90,000.00 is needed to proceed with the construction. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. WIDER said Public Housing and Community Development concurred.

MR. MORGAN said this project has been discussed for ten years, it should get started and he urges everyone to vote for it. It is badly needed.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote), on ITEM #16 for \$90,000.00 for Stamford Housing Authority.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (20) \$99,008.00 - VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS - M.A.A. MERIT INCREASES - Salary Codes 1110 - Approved by Board of Finance on 12/14/78 with following statement. (see Agenda for details and itemization)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this is an additional appropriation to grant merit increases to the municipal administrators. It represents the final phase of the pay-plan approved by the Board last September, 1977, at which time this Board of Representatives, as well as the Board of Finance the previous month indicated dissatisfaction of the across-the-Board raises for managers without regard for job performance. These merit increases of 6%, 8%, 9% are on the scale directly related to job performance. It incorporates the cost-of-living and merit. A 6% raise was considered average; an 8% above average; and 9% superior. There were no raises given for a below average grade. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor of these increases and she ~~so~~ MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI said his Committee met, four members being present, and a motion was made to deny this request, the vote being 2 to deny, and 2 abstentions.

MR. WIDER said he had a number of reservations concerning the merit plan program because he worked on it for many years; as a matter of fact, his first union was at the Stamford Rolling Mills; but he discussed this with a lot of people and while it is a part of the spoils plan from years ago, it does accomplish some true things which he feels would be beneficial to all. In previous evaluations, they were done on people in the street, and it is a step in the right direction to do it on people in the office. This plan should be well scrutinized by the people who are elected to represent the citizens because we really need some kind of tightening up on our M.A.A. program.

MR. BLUM said he wishes to discuss this and it might be a little lengthy, and then he would like to follow it up with an amendment. He said at the October, 1978 meeting this Board voted on a 5.5% Cost-of-Living Adjustment, which was retroactive from July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979.

MR. BLUM said now they are going to vote on a M.A.A. Merit Increase which has got a tag on it from the Board of Finance that they are to incorporate a Cost-of-Living Adjustment into the merit factor. Add to these 6%, 8%, and 9% merit increases, the 5.5% granted in October, and you have some receiving 14.5%, which is against President Carter's price and wage guidelines to hold the line on inflation. Also, he sees something wrong with this proposal as there will be a certain amount of discrimination where certain, out of a 100 and some odd, only 69, or is it 66, will receive the merit increase. Some somehow were not evaluated. Some were evaluated unsatisfactorily. Whether they kept to the guidelines, or whatever the instructions were from the Personnel Commission, but in a sense, if each one of those who are receiving the 9%, if they are not in a sense political, then what are they? If those who are receiving nothing, if that in a sense is not political, then I don't know what it is. I think there is a certain amount of discrimination here, and for that reason I would like to AMEND that we TABLE this entire merit plan until we have some further investigation. We now have a research analyst with us so let us determine if there is a certain amount of discrimination, if it in a sense political or not political, and if this does not go above the guidelines that the President set.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX said a Motion has been made to Return to Committee, and was there a Second to that? There was no second, so they will proceed with discussion on the original motion.

MR. BOCCUZZI said in looking over the increases they are going to be giving out, he sees figures like \$2,400, \$2,100, \$3,700. Now 9% of a salary is quite a bit of money. We have people working for the City with union contracts getting 5% of their \$12,000 annual salary, which is a \$600.00 raise. Now if a person is earning \$30,000, and you give him 5%, he gets \$1,500, but this system didn't seem to figure that, and they gave him a 9% raise. I don't know who did the evaluation, but I could pick a flaw out right in the Personnel Department who gave Mr. Bernstein an 8% increase. That is supposed to be a very good average. If he is doing such a good job, how come the people under him only got a satisfactory average of 6%? If department heads are doing a good job, it means the people under them are supposed to be doing a good job, too, so they therefore should have gotten 8% also. I can't really buy the evaluation at all. I don't think it was done properly. From the standpoint of a working man, I just cannot believe that the amount of monies in increases are legitimate, or should be that high. They should take this whole thing back and start with a 6% and work down. Never mind the 9%.

MR. DeLUCA said we're being told that the Merit System is the greatest thing to hit Stamford in years and is going to provide incentive for greater productivity and efficiency. There is an old saying that you can lead a horse to water, but you can't force him to drink. Some of our administrators have been in their positions so long that you are never going to change their habits. We have seen examples of this in the past year since I have been on this Board where rules are circumvented and it is going to be tough to convince me that by giving increases of 9%, 8%, and 6%, you are going to get greater productivity and efficiency out of it. It's strange that only the Directors got the 5% increases. There are many people that I know who were not even evaluated. I, personally, know some of these people have been doing a fantastic job during their time with the City. Do you mean to tell me that this isn't part of a political game that's being played. I daresay not. It is a political game they are playing. Soon, no doubt, major increases will be forthcoming for the Mayor and his Cabinet. It's about time we started sweetening the pie for the taxpayers; they are not concerned with phony surpluses at the end of the year; they want tax cuts now, not later on. This plan seems to be worse than the old system, and as I said before, it is all a political gimmick. I would rather take my chances by giving across-the-board increases. Hopefully this can be rejected tonight.

MR. DARER said somehow this meeting tonight seems to be one of the worst he has attended and that is because he has heard more conjecture, more misinformation, more outright falsehoods, and in a way, more rubbish than he has heard since he has been on this Board.

MR. BOCCUZZI made a Point of Personal Privilege, saying he thinks Mr. Darer is just taking everybody over the coals with a paint brush. Let him single out the people who are putting out rubbish and misinformation. Mr. Boccuzzi said he feels when he spoke a few moments ago, it was not rubbish and it was not misinformation. If Mr. Darer is including him in that, fine, but let him say who is doing it. Mr. Boccuzzi does not want to be included in a wholesale statement like that.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DARER said this includes both cost-of-living, the 5.5%, and merit factors. He's heard talk tonight of 14%, 15%, 13%,; we are talking about a 5.5% cost-of-living increase, and any balance is a merit increase, that's the first point. Secondly, talking about people whose names were not on this list is because some departments did not submit names in time to make this list. In caucus, the Republicans spent a lot of time explaining the relevance and importance of a merit increase plan. He is only a little unhappy that the Democrats didn't do the same because a lot of time might have been saved with all these questions.

MR. MORGAN said in his capacity as Majority Leader, he chairs the Democratic Caucus, and he would like to point out to Mr. Darer that the Democrats and the Republicans themselves choose how they operate within their caucuses, and he takes sharp exception to the fact that Mr. Darer feels impelled to criticize the methods of the Democratic caucus. Mr. Morgan feels Mr Darer is stepping out of bounds with about every other word he utters and he urges him to be a little more cautious.

MR. DARER said civil servants by the nature of their jobs, or of their persons, would not attempt to mislead or deceive or attempt to connive this Board or the City. They are honorable people who are trying to do a job, in many cases under difficult circumstances. The whole concept of the merit plan is to reward those people who are evaluated by their superiors to be giving outstanding performances. It does not reward those who do not give outstanding performances. It is not fair to look at individuals. We must look at job titles.

MR. WIESLEY said that 9% does not represent all merit, it is 3%. Try and keep this separated and it doesn't look as horrendous as you might think. We have a problem when you begin a new system with your evaluators or appraisers which are usually the immediate supervisors, and we were advised by the Personnel Dept. that one of the things they have already started was training people to appraise better, to evaluate better.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the M.A.A. will eventually unionize; it's a matter of when, and we will not get away as cheaply as we are getting away tonight, and she doesn't want anyone to forget that. If this is delayed one or two months, by either holding or rejecting, it will give the M.A.A. a chance, and it is their right because they can unionize now, to gather their forces, and this will be down the tubes. We will never again get the opportunity to have merits for the administrators. That's the first thing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the second thing is that someone mentioned it is all a political kind of thing. In any system, whether it's business or industry, or schools, politics comes into play, and she is certain that in some areas here evaluations were not as fair as they could be. It is an imperfect system, as most systems go, but it must be remembered that if an employee is not evaluated, that person cannot get a merit increase; that is, it really is to the benefit of the department head to evaluate every single person that works for him. Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and she so MOVES. SECONDED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. RITCHIE said the merit system is a step in the right direction to civil service reform. This is what the Personnel Committee of the 14th Board asked for and these are the fruits of the labors, the many hours that they put into it, the guidance they gave to the Personnel Commission and Director. If someone wants to strive for a higher wage, he's going to put in a good day's work for the City, or at least she hopes so.

MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. FOX said yet to speak are Mr. Zelinski, Mrs. McInerney, Mr. Esposito, and Mr. Morgan. He called for a machine vote and the Motion CARRIED with 25 Yes, 13 No, and 1 Abstention.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Main Motion of \$99,008.00 for M.A.A. Merit Increases, fiscal item #20. APPROVED with 28 Yes votes, 10 No votes, 1 abstention. (Mr. Morgan changed to No and Mr. Feighan changed to Yes.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said this evening our new research assistant, Mrs. Chasek, is present. She has been doing research for the Fiscal Committee Friday and Monday, she just began last week, and it is a pleasure to have her on board. She has done the job diligently, and Mrs. Goldstein looks forward to having Mrs. Chasek working with the Board and their working with her. Much of the items that Mrs. Goldstein spent endless hours on in the past Mrs. Chasek will now spend endless hours on.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN MOVED TO THE CONSENT AGENDA, Fiscal Items #4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19. SECONDED. CARRIED unanimously, EXCEPT that Mrs. McInerney wishes to be recorded as a NO vote on #18 and #19. She voted against the Health Dept. contracts and wishes to be consistent and vote against the raises, too.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Michael P. Feighan

MR. FEIGHAN said his Committee met on Thursday, January 4, 1979. Present were Reps. Bernier, Sherer, Darer, Parker, Raymond, Markiewicz, and Feighan. Several items received unanimous vote of the Committee. He MOVED to the CONSENT AGENDA, Items #7, 9 a and b (c is stricken), and 11.

- (1) OFFER OF A GIFT OF LAND ON LaNELL DRIVE ON SHOREFRONT FROM MERCHANTS BANK & TRUST CO. OF NORWALK.

MR. FEIGHAN said this item is being HELD IN COMMITTEE pending further information from the Parks Dept. specifically in terms of maintenance.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SEC. 10-50 OF THE CODE re multiple dwelling inspections and certificates of Occupancy by Health Director.

MR. FEIGHAN reminded the Board that items 2, 3, 4, 5 all pertain to amendments to the Housing Code. A public hearing was held on Dec. 20th, Wednesday, on these four items. Present were Reps. Raymond, Markiewicz, Bernier and Feighan.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. FOX asked Mr. Feighan to specify the nature of the amendment to Item #2 so they could determine whether it should be re-published.

MR. FEIGHAN said they added the words "in multiple dwellings of 3 units which are owner-occupied" after the words "cooperative form of ownership", and that the Committee felt this did not change the contents substantially enough to re-publish. The ordinance had been published previously. He MOVED for FINAL ADOPTION. The vote was 5 in favor and 2 opposed. SECONDED.

MR. SHERER said he was opposed to this particular ordinance from its introduction. We have a Stamford Housing Code. And also the State Legislature, in its wisdom, permits of changes to fit local housing conditions. We are adding to the bureaucracy by creating a "Big Brother looking over the shoulder" situation and adding to the over-seeing of an individual who is trying to make a living, trying to supplement his income by having a three-family house; and when faced with inspections which are made during business hours by the Health Dept., will be faced with an extra burden to take time off from his own livelihood, and, too, delay the re-letting of the apartment, inconveniencing both the Landlord and the new Tenant. Mr. Sherer urged members to vote against this.

MRS. SANTY said she would have to vote no to this amendment. She received many calls from constituents who are small landlords and are very, very upset about it; one of them saying they are being forced to sell out, and reducing the number of housing units. She said this is a very poor piece of legislation; that this is taking away the rights of the small landlord. This is aimed at the large landlord with large complexes and it will affect him in the least; and the fees involved, the costs, are just going to be handed back to the tenants in increased rents so who is going to really benefit in the long run. She urged voting no.

MR. WIDER said he is opposed to additional restraints on landlords. He has done much research on this matter for many years. We will have another New York City where landlords will be walking off and leaving apartments at the mercy of tenants, and after a while they would have to close them up and walk off and leave them. You are going to put the small landlord out of business because he just cannot afford some of the service charges put upon him. We have all the ordinances we need. All we have to do is use them and force the Health Dept. to do their job and we can serve the purpose. Now in large multiple buildings where service to the people is neglected, we need controls and enforcement, but for the small landlords who are trying to keep their buildings up, we cannot add to their burdens.

MR. FERRARA ^{said} he would like to make two changes, and that basically is change the ordinance back to the wording it originally was, where it was 4 units or more, and 15 or more years, and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BAXTER made a POINT OF ORDER and questioned the propriety of going back to an existing ordinance, which is not amending the motion on the floor, but rather asking to be defeated.

MR. FERRARA said he wants the paragraph which has exclusion of condominiums and cooperatives left in, but he would like the period of time to go from 10 years back to 15 years, and take out the 3 multiple dwelling units and go back to the language of 4 dwelling units.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. BERNIER said he would like to explain what Mr. Ferrara wishes, as he is a member of Legislative and Rules.

MR. FOX said he is not following exactly what Mr. Ferrara is trying to do.

MR. BERNIER said one change about which there is no argument is the new provision for appeal to the Superior Court, Judicial District of Fairfield (formerly Common Pleas Court). Next, the underscored change in the third line is 10 years. That is a change from the previous ordinance which was 15 years. Mr. Ferrara is suggesting strike the 10 years and leave it at the 15 years that was there before.

MR. FOX said that was not an amendment to the matter on the floor. It is a rejection of the proposed ordinance before us. It is not a proper motion to amend.

MR. BERNIER said he is not sure he agrees with that, but would like to continue. The balance of the paragraph which is underscored is new and Mr. Ferrara wants that in. The only thing he is looking for is to change the 10 years back to 15; and to make sure the remaining sentences that are underscored remain.

MR. FERRARA said that was correct.

MR. FOX then ruled that is not a proper motion to amend. It is a motion to defeat.

MR. BAXTER said he would now ask The CHAIR to reconsider his ruling, because if Mr. Ferrara wants to change 10 to 15, but wants the language which is underlined at the bottom to remain in the ordinance which is not now there, then it would be an amendment.

MR. FERRARA said that is exactly right. Change 10 to 15 and leave the underscored text.

MR. FOX said he would abide by the advice of the Parliamentarian. He called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED. No votes will be recorded for Mr. Darer, Mr. Feighan, Mrs. Goldstein, Mrs. Santy; the rest Yes, on Mr. Ferrara's amendment.

MR. BAXTER said he would like to speak now about the motion as amended. The Main Motion, that is. He has no quarrel with the exclusionary language which Mr. Ferrara likes so much. The only difference now is that it applies to 3 units instead of 4 units of housing and he is not convinced that this change is needed unless you adopt the philosophy that power that's around should be grabbed whether or not you can show any need for it. He has yet to hear that there is a problem in those 3-unit dwellings that need correction, or that this ordinance would correct it, so it puts a burden on small landlords and the ordinance can be read to be confiscatory. Mr. Baxter does know if it applies that way, but if you read carefully the different sections, if an apartment occupancy permit is not issued, the guy gets no rent, and if it takes 3 or 4 months before that thing is rejected even though the statute permits the occupancy, it specifically prohibits the collection of rent for that time. In addition to the burden that Mr. Sherer and others talked about, the way the statute is now drafted, as it now exists, it has a burden to it and he sees no reason to increase the scope of that burden without a showing of a compelling need.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. MacINNIS said he has just two questions. One, does anybody have any idea what kind of numbers we're talking about, and in going from 4 units to 3, how many additional dwellings are we talking about, potential dwellings?

MR. FOX said we apparently don't have an answer for that question, and would Mr. MacInnis go on to number two and see what we get for that.

MR. MacINNIS said Mrs. Santy made reference to fees, and he would like to know what those fees are, and are they imposed upon the landlord.

MRS. RAYMOND said she believed there is a fee involved to have the Health Dept. inspector come out and get the CAO. It is \$2.00, she believes, to receive the certificate for the landlord. And that is good for as long as the existing tenant remains in that dwelling. The landlord pays that.

MR. WIESLEY said who specifically has the people to make the inspections, how many inspections are involved, and what are the real numbers on it.

MR. DARER said he would try to assist with these questions. It is a very difficult matter because there are four different ordinances here, all of which were taken together because they dealt with a specific area. L&R looked at this problem from the viewpoint of complaints that have come in to the Health Dept. in connection with housing. The question was raised as to what level we should try to fix units, 3 units, 4 units, 5 units, in relation to particular ordinances that are coming forward to this body in the next few minutes. Of a series of complaints that came in to the Health Dept., 6% came in 3-family units; 12% came in 4-family houses; 14% came in 5-family houses; 27% came in 6-family housing, and 7-family houses or above, 31% of the complaints were made.

MR. PERILLO asked 6%, 12%, and so on of what? How many?

MR. DARER said since September, 1978, in heating alone, there were 278 complaints. The theory behind the 3-units, which now has been amended to 4, which hasn't been amended, was that where we had an owner-occupied unit, the owner-occupier tended to maintain his home and maintain the house. Where there was no owner-occupier, it was the intention to try and offer to the apartment tenants as much protection as was available to other apartment dwellers in the City who might come from greater unit numbers. In response to Mr. Wiesley, we specifically asked Mr. Nehring whether they had sufficient staff to administer these ordinances, and whether there would be an additional budgetary request as a result of these ordinances, and he specifically stated No.

MR. SHERER said he would like to add two points to the whole thing. The way the State laws work and the local laws work, there is no prohibition for our local body politic to make more stringent a State law; even though the State law has said 4 units or more must have a Certificate of Occupancy, there never was anything to stop us before in making it tougher. Among the items on the Housing Code, the most important is the heating system inspection, and that's obviously a problem when someone who is living nice and comfortable and all of a sudden, the heat stopped. You can see that is a problem. If an apartment is available for lease and someone looks at it and they don't like it, they don't have to move in. No one is forcing anyone to go into the place, if it's not habitable or not tenantable. No one is going to take the place if there is something wrong with it. If enough people don't take the place, the landlord is going to have to fix it up, so I think there are some external controls that do exist that we are losing sight of.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. RYBNICK said he has heard a lot of discussion and he is more confused now than before, and MOVED that it be sent BACK TO COMMITTEE so that it can be re-written, the whole thing, so we can understand it. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote. The MOTION CARRIED, with Mr. Darer and Mr. Ferrara and Mr. Feighan voting NO, the rest Yes. The ordinance is Returned to Committee.

(3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SEC. 10-26 (e) re HEATING FACILITY ANNUAL INSPECTIONS for multiple dwellings, etc.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #3 amend Section 10-26 (e) in regarding to heating facility annual inspections. This item, as well, was amended in committee, who voted 5 in favor and 2 opposed, and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. SHERER said he agrees in principle with the reason for this amendment to the Housing Code....

MR. FOX said this is an amendment to an amendment which we do not have before us and no one else knew about prior to this evening, and probably is adding to the confusion. He suggested a five-minute recess to discuss this.

RECESS from 11:17 to 11:28 p.m.

MR. FOX said the ordinances being dealt with are very technical and rather complex and the L&R Committee and Mr. Feighan, in particular, have devoted a great amount of time, including a public hearing to work on these proposed amendments, and they have done a fine job.

MR. BAXTER MOVED to re-commit #3 which is now being discussed, as well as #4 and #5 to committee in order to handle the whole thing in one package. SECONDED by Mr. Wider.

MR. FEIGHAN objected to handling all three together and asked they be considered individually, and handled in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

MR. FOX asked if there was a motion to re-commit #3. MOVED AND SECONDED. He called for a vote to Return to Committee Item #3. CARRIED with 3 NO votes (Messrs. Blum, Feighan and Darer); rest yes votes.

(4) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 10-1 by adding an additional definition, that of "Heating Facility".

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #4 is a definition of a heating facility, and the Committee voted 7-0 in favor, none opposed, and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on Item #4 and it CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(5) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SEC. 10-51 RE LICENSING OF OPERATORS OF MULTIPLE DWELLINGS, ROOMING HOUSE OR HOTELS.

MR. FEIGHAN said paragraph 7 is an additional paragraph that was published as the Law Department advised there was a technical deletion existing. Committee voted 7-0 for final adoption, that is unanimously and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

- (6) PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF ORDER OF THE 15th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES RE VOTING PROCEDURES SUBMITTED BY CITY REP. DeLUCA. Regarding no passing while roll call vote and voting lights not to illuminate until after votes recorded.

I. On Page 6 "VOTING", Paragraph 2 existing text shall be designated as (a).

Paragraph 2 (b) shall read: "There shall be no passes during a Roll Call Vote."

II. On Page 7 "MACHINE VOTING", Paragraph 9 existing text shall be designated as (a).

Paragraph 9 shall read: "The 'No Light' switch shall be utilized so that voting lights shall not appear. The President, after he has ascertained that all members have voted, shall cause the voting lights to illuminate."

MR. FEIGHAN said on Section II of Item #6, the Committee felt this was going to be a "housekeeping" type of maneuver, that might be the wrong term, but this item would be discussed by members of the Board, by Leadership, whatever; with that in mind, the Committee took on action on it.

MR. FEIGHAN said on Section I, of Item #6 above, the Committee's motion to recommend approval was lost by a vote, a tie-vote of 2 in favor and 2 opposed, with one abstention, and he so MOVED.

MR. FOX said as is customary with a negative report from the Committee, the Motion should be to approve that change, keeping in mind the recommendation of the committee. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA said he makes a motion to approve this amendment to change the Rules. Tonight was a prime example of what can happen by people passing. We owe it to our constituents to vote according to our consciences, not by keeping tabs on who votes yes and who votes no. He urges members to vote yes.

MR. SHERER supports this amendment to the Rules. He was at the L&R Committee meeting and just stepped out of the caucus room when the vote was taken. Had he been there, he would have voted in favor, yes, and the vote would have been reported out 3 in favor and 2 opposed with one abstention, so perhaps someone could be swayed by the fact that there could have been a favorable committee report. There is not much advantage and not much to gain by passing, except perhaps to be on the winning side, if it's possible, and that is not being particularly accountable to one's constituents. He asked that other Board members make their views known to the Leadership on this.

MR. BAXTER said passing is proper; however, he thinks closing the lights on the voting machine is super and should be done.

MR. FEIGHAN said when Mr. Sherer walked out of the room, one other member of the Committee also walked out. Mr. Feighan polled him and was told that had he been in the room, he would have voted NO, which makes it a negative vote again. What is fair for the goose is fair for the gander.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. FOX called for a vote on Moving the Question. CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Main Motion and said a two-thirds vote of those present and voting was required for passage, or 2/3 of 34, or 23 Yes votes. Mr. Livingston changed his vote. The MOTION is LOST with 8 Yes; 25 No, and 1 Abstention.

MR. BLUM asked what is the intention of the Leadership in regard to machine voting on part II of this.

MR. FOX said the Leadership will wait until it gets additional input from other members of this Board before it makes a decision on it.

(Item #7 is on the Consent Agenda.)

- (8) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT CLOSE-OUT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.
Re Urgent Needs categorical program settlement grant. Submitted by Mayor Clapes 12/19/78.

MR. FEIGHAN said the Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed, with 2 abstentions and he so MOVED for approval. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG made a Point of Personal Privilege. He said he would like to read a statement into the record of this meeting. He waited to express his deep concern in regards to the close-out agreement until the final vote was taken. He is expressing his concern as Chairman of the Board's URC Committee, not as a Committee as a whole since they did not meet on this item. He is making his comments after the vote because he knows how important the Seven Million Dollars is to the City and he knows if defeated, the money would surely be lost. His reason for commenting is that he doesn't believe the way this matter was handled by the Mayor's Office, Community Development, and URC should go un-noticed. He is appalled.....

MR. SHERER said Point of Order. Hasn't there been a vote and the debate closed on this item. He does not think it is a matter of Personal Privilege. He thinks it is debate and the matter is closed.

MR. BAXTER MOVED that they extend the speaker the courtesy of making his statement and he would hope for a Second. There were several Seconds.

MR. SHERER said he would like to make a challenge to the CHAIR'S ruling.

MR. FOX said there hasn't been a ruling yet. He said Mr. Schlechtweg requested a Point of Personal Privilege to make a comment about a matter which has just been discussed, and he could make that comment either now, or make it when they reach Mr. Schlechtweg's Committee of which he is Chairman, so he can speak now or later when they get to URC.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said he would proceed now. He is appalled that this matter which he considers to be one of most important in the Urban Renewal Project was handled in such a haphazard manner. This item was brought to our Steering Committee in a way that no one had any idea what it was in regard to. He, as Chairman of the Board's Urban Renewal Committee, was not even made aware that this item was to be considered. We are all working people on this Board and it is most difficult to stay abreast of all matters which concern our City. We rely heavily on department heads and personnel, full-time, well-paid persons to keep us informed on these important issues. This item should have been referred to my committee for action. My committee has always acted in a bi-partisan manner for the good of Stamford, and such a complex issue which relates to the Urban Renewal Project should have been scrutinized by the URC committee. The Committee knows this project better than others, and what should have taken place did not. However, he would like it written into our record that our meeting did not consider this item. It is his sincere belief that our Mayor and his so-called technical advisors wanted this item passed in the climate in which it has been passed and that is one of lack of knowledge. The Mayor set up a task force of which Mr. Schlechtweg was asked to be a member. The purpose of this task force was to develop the close-out agreement. They convened in November, that was the last time a meeting was held, to the best of his knowledge. A meeting was set up and on that day, it was cancelled. Mr. Schlechtweg was told he would be contacted, and needless to say, he was not. He was under the impression that the matter was in limbo, and he awoke one morning last week only to hear that the agreement had been passed by the URC Commission, and it would come before us this evening. Something that is as important as this should not be handled in the way it has been. This particular issue will be with the City for many years and it was just a shame the way it was handled.

MR. WIESLEY said he thinks the area to begin with has probably got to be shouldered a bit by the Steering Committee. The people who were there at the time had some questions as to who we really should have assigned it to. He thinks that when we look at it right now, he sees no reason why it should not have gone to Jack Schlechtweg's committee, but we didn't do it; at that particular time we handed it to Mr. Feighan and he said "O.K., if nobody else wants it, I guess we'll have to rule on it," or words to that effect. That is the way I recall it. It didn't go to Fiscal, but as I recall, there was a question in our minds as to who we should send it to. I'm not talking about the time we had to do any kind of study.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said that's my point; that's my point; no one has any idea.

MR. MORGAN said the reason there was confusion at Steering was the lack of paperwork and without documents in hand distributed to the members, it is a little difficult for us to determine which committee it would be assigned to, and he thinks the fault does not really lie with the Steering Committee, but with the source of the paperwork. He would like to commend Mr. Schlechtweg for showing restraint for what is really a very important item that is before this Board, and that is the Seven Million Dollars the City is going to receive. It would have been very easy for him to throw up a roadblock before we took a vote and say, as a Committee Chairman, his toes had been stepped on, and this thing had not been adequately considered by the proper people and just make it very difficult for this thing to pass, but he knew it was important, so important, and the Urban Renewal Program is most important to the City, and he didn't do that, rather he let it pass and then he had his say, and I think that was a very wise way for him to proceed and I think he should be commended for it.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. BLUM said others should be given a chance to speak on this as long as the Minority Leader did mention his opinion; and the privilege was given to the Chairman of the URC to make his comment; and then the Minority Leader of the Republican Party, and then the Majority Leader, they spoke. Mr. Blum feels that the members of this Board are entitled to say something on this particular item. They did not say it. It was passed through without any voice or comment on it. Everyone knew where they stood. If they didn't vote it this evening, they would lose it. But Mr. Blum thinks members should now be allowed to comment, or to back up Mr. Schlechtweg on this particular item as long as the Minority Leader and Majority Leader were given the opportunity to speak.

MR. FOX said they would proceed to Item #10 which is no longer on the Consent Agenda.

- (10) AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED TO PURCHASE .567 ACRES OF LAND ON HARBORVIEW AVE. OWNED BY FIRST STAMFORD CORP. FOR USE AS A TRANSFER STATION SITE, per Mayor's letter 11/30/78. By condemnation, if necessary,

MR. FEIGHAN said this is for authorization to purchase .567 acres of land for use as a transfer station site, and the important remark here is, "by condemnation, if necessary". This is an initiating move actually to get this whole thing going; many of you know it has been around for a while. With that in mind, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of this authorization to acquire, by a vote of 7 in favor, none opposed, and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. PERILLO said Public Works concurs. However, there was no transfer of funds here. There was \$75,000.00 earmarked for this project back in August of 1975.

MR. DeLUCA said before he can vote, he would like to know the cost of the land today, the cost by condemnation, and the cost involved to construct a transfer site. To approve something where no costs are available just does not appear to be right. He would appreciate getting some figures.

MR. FOX confirmed with Mr. Feighan that \$75,000 had been approved for purchase of the site; that in terms of condemnation, none have been initiated; and if in fact it is initiated there is no way of telling just what might be awarded if it actually goes to trial.

MR. PERILLO said at that time they didn't know if \$75,000 would cover it.

MR. FEIGHAN said he spoke both to the Commissioner of Finance and the Public Works Commissioner and asked specifically the same questions. The Finance Commissioner has not been involved thus far as no request has come to him at this point. From the Commissioner of Public Works he learned that this parcel of land on Harborview Avenue is contiguous to the Multi-Purpose Incinerator, and will localize operations by taking the transfer station off of Magee Avenue. He, as the Representative from the First District, would make that a definite contingency for any additional expansion of Harborview Avenue Transfer Site. The plans are to phase out Magee Avenue. The Public Works Commissioner knows a chain-link fence is in the works. There are going to be additional costs but you have to take that in relation to what it would do for that particular area which is in desperate need of something, and this is a step in the right direction.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. BLUM said at one time, this Board talked of a recycling plant in Bridgeport, who would take our 1943 Incinerator out of line and make it a transfer station. He wonders why we had to decide to buy a piece of property to build a transfer site in a different location when we have a building that is not being used for anything at this time. It is an old incinerator, we already own the land, so why can't this be used as a transfer site. He would like to ask the Mayor and Comm. Mordach to think about using existing property that we own rather than going out and buying new property. Let's keep it and let's use it. Recycle that building into a transfer site.

MR. BERNIER MOVED THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX said there were no speakers waiting. He called for a vote on Item #10 for Harborview Avenue. CARRIED with Mr. Blum voting No, and Mr. DeLuca abstaining; rest Yes.

(Item #11 is on Consent Agenda - tax exemption for Jewish Center on Newfield Avenue.)

(12) REQUEST THAT CITY OF STAMFORD DECLARE JANUARY 15th OF EACH YEAR AS A HOLIDAY TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF THE LATE REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

MR. FEIGHAN said unfortunately, the Committee had only a short time to deal with this issue and came up with the facts from the Finance Commissioner's Office is the cost, the total payroll cost for such an action would be \$105,000. This would be an average daily payroll of \$84,200, and an additional payroll cost associated with such a holiday at \$20,8000, for a total payroll cost of \$105,000.00. With that in mind, the Committee voted to DENY the recommendation by a vote of 7 in favor and none opposed, and he so MOVED.

MR. DIXON said he regards this item as a matter of great importance, and therefore cannot in good conscience see it pass through and in all probability be defeated tonight with so little consideration given to it. Before we take upon ourselves the responsibility of voting for or against this matter, a public hearing should be held and the people given a chance to express their opinions and feelings. After that is done, we can all vote with a clear conscience and in their best interest. We have just ended one of the busiest seasons of the entire year and the L&R Committee has not had ample time to do justice to this cause. MR. DIXON then MOVED that this matter be RE-COMMITTED to L&R for the purpose of further study and a public hearing. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO shares Mr. Dixon's feelings that in all likelihood this would be defeated tonight, which would be a shame. We spend too much time in terms of holidays, memorializing people who are so far out of our history that we lose sight of why we celebrate them. We look forward to a three-day vacation in February because it is a president's birthday, but the meaning of that is changed so much that he is no longer born on Feb. 22nd, but he was born the 3rd Monday of the month. Putting it back into committee would give L&R a chance to consider switching off a holiday, maybe not memorializing Washington or Lincoln, and switch to someone who is a living legend like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. WIESLEY agrees that L&R might consider substituting this for another holiday already existing so no additional cost would be involved.

MR. DARER is not in favor of returning to committee. He would like to vote tonight. The schools observe this day as a holiday. To switch is impractical because most of the other holidays are national holidays observed by banks and other functions which are commercially-viable operating interests are closed, too. It is also fiscally impractical at this time to undertake this, and the voters would like askance upon us if we decided to vote this as a holiday at this time. He strongly recommends that they vote this tonight either positively or negatively, as the members see fit, but vote.

MRS. RAYMOND fully agrees with Mr. Darer. She voted against it in Committee because of fiscal reasons, and also because when she was in school, she had Washington and Lincoln off, and she just had a grand old time taking the day off. She did not sit down and meditate on what these gentlemen did. For herself, if she were a municipal employee, that is the same way she would handle Martin Luther King's birthday if she had it off. She said we cannot do that any more. That as individuals, if we wished to sit and meditate and think about the importance and good things accomplished by these gentlemen, we certainly can do it on our own time, as we wish, for as long as we wish, without committing so many dollars of taxpayers' money of the City of Stamford and others.

MR. BLUM said we might have some employees who might have to work on holidays and we might have to pay them time-and-a-half. Not many employees work on a holiday; the preponderance don't. That is the intent of the holiday, to take the day off and enjoy it, not to go to work, so we should give it serious thought, have a public hearing and get some input from the community. He agrees it should go back into committee for those reasons.

MR. LIVINGSTON agreed that it should go back into committee for the purpose of letting the public be heard.

MR. WIDER also agreed to sending back to committee to get public input.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Return to Committee. The Motion is LOST, with 17 yes, 17 No.

MR. BAXTER said he would like to continue discussion. He intends to vote against this. He favors a floating holiday type of approach where one of the existing holidays the City has, is cancelled, and each person can take a day off as a holiday of their choice. If they choose to do it for Martin Luther King, that's fine; if there is some other religion, or some other national hero, or some other important figure they wish to honor by taking off, they can do that. The number of holidays remains the same for the City, and because it has not gone back to committee where that could be considered, he will vote against this.

MR. FOX asked Mr. Feighan for a point of clarification. The agenda refers to a request, but he recalls it would have to be an ordinance. Otherwise it would have no force or effect other than the feeling of this Body.

MR. FEIGHAN said if it has to be an ordinance in fact, there is no draft in ordinance form before this Board.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. FOX said then there is no choice but to refer it back to committee and have it published. He would entertain a motion to refer it back to committee for that reason and asked if there were a Second to that.

MR. DARER said he hated to be difficult on this, but if, of balance, we're against the idea of this matter at hand, then we ought to deny it and let it rest. Sending it back to committee means spending time to put together an ordinance that we would then reject again. That is just belaboring the point and why don't we just vote; if the request is denied, it is denied.

MR. FOX said except that there is nothing before us. If it is put forward and approved, we have approved something that in fact does not exist. There is not an ordinance before us.

MR. DARER said if we reject, there is no need to make an ordinance.

MR. FOX said there is a Motion on the floor to return to committee. Moved and Seconded. This is not something that requires a Motion to Reconsider for the reason that it is being Returned to Committee or considered to Return to Committee for a different reason than voted on a few minutes ago.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the Motion to Return to Committee was LOST, by a tie vote again, 17 yes, 17 No.

MR. FOX said he wished to clarify one point with Mr. Feighan. It was his understanding and recollection in the Steering Committee meeting that this be referred to the L&R Committee, a matter which had been considered by the 14th Board. There was some question on that as to whether it was ever referred to this Committee or whether it died; and to clarify that point, a motion was made to bring that matter, and that he recalls it to have been an ordinance, from the 14th Board for consideration by this Board.

MR. FEIGHAN said he recalls there were two motions there, one to refer to L&R; and the other to put it on this agenda for this evening's meeting. At no time does he remember any wording other than the phrase "request". He does not ever remember hearing the word "ordinance".

MR. FOX said then what we have here before us tonight is simply no more than a resolution, not an ordinance. He suggested we take a vote on that resolution. On Item #12.

MR. BLUM said this must be an ordinance. The only legal matter or law is an ordinance, or by Charter. A resolution is not law. We cannot vote on this item as a resolution. This is a mockery. We vote twice, 17-17. Don't we know in order to have a law to create a holiday in this City, it must be through ordinance, not be resolution. A resolution makes nothing. It is just a resolution.

MR. LIVINGSTON calls for a Point of Personal Privilege. He wishes to express himself on what is happening right now. The way this has been proceeding is a mockery out of some of the very things Dr. King stood for. He will not vote on this matter at all again tonight.

MR. ESPOSITO called for a Point of Information. On the outside chance that this resolution passes, what will be the practical consequence of that.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. FOX said none.

MR. MORGAN said given what's been said and what's transpired, it would be his intention at the next Steering Committee meeting to introduce a request for a new ordinance to declare Martin Luther King's birthday to be a holiday for the City. That would get this thing back on the track and that's the time to do it, not tonight.

MR. FOX said he is sure there is such an ordinance but that is not what is before us tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI said he does not wish to belabor the point, but he personally disagrees with the thinking about the significance of a resolution. A few minutes ago, we approved a resolution approving the execution of a financial settlement, a close-out agreement between the City and URC. Are you saying that doesn't mean anything.

MR. FOX said that was an entirely different question and not appropriate to this particular.

MR. BAXTER MOVED THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX said there was no need for that motion as no speakers were left on the list. He called for a vote, making it clear that the motion is put before the members in a positive fashion. The committee voted 7-0 against that. For the purpose of voting it was put in a positive fashion. A request for a holiday.

MR. DIXON said he wanted a little further clarification. He said if we are voting on a request for a holiday, and this motion is passed, we have voted on nothing more or less than a request and not a holiday.

MR. FOX said the vote is on a resolution and if it passes, it expresses the will of this Body and nothing more. It does not establish a holiday as such. If it loses, it does nothing more than express the will of this Body.

MR. DIXON asked if it passed, would further action be forthcoming. Would it put the Board in a position to have to follow up with an ordinance.

MR. FOX called for a vote, stating yes is to approve the request, and a no vote is against it. Mr. Livingston asked to be recorded as an ABSTENTION. The MOTION is LOST, with 11 Yes and 21 No votes, and 2 abstentions.

MR. FEIGHAN MOVED for APPROVAL of Items #7, 9, and 11 on the CONSENT AGENDA.
SECONDED. CARRIED.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - John Zelinski, Jr.

MR. ZELINSKI said No Report.

MRS. MAIHOCK MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider the Jan. 4, 1979 letter from the Long Ridge Fire Co. concerning provision of sufficient fire protection to the people of North Stamford with a new fire company station. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the agenda, which is waiver of building permit fee for the Long Ridge Fire Department. MOTION IS LOST, 14 yes, 15 no, 5 abstentions.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Leo Carlucci

(1) REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE OF UNDERHILL STREET AS A CITY STREET.

(2) REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE OF CHATHAM ROAD AS A CITY STREET.

MR. CARLUCCI said Planning and Zoning met Thursday, December 28, 1978. A quorum was present. Item #1 for Underhill Street was HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. CARLUCCI said Item #2 for Chatham Road was HELD IN COMMITTEE.

(3) ABANDONMENT OF GARFIELD STREET FOR USE AS A PARK PER REQUEST OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT. AND HOUSING AUTHORITY. Held in Committee 12/4/78 awaiting Corporation Counsel's letter re hearing date to be set.

MR. CARLUCCI said the Housing Authority presently has a paved play area covering part of the right-of-way on Garfield Ave. This portion of Garfield Avenue is only a paper street, is not paved, has no residents, and has no vehicular traffic. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of abandoning this portion of Garfield Avenue from the southern property line of Parcel A, as shown on Map #71-58 northerly to the end, and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote. The Motion CARRIED with one abstention, being Mrs. Summerville.

MR. CARLUCCI MOVED to Suspend the Rules to take up a name change, a portion of Walnut Street to Walter Wheeler Drive. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules. LOST with a vote of 9 Yes, 16 No, and 9 Abstentions.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Alfred Perillo

MR. PERILLO said no further report.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - David I. Blum

(1) THE MATTER OF HAWK TRANSPORTATION.

MR. BLUM said he could not give a report tonight. He received a call from the Public Works Commissioner that the people who were supposed to attend could not come. One from the Law Dept. had other commitments. He does have a meeting scheduled this week with the Legal Dept. and Public Works for Thursday, and Mr. Boccuzzi who is interested in this matter. He hopes they can all get together and have this final meeting, with reports from the Public Works and Legal Departments.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Gerald Rybnick

- (1) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PARKS DEPT. FEES DATED 12/11/78 for next year.

MR. RYBNICK said the Committee approved the fees and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote and the Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) LETTER REC'D. 12/18/78 FROM CITY REP. DeLUCA RE RESIDENT GOLF PERMITS AT BOTH GOLF COURSES.

MR. RYBNICK said Item #2 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Mildred Ritchie

No report.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Fiorenzo Corbo

- (1) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF SEWER EXTENSION APPLICATION FROM VINCENT DeNICOLA for Newfield Avenue subdivision, transmitted by Sewer Commission Officer George Connors.

MR. CORBO said the Sewer Committee met, January 3, 1979. Present were Reps. Wider and Corbo. Also present were Messrs. Repucci, Sabia, Connors, DeNicola, and Shiffman who is attorney for Mr. DeNicola. The committee voted 2 in favor of the application and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. CORBO said the application is incorrect because the last statement in the application states the applicant agreed that the sewer construction will not commence until the application is reviewed and approved by the Sewer Comm. Our finding is that the sanitary sewer extension was already installed at the time of the application.

MR. FOX said then there is no need to approve it?

MR. CORBO said there is no need to approve it. He would like this to be put BACK INTO COMMITTEE for further investigation. The Committee voted 2-0 in favor and then later found the application to be incorrect.

MR. FOX said then the item will be simply reported as HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE - Lathon Wider

- (1) FURTHER REPORTS ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORK SHOPS AND PROGRESS.

MR. WIDER said the Committee met on January 2, 1979. Members present were Representatives Darer, Hawe, Dixon, and Wider. We have work-shops coming up this week; one is tomorrow afternoon here in this room. There is also one on the 11th.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND GENERAL RELOCATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION RE ENDORSEMENT OF NEW DEPT. OF HOUSING IN STATE WITH CABINET LEVEL CHAIRPERSON from D. Blum 11/28/78.

MR. WIDER said the Committee voted 3 for, and 1 abstention. He referred to Vice-Chairman Darer to read the resolution to be adopted. He so MOVED.

MR. FOX said if this is the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution we all have received in written form, it need not be read, just voted on. Or has it been modified.

MR. WIDER said there were two small modifications.

MR. DARER said in paragraph two "Whereas the middle and moderate rentals as well as the low income rentals in Stamford are at zero vacancies" is one modification. Then in the paragraph regarding that the State legislative body pass legislation creating a Department of Housing with cabinet-level commissioner, with substantial resources, "substantial resources" is the change. That's really all.

MR. FOX called for a vote. The MOTION CARRIED with 2 abstentions, Mrs. Raymond and Mrs. Summerville.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - John Schlechtweg, II

No report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE FLOOD ENCROACHMENT LINES ALONG MIANUS RIVER ROAD NORTH TO JUNE ROAD. Published.

MR. FOX said Mr. Loomis has left.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock - No Report.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE - Jeremiah Livingston - No Report.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Paul Esposito - No Report.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis - No Report.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE
RE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, ETC. - Michael P. Feighan

- (1) Report Requested.

MR. FEIGHAN said the Steering Committee has asked for an Interim Report. The Committee has been working closely with Corp. Counsel Sherman in its attempt to collect data concerning the operation of the Sewage Treatment Plant, at the same time being mindful of the 4 Million Dollar lawsuit.

SEWAGE TREATMENT SPECIAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FEIGHAN (continuing).....In an executive session of the committee, with Public Works Commissioner and Superintendent, Corporation Counsel, York Engineering, and special counsel hired by the City with the approval of this Board, we agreed that odor abatement, a working plant, and prosecution of litigation should have priority. Purposeful changes in operation were first to be approved by engineering counsel. We are now aware of plans for sludge haulaway, sludge-burning and sludge-drying in centrifuges. These have been far from total success and the committee will continue to monitor these activities, especially the drying and burning processes. It is incumbent upon this Board to keep this history in mind when further requests for appropriations come before us. We, as a committee, have been told by residents that the odors are "better than they were" but they are still there. They have just subsided in the cold weather. As it stands now, the warm weather will again bring sewage odors to the City intermittently to the degree that they were here last year. A major concern to the committee has been the inadequate staffing of the plant. We have been told that the Mayor has continually deleted the budget requests for salaries for several important and much-needed positions at the plant.

MR. FEIGHAN continued, saying he had recently been informed that under direction from the State Dept. of Environmental Protection, the Public Works Dept. had agreed to fill some operation positions by promotion, creating four labor positions. In addition, four positions in the Maintenance Section will be filled supposedly as early as this week. The Committee's next steps have been initiated already. We have received past years' budgets information from the Finance Commissioner to study financial aspects of the plant, and we are awaiting an engineering report due this month from York Engineering on the breakdown and replacement of the centrifuges and over-all operation of sludge-drying and burning, and the design review of the plant in general. Although the Committee is constantly assured by the Public Works Department, it seems that the problems are still bigger than the remedies, and the implementation of a successfully-working sewage treatment plant will not be for some time.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE
RE STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY - George Baxter

(1) Report Requested.

MR. BAXTER said the interim report is as follows: (1) the Committee has done all the investigating that it chooses to do, and has formed its opinion and conclusions. (2) a final report in draft form has been circulated to the members of the committee, and after I have a chance to talk with them to get their concurrence, we will issue the final report at the next meeting. (3) our expenses will probably be less than \$250.00 in total.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - None.

PETITIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESOctober 4, 1978 Regular MeetingMOVED, SECONDED, AND CARRIED.November 9, 1978 Special MeetingMOVED, SECONDED.

MR. MacINNIS said he wished to be recorded as present on Nov. 9, 1978.

MOTION to amend to reflect this. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. MAIHOCK would like to amend a word on Line 9 to read "Fiscal" -- gone through FISCAL, on page three. It says through Board of Finance.

MOTION to amend to reflect this. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF NOV. 9, 1978 AS AMENDED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

November 20, 1978 Adjourned Regular MeetingMOVED. SECONDED, AND CARRIED.

November 13, 1978 Regular Meeting and December 4, 1978 Regular Meeting not completed as yet.

RESOLUTIONS

MR. FOX said we have three resolutions, all of which were submitted in writing to the Steering Committee in proper fashion. It is not necessary, therefore, to read them now. We can go through and approve them one at a time.

- (1) RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING STATE REP. ERNEST ABATE ON BECOMING SPEAKER OF THE STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Submitted by Mr. Zelinski.

MR. FOX said this has been MOVED, SECONDED. He called for a vote, and the MOTION CARRIED with Mrs. Raymond ABSTAINING, and the rest Yes votes.

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING STAMFORD CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL'S FOOTBALL TEAM ON THEIR SUCCESS. Mrs. McInerney submitted.

MR. FOX said this has been MOVED, SECONDED. He called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED with Mrs. Raymond ABSTAINING, and the rest Yes votes.

- (3) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING CONSTANCE STEVENSON OF TOQUAM SCHOOL FOR BEING ELECTED "TEACHER PLUS" BY "INSTRUCTOR MAGAZINE", which is the equivalent of the country's Teacher-of-the-Month. Submitted by Mrs. Goldstein.

MR. FOX said this has been MOVED, SECONDED. He called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED with Mrs. Raymond ABSTAINING, and Mr. Baxter voting NO, and rest Yes votes.

RESOLUTIONS (continued)

MRS. SANTY said she guessed tonight was not her night. She proposed a resolution regarding Sgt. Joseph Pucci to Steering in the proper fashion but for some reason it was denied. Now, we send resolutions all over the world, to Russia, to every place. Now this man has served the City outstandingly. She spoke to the Chief and to Deputy Chief Considine about this and everyone involved. So on your desks tonight, Mrs. Santy asks the members to reconsider a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution. You all have it. She will just read the first sentence: "Whereas, Sgt. Pucci of the Stamford Police Department has received numerous commendations, citations, and awards...", and she would like it considered tonight. MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules. CARRIED.
20 Yes votes, 5 No votes, 9 Abstentions.

(4) RESOLUTION COMMENDING POLICE SGT. JOSEPH PUCCI.

MRS. SANTY MOVED for approval of this Resolution. SECONDED. CARRIED with 1 No vote (Mr. Morgan), and 1 Abstention (Mrs. Raymond), and the rest Yes.

MR. ZELINSKI said he had one final resolution which was included in every one's package tonight. He would be glad to read it in case some members did not have a chance to read their copy.

MR. BAXTER made a Point of Order, asking for a description of what the resolution is before a vote is taken to Suspend the Rules.

MR. ZELINSKI said it was concerning the West Side Fire House bidding procedures, and to support the Purchasing Aent in awarding the bid to Mr. Bonina so we don't have to send it out for re-bid and cost the City more money. He so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FOX called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules. LOST by a vote of 13 yes, 11 no, 10 abstentions.

MR. ZELINSKI said he thought the motion passed.

MR. FOX said two-thirds affirmative votes are needed to pass a Motion to Suspend the Rules.

MR. BLUM said he knows everyone is going out at this time, but he would like a Moment of Silence for the late T. Carter Dodd.

MRS. SANTY said he was an outstanding man in the community,

MR. FOX said at this point we do not have 21 people on the floor, and therefore without a quorum, he would declare the meeting ADJOURNED.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, upon Motion duly made and Seconded, the President declared the meeting ADJOURNED at 1:15 A.M.

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

HMM:MS

APPROVED:

Note: The above meeting was broadcast in its entirety by Radio WSTC and WYRS.

By: John Wayne Fox
John Wayne Fox, President
15th Board of Representatives