

MINUTES OF MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 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, August 6, 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 8:43 P.M. by the President, John Wayne Fox, after both parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: NONE

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

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 36 members present (Mrs. Parker came in at 9:00 P.M.) and 4 absent. The absent members were Representatives Charles Tiani, Burtis Plounders, John Boccuzzi and Diane Raymond.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PAGES: Kathleen Butler, Freshman, Stamford High School.  
Kathleen Fox, Daughter of President Wayne Fox.

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

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. ESPOSITO 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, July 23, 1979. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Wayne Fox at 8:10 P.M.

Thirteen members of Steering were present:

Present at Steering (13)

Wayne Fox, Chairman  
John J. Boccuzzi  
Handy Dixon  
Sandra Goldstein  
Michael Feighan  
John Zelinski  
David Blum

Alfred Perillo  
Lathon Wider  
Dominick Guglielmo  
Richard Ferrara  
Mildred Ritchie  
Marie Hawe

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)Absent from Steering (4):

Annie M. Summerville  
Donald Sherer  
George Hays  
Ralph Loomis

Others In Attendance:

Robert DeLuca	Connie Redford
Fiorenzo Corbo	2 Special Policemen
Lorraine Parker	2 Civilians
Judy Chasek	Media

(1) APPOINTMENTS:

Six of the prospective appointees were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. HELD IN COMMITTEE were: Robert Callahan for Board of Recreation; Margaret Peters for Patriotic and Special Events Committee, both to be considered the following month.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS:

The ten items previously approved by the Board of Finance were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three fiscal items which the Board of Finance approved the same night as Steering, July 23rd, before the Steering Committee met; these were \$926.00 for Zoning Board of Appeals; \$1,138,142.00 to fund Teamsters' Labor Contract; and \$16,700 for the Board of Education "PACE" Grant, making a total of 13 fiscal items.

(3) LEGISLATIVE MATTERS:

Nine items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA, seven of which appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The other two items were a resolution proposed by the Board of Finance by Joel Freedman regarding tax relief for the elderly; also tax abatement for the Stamford Art Assn. Ordered off the agenda and held was the proposed resolution by Mayor Clapes to urge the General Assembly to pass a bill providing tax relief measures which could be exercised by a municipality at its own option such as local sales tax, tax on gross wages, expansion of circuit-breaker tax relief, etc.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS:

Three of the items on the Tentative Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. One item was ordered Held in Committee, being the matter of nurses, provisional employment of Ms. Marie Gavula, from Mrs. Luther. Ordered off the agenda was a letter from the Personnel Commission dated 6/6/79 subject "Pay Disparity - Health Dept. Nurses" which requested thoughts of this Board on this subject.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:

All four items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

The one item was ordered Held in Committee, being Rep. Corbo's request to have Public Works proceed with study to correct existing erosion problems between Long Hill Drive and Clover Hill Drive. Re Seeley letter re drainage.

(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS:

Ordered Held in Committee was Rep. Ferrara's letter requesting ordinance to restore auxiliary police to active patrol with proper insurance, etc.  
Ordered removed from agenda was Rep. Ferrara's letter re police budgets, etc.

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS:

Ordered Held in Committee was Mr. Fodiman's complaint re Sterling Farms Golf Authority (7/10/79). The other two items appearing on the Tentative Agenda were ordered off the agenda, being Rep. Blum's inquiry into policy of hanging banners and urging additional facilities; and mailgram from Pop Warner Bantam Football League to use Cubeta Stadium.

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS:

Ordered off the agenda was Rep. Blum's request to look into Board of Education's feeder plan relating to Stamford High School (7/18/79).

(10) SEWER MATTERS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on Tentative Agenda. Ordered in committee for September consideration was Rep. Lathon Wider's request for a progress report on West Side and Culloden Road interceptors.

(11) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS:

One item was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Three were ordered Held in Committee, being (a) Mr. Conway's complaint re road salt polluting his well; (b) Rep. Corbo's request to have Resolution #1249 of 7/2/79 be made the subject of an ordinance re hydrological study of Rippowam River to Long Island Sound; and (c) Rep. DeLuca's 5/2/79 letter "Environmental Problems in Cold Spring Road-Rippowam River Area." Moved to the Public Works Committee was Mr. Seeley's letter re drainage and other problems.

(12) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS:

The one item was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA: proposed ordinance restricting parking of commercial vehicles in residential streets.

(13) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the request of Rep. Blum re translating proposed Charter changes into ballot questions.

(14) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS:

Ordered removed from the agenda were both items: (a) Rep. Blum's 7/18/79 proposal that all voting be done via machine so every member's vote is recorded; and (b) Rep. Corbo's 7/16/79 request to reconsider Bee-Line Automotive's appeal from Planning Board which this Board denied at June meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon MOTION, SECONDED and CARRIED, the Steering Committee ADJOURNED at 9:15 p.m.

HMM:MS

John Wayne Fox, Chairman  
Steering Committee

MR. FOX said that there being 36 members present, that is the number we will use to determine the votes necessary for a given item. In other words, two-thirds of thirty-six would be necessary to approve any emergency appropriations. We ran into some difficulty with that on one item last month and I would hope that does not happen again. If you are planning to leave the meeting for one reason or another, such as to, whatever it might be, if you would make myself or Mrs. Summerville aware of that. I don't mean if you plan to go out for coffee. I mean if you plan to leave to go home. We have pages this evening.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met August 2, 1979. Present were Reps. Handy Dixon, Audrey Maihock, Mildred Perillo, Everett Pollard, John Boccuzzi, Dominick Guglielmo, Robert DeLuca and Adelaide Schlechtweg. Also present for portions of the meeting were Reps. Annie Summerville, Mildred Ritchie and Fiorenzo Corbo.

WELFARE COMMISSION

Term Expires:

- (1) MR. JOEL LITAKER (R) NAME WITHDRAWN Dec. 1, 1981  
 365 Elm Street  
 (Held in Committee 7/2/79)

MR. DIXON : Mr. Litaker's name has been before this Board for quite some time, but he hasn't been able to attend any of our meetings for interview. I discussed this matter with the Mayor and the Mayor assured me that he had conferred with Mr. Litaker and he has WITHDRAWN Mr. Litaker's name from this appointment. May I add for the satisfaction of the Board Members, the reason being Mr. Litaker has taken a position out-of-town and it has been impossible for him to come to the Appointments Committee Meeting for his interview.

PLANNING BOARD

- (2) MR. PATRICK GRASSO (D) Re-appointment Dec. 1, 1983  
 Bend-of-River Lane

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

E. GAYNOR BRENNAN, SR. GOLF COMMISSION

- (3) MR. ANTHONY MAMMONE (D) APPROVED Dec. 1, 1983  
 44 Maple Avenue UNANIMOUSLY  
 (Replacing Stephen Carriero  
 whose term expired)

MR. DIXON: I MOVE for approval of Item #3. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

HEALTH COMMISSION

- (4) MS. STEFFIE BLOCK (D) Filling a vacancy Dec. 1, 1980  
 6 Cooper's Pond Rd. created by Charter  
 Revision

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.



APPOINTMENTS (continued)ZONING BOARD OF APPEALSTerm Expires:

- (5) MR. JOHN LEYDON (D)      Re-appointment      Dec. 1, 1983  
86 Michaels Road

MR. DIXON said Item #5 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

- (6) MR. HERBERT KOHN (D)      Re-appointment      Dec. 1, 1981  
6 Kenilworth Drive

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DIXON: Items #2,4,6 having received unanimous vote of approval of the Appointments Committee on the Consent Agenda, I would now MOVE for approval of this Board.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Fiscal Committee met on July 31, 1979. Present were Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Flounders, Mrs. Hawe, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Zelinski and Mrs. Goldstein. Non-committee members present were Mr. Hogan, Mrs. Summerville, Mr. Markiewicz, Mr. Perillo, Mrs. McInerney and Mr. Blum.

Mrs. Goldstein said on the agenda this evening is \$1,560,293 in additional appropriation requests. Of this amount, \$939,750 are grants or accruable to last Fiscal year and they will have no effect on the current mill rate. Only Items 7 and 8 for \$620,543 will come out of the tax dollars provided in the contingency funds.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal recommends that the following items are to go on the CONSENT AGENDA: Items #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13. In each case, where a secondary committee was involved, that committee concurred in putting the item on the Consent Agenda. Where there was no secondary committee report, the proper Motions were made to Suspend the Rules; they were Seconded, and Carried.

- (1) \$ 38,965.00 - YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU - PROJECT SUPPORT - Code 794.7551 -  
Additional Appropriation representing LEAA Grant (91% Federal and 9% Local) (\$35,422 + \$3,543.00) per Mayor's request 7/5/79. Board of Finance approved 7/12/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal voted 5 in favor of HOLDING this item, pending further information, with 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

FISCAL (continued)

- (8) \$1,138,142.00 - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS - TEAMSTERS' CONTRACTS- Additional Appropriation to fund Teamsters' Local #145 contracts retroactive to July 1, 1977, for teamsters employed by E. Gaynor Brennan Golf Course, Parks Department, and Traffic & Parking Department, per Mayor's request 6/8/79. Board of Finance approved 7/23/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. ZELINSKI said Personnel concurred.

MR. FOX called for a vote. The MOTION is CARRIED. 35 Yes; 1 No (Mrs. McInerney). (voice vote)

- (10) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FILING OF APPLICATION FOR AN EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (\$22,000.00) - A GRANT FROM STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE COUNCIL - to assist troubled employees and improve job performance, per Mayor's letter 7/18/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I am Chairman of the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Committee. Mr. Markiewicz and I attended the meeting of the Fiscal Committee. While discussing this item with Susan Brewster, I asked her if there was a possibility that other city agencies, such as Commission on Aging, CTE, Housing Authority, would they be able to participate in this program? Ms. Brewster said the way it was written she was not sure. I also asked her if she would find it objectionable if the Board were to offer a resolution which would cover other agencies? Her answer was no, and she would encourage it. Based on that I would like to have a Sense-of-the Board Resolution asking that other City Agencies be allowed to participate in this program.

MR. FOX: I would suggest that we vote on the main resolution. We have a requirement that any resolution that we vote on be in writing and be properly on file as part of the record of this Board. If you would want to put together something in writing, I think we will have the opportunity to deal with it before we adjourn this evening.

MR. BLUM: This is a nationwide program and I do hope that these troubled employees do not have the problems that other industries have in the sense that this city will treat those cases as a disease or a sickness rather than use employees as another means by which they can be fired.

MR. FOX: I believe we can proceed with the vote. The MOTION has been MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

FISCAL (continued)

- (11) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO FILE FOR \$585,940.00 PAYMENT-IN-LIEU OF TAXES FOR STATE-FINANCED MODERATE RENTAL HOUSING - a grant from State Commissioner of Housing, per Mayor's letter 7/19/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal voted 6-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. WIDER: Do I understand that the Mayor is filing a request for return of taxes on the property that the State has its moderate rent housing on? Is this authorizing the Mayor of Stamford to request a return on the real estate tax on the property that is occupied by the moderate income housing?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have abated the taxes for these units and this is money that the State gives us for that abatement.

MR. WIDER: Will this come back to the General Fund or will it go to the Housing Authority?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The General Fund.

MR. BLUM: This payment-in-lieu for services for moderate rental housing, am I to assume this is for services performed by the City of Stamford, we are getting payment-in-lieu of taxes?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We are receiving payment from the State for those taxes that we should be getting from the moderate rental income units. This money will go into the General Fund as income.

MR. BLUM: I really didn't get the answer as to the fact that we are, if the amount of money goes into the General Fund, we are supposed to be giving services to the moderate rental.

MR. FOX: We can now put this item to a vote. The MOTION has been MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. ( Mr. Blum and Ms. Summerville abstained) (voice vote)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before we vote on the Consent items, I would like to mention something to the Board. I would appreciate it if Mrs. Summerville will direct the Administrative Assistant to indicate that on Item #4, we are really taking two separate votes, since it was placed on Consent. One action is passing the resolution, which is approving the reports of the Commissioner of Finance and the second action is passing the appropriation and those two actions are separate and significant for the passage of this item.

MR. FOX said that would be noted for the record.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN MOVED for APPROVAL of the CONSENT AGENDA for Fiscal items #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12 and 13. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. McINERNEY: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I would like to thank everyone that supported Item #4. The people from Middle Ridge Rd. are here and they appreciate your support.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Michael P. Feighan

MR. FEIGHAN: The Legislative and Rules Committee met on July 26, 1979. Present were Reps. Feighan, Parker, Raymond, McInerney, Markiewicz and Darer.

- (1) REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY. Bd. of Finance approved 3/8/79. Held in Committee.

MR. FEIGHAN: It was the feeling of the Committee that since re-assessment is to begin shortly and will be completed in two years, the Committee recommends DENIAL of this request by a vote of none in favor, 6 opposed and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: The report of the Committee is to reject the item. I would suggest that as we have done in the past, we entertain a motion to approve the item, keeping in mind the report of the committee.

MR. FEIGHAN: I would make a motion in the positive that we recommend approval of this request.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask Mr. Feighan if we turned this down as the L&R Committee suggests, would that sort of knock out some of the projects that the city is now working with URC?

MR. FEIGHAN: No, it would not.

MR. FERRARA: I don't understand the logic that if we hold it in the hopes of re-valuation in two years, having the highest sales price, let me remind you that if we hold the property for two more years, there is no guarantee we can sell it for more money and we would be losing the taxes on this property for two years.

MR. FEIGHAN: It is a point well-taken. Believe me the committee took that up too. We ran it by the tax assessor's office as well. That is definitely a point. The Committee in their wisdom voted the other way.

MRS. PARKER: Perhaps I can further clarify something about this and that was the basis of these parcels, the assessments on them go back to the year 1971. For us to put this on the market so to speak with the base price as they are now would probably be more detrimental to the City than if we collected the taxes for the next two years on them before they are re-assessed.

MR. FOX: The report of the Committee is unanimous against that request. The motion has been proposed in a positive fashion. I would suggest that we vote by use of the machine. The MOTION IS LOST. 3 Yes; 33 No.



LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX EXEMPTION FROM CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE, EASTERN LATIN AMERICAN DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY AT 89 HENRY STREET, STAMFORD. Held in Committee 6/4, 7/2/79.

MR. FEIGHAN: Copy of a letter sent to the Board of Representatives on January 19, 1979 with the initial request for this tax abatement states that the time period within the request is for the full year of 1976 and for the second half of 1977. In that same letter it states that ever since 1976 the church started to request the tenants find other apartments. Some moved out, but some stayed right through the end of 1977. With that in mind, for the period that the abatement is being asked for, it was in fact rent-producing property, the Committee voted to DENY the tax abatement by a vote of none in favor and 6 opposed and I would so MOVE.

MR. FOX: As we did previously I would entertain a motion to treat the item in a positive fashion.

MR. FEIGHAN: I would MOVE to recommend publication.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. Keeping in mind the Committee is unanimous against this particular ordinance. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION IS LOST. 1 Yes; 33 No; 2 abstentions.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL PROVIDING PENSION BENEFITS FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS. Held 5/21/79 and 7/2/79.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #3 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING "THE DESIGNATION OF A RESIDENTIAL STREET AS A PLAY STREET" submitted by City Rep. Paul Esposito.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #4 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING CODE SECTION 18-6 CONCERNING "PLAYING BALL, THROWING STONES, ETC., UPON CITY STREETS, submitted by City Rep. Paul Esposito.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #5 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDING CODE SECTION 15-1 BY DELETING: "and a copy of the same is posted in a conspicuous place at such premises" - submitted by City Rep. Audrey Maihock.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #6 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

- (7) PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDING CODE SECTION 15-2 BY DELETING:  
"and a copy of the same is posted in a conspicuous place at such premises" - submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #7 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL PROVIDING TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY UNDER CERTAIN STATE STATUTES - per last draft from Deputy Corp. Counsel Barry Boodman 2/23/79 with assistance of Finance Board member Joel Freedman and Deputy Tax Assessor Edward Faski.

MR. FEIGHAN: This has been published and is in fact for Final Adoption. The Legislative and Rules Committee held a Public Hearing on this Thursday, July 26, 1979, and having discussed it in public and in committee the Legislative and Rules Committee has recommended approval by a vote of 4 in favor and 0 opposed with 2 abstentions and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY: I MOVE to amend this Ordinance presented by the Legislative and Rules Committee to delete, you all have it in front of you; I don't think it is necessary for me to read it, but lines 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18. Also lines 57, 58, 59, and 60. The first paragraph is a WHEREAS dealing with the interest-free loan and the second one which is more important actually is file a lien. I MOVE to amend this Ordinance to delete from the Ordinance these two sections and then I'll speak on it if I have a second.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY: The four chapters of the American Association of Retired Persons are opposed to this Ordinance as presented with a lien against their property. They are not asking for a temporary loan of \$150 to \$300 per year, that is available at banks, finance companies, their children, their neighbors, but elderly tax relief as every other town has. They appeared at our open hearing and they spoke. They asked for tax relief only to raise the cut off state mandated income from \$6,000 to \$8,000 or \$10,000. not including social security. This they wanted as a tax freeze. I wish that all of you here could have been here this evening and saw these people and listened to what they had to say. Other municipalities have recognized the plight of our senior citizen caught in the trap of retirement-fixed income and rising inflation. I can just cite a few here. Darien has a cut-off point of \$8,500 without social security. New Canaan has \$15,000 with social security. Greenwich is in the process of revising their statutory level.

We recognize the need for elderly housing by granting a tax abatement to the Shippan Avenue Housing. Why can't we help the elderly homeowners in this town keep their homes, then maybe we wouldn't have to worry about all these abatements. If they are forced to sell their homes, then we are going to have to have more housing for them.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MRS. SANTY (continuing)....Why are they opposed to a lien? Well, in the last two weeks I received numerous phone calls. Legal problems they cited when selling their homes. Problems because many of them still have a mortgage on their homes. Embarrassment I found that to be quite something very important to them. One widow told me a lien would worry and embarrass her. She would rather cut down her grocery bill than borrow \$200. a year from the City. They didn't want to think about the burden they would place upon their family, their children. The Elderly groups are not pressure groups, they are not lobbying groups. Maybe that is why tonight we are imposing something on them they don't want. They are people who came to us for help, but they have enough dignity, which we have been slowly taking away from them to say we want nothing if it has to be this.

I ask each of you to vote in favor of my amendment for the elderly represented in your districts, because Stamford should recognize its social responsibility to these persons and grant financial help to an extent which is also fair to other tax-payers in the city. The Stamford Tax-Payers Assoc. which is certainly the "watch dog" of all taxpayers came out opposed to a lien. Now certainly if they do this, worrying about all the taxpayers, I don't see why we can't understand and help our elderly.

MR. BLUM: I wish to come out in support of this deletion of the lien and the loan. This City as well as our State and our nation have subsidized industry, have subsidized buildings of the down-town Urban Renewal, have subsidized commuters, but we are not there event to subsidize those senior citizens who worked their entire life in this City or a great portion of this City to build this City. I think they are entitled to subsidies without owing this tax. I don't want to be an Indian Giver to a senior citizen and I will vote in favor of this amendment.

MR. ZELINSKI: I wanted to say similar comments what Mrs. Santy and Mr. Blum have said. I think that the changes proposed by Mrs. Santy are good and I think certainly well-deserved by the senior citizens of our community who have given so much to make Stamford a better place to live.

MRS. PARKER: As part of L&R I was in favor of the proposed Ordinance as it stands. I think we have to look very carefully into what we are doing here. The tax relief as it stands now is for the elderly. It is not for the children who are the heirs of the elderly. We do not want to put any undue pressure on the senior citizens. We want to give them tax relief. If my guesstimate is right, and I've used some numbers, if we give them the top figure of \$300. a year, based on the national figures of '70 and '72 and I'm going a little high, by saying that each one of these persons will use this tax relief for a ten-year period and I would say that is high. We are talking about a \$3,000. bill for tax relief which would then be a lien against, and in ten years I would say there will not be a house in Stamford that was not worth less than \$100,000. So the heirs in selling would get only \$97,000. rather than the \$100,000. because over the last ten years their parents have had less of a burden of taxes. As I said before, this is tax relief for the elderly, it is not tax relief for the inheritor.



LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. FEIGHAN: I can't really discuss the feeling of the L&R Committee in terms of this amendment because we just received it tonight, although I was able to mention it to a few committee members and we seem fairly split on it. I personally am not opposed to the amendment; I would possibly like another chance to review the Ordinance, but I think as Chairman of L&R I can try to capsulize the feelings of the members of the committee.

First of all we are talking about the Ordinance as it stands. It does not stand with any reference of tax abatement. I think L&R in almost two years has used tax abatement, it is probably the touchiest subject the committee has reviewed. I think the full Board is aware of that. I think we are talking in terms of as the State Statutes dictate to us and that is the Ordinance as it stands.

It's a mentality on the part of the committee and on the part of the Board in fact to give tax relief to the elderly, to initiate something. Along these lines, the Ordinance stipulates that this tax relief would be reviewed after one year. What we are trying to do is to continue that mentality today, tomorrow and a year from now. I sort of feel that if in fact this were to be defeated now, it would be a long time before anybody would take up another item of tax relief in any particular form. That's just a personal opinion. The Committee has a mentality they would like to give tax relief to the elderly. This is one way of going about it and it would be reviewed in a year.

MR. LOOMIS: Essentially what you have adopted, is it not what the Board of Finance, its task force had worked on for sometime in presenting its recommendations to your committee? Is that correct?

MR. FEIGHAN: This is it exactly, yes.

MR. LOOMIS: Their recommendations did not include this amendment that is presently before us. I just had a question for Mrs. Santy. In your presentation you indicated that every single community is doing what you are suggesting we do with this amendment. There are 169 communities. Of those 169 how many have adopted this?

MRS. SANTY: There is not one in Connecticut now with a lien. There is not one that offers tax relief to the elderly that has stipulated a lien against the property. Westport tried the lien for a year and it did not work out. We are the only municipality putting a lien.

MR. LOOMIS: All I would like to say is that I'm uncomfortable with the adopting language like this that is presented to us a few hours before a meeting.

MRS. SANTY: I came to the meeting and there were only three Representatives here. I've spoken to Mr. Feighan and I've gotten other opinions. What I was going to suggest that this amendment if approved tonight, that it go back into committee for publication and then to work out the details further.



LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (continued)

MR. DARER: The Committee sat with many people at the public hearing. One of the things that I think we've all been inculcated with during the sitting of this Board is Fiscal responsibility and at the same time compassion toward our constituents and toward the people of the City of Stamford. I do feel that Fiscal responsibility calls for us to support the Ordinance as put forth by the L&R Committee. The reason being Mr. President, we have someone tonight from the Board of Finance in our caucus who gave us some numbers of the essential cost of this Ordinance. Those figures I won't mention tonight because I have no way of verifying them, but they were quite high. We talked to Mr. Faski about this to gauge exactly what this cost would be.

We don't want to accuse anybody of doing anything, but many of us in our business experience have seen where parents have turned over certain assets to children to bring down their estates. We don't want the City of Stamford to be a party or be involved in things of this kind. We would like it to be run on a what we think is an equitable basis for one year to see what happens to get a gauge, get a feeling of the pulse of the way this operates. We feel that the inflationary value of the money that the City of Stamford might receive ten years out or the discounted cash flow of that money is really very small. The point is it is a principle. It's a principle that the L&R Committee discussed and felt that the City of Stamford was making a gesture towards the elderly. There are many programs for the elderly in the City of Stamford that are paid for by the taxpayers, it is not a one-way street, we want to do something for the elderly; we want to start it in a way that we can monitor it and then maybe add on to it a year from now after we have seen the way it operates. I really think we should pass this without the amendment.

MR. WIDER: I have viewed the Board's Ordinance and the amendment and I have also viewed hundreds of senior citizens in their plight and I sympathize with them, but I think we can't completely change what is before us; the Ordinance we have for tax abatement for senior citizens. I think we should try this Ordinance first and see how it works out for a year, then after that I would be one of the first people to work to see if we couldn't approve it. I certainly would approve the Ordinance as it is.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I feel that the Committee labored with this particular Ordinance for quite a time; we did what we felt in our minds and in our hearts was better for the total community. We cannot truly, and we've done it in the past, so I cannot say it has not been done, pass legislation for special interest groups, regardless of the interest. The senior citizens in this community are a viable asset to Stamford. I think if we pass this we should be cognizant of the total cost factor involved. We cannot afford to dilute our community by making it more difficult for the average person to live here. There is no doubt in my mind that the demands for services, along with the budget growth will not diminish next year. Someone must pay for the services and the budget. Who is going to do it? We worked with this Ordinance, we think it is reasonable; after one year we will be willing to make amendments and I cannot support the amendment that came before us earlier this evening.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES(continued)

MR. VENTURA MOVED THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX: I think we can put the motion which is on the floor to a vote. The motion is the proposal made by Mrs. Santy and is her motion to amend the Ordinance which we have for final adoption. Mrs. Santy's proposed amendment is submitted to us in writing and outlines the particular lines of the Ordinance that she would like to have deleted. As I indicated before, if in fact this amendment is approved, it is my opinion that we will then be entitled to publish it, but I don't think it would be proper for us to go then to final adoption this evening in light of the fact that there are substantial changes. Also in light of the fact that I feel that if this amendment is approved that the committee would wish to review those changes and see how they relate to the remaining portion of the Ordinance. The MOTION had been MOVED. SECONDED. I would suggest that we vote by use of the machine. The MOTION IS CARRIED. 22 Yes; 13 No; 1 abstention.

MR. FEIGHAN: Now that the amendment is passed, I would like to make a MOTION as Chairman of the Legislative and Rules Committee, as we discussed due to the fact that this would change the Ordinance substantially, I would like to MOVE for publication of this item.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote) We will now publish the Ordinance as amended.

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR STAMFORD ART ASSN., their letter 4/2/79; property at 39 Franklin Ave., Stamford, purchased from St. Andrew's Parish.

MR. FEIGHAN said Item #9 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - John J. Zelinski, Jr.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Personnel Committee met on July 30, 1979. Present were Reps. DeLuca, Blum, and Zelinski, along with Ron Parente from the Administrators' Unit and Mrs. Sally Silveira from the Board of Education.

- (1) THE MATTER OF HIRING/PLACEMENT OF PROVISIONAL EMPLOYEES per 3/30/79 letter of City Rep. DeLuca. Report made by Chairman Zelinski at 6/4/79 Board meeting, with further study to be made.

MR. ZELINSKI said Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) RE-SUBMISSION OF LABOR CONTRACT - FOR APPROVAL - BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION AND STAMFORD ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT for period 1979/1980 and 1980/1981. Per State Statutes 10-153d. Letter 7/16/79 from Allen Grafton, Asst. to Supt. Peebles, submitting contract again, advising no changes made.

MR. FOX: Let me clarify one point with respect to item #2 before we have the

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: (continuing)...report of the committee on that. The members of the Board will recall that at our July meeting we had submitted to us the labor contract for approval between the Board of Education and the Stamford Administrative Unit. At that time, this body rejected that proposed contract. That proposed contract in total without any changes was re-submitted to this Board. As you know, there is a 30-day time period. With that proposal now before us and the 30-day time frame running, if we do nothing, then that contract is by Law approved.

There has been a letter submitted to us and some discussion by the Personnel Committee regarding certain changes which have been approved by the two negotiating teams involved, which have been submitted to the Union and to the Board of Education. We have a copy of that proposed change, but that proposed change has not been approved by the respective bodies, the Union and the Board of Education. There was some discussion that we might consider that and approve the contract contingent upon that approval by those bodies at a later time, without passing judgement in any way on the merits or lack thereof of the contract, let me say that it is my opinion and I would rule against following that second approach. I do not feel that acting as a legislative body of this city we can approve a contract contingent upon some future possibility. Consequently what we have before us this evening and what we will vote on is the proposal as originally submitted without any changes. The same proposal that was before us during our July meeting. If in fact the two bodies involved approve the proposed change, it can, and if we don't approve the contract that is before us, then the contract as changed can be submitted again, we can then vote on it when submitted. We can either vote on it at our September meeting or if in fact the 30 days would run prior to our September meeting, then it would be my intention to call a Special Meeting to give this Board the opportunity to vote on that contract. But what we have before us this evening is the contract as originally proposed without any changes.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Personnel Committee met this evening at 7:30 to take a formal vote on the contract. Present were Reps. Santy, DeLuca, Ventura, Zelinski. The Committee voted 2 in favor and 2 against. Let me say that I concur with your ruling on this as far as we are voting tonight on the old contract and not on the change which deals with Article 8, in the Administrators' Contract and I would MOVE because of that, the contract be DENIED tonight.

MR. FOX: The report of the Committee is to reject the contract. As we have done with L&R, I would ask that you propose the motion in a positive fashion and we can vote on the motion, keeping in mind your report.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, then I make a motion in the positive vein.

MR. SHERER MOVED THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX called for a vote by use of the machine on Item #2, keeping in mind the report of the committee and the recommendation of the committee is to reject it. The MOTION IS LOST. 33 no; 3 abstentions. THE CONTRACT is REJECTED.

- (3) RESOLUTION REQUESTED BY BOARD OF FINANCE TO PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR THEIR PERMANENT PART-TIME CLERK (employed since 1954) WITH SAME BENEFITS AS MEA PERSONNEL, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1979, per Charter Section 654. Held in Committee 7/2/79.

MR. ZELINSKI said Item #3 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Dominick Guglielmo

MR. GUGLIELMO: Planning and Zoning met on Monday, July 30, 1979.

- (1) REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE OF WINDEMERE LANE (400 ft.) AS A CITY STREET from John Porcelli. Held 6/4 and 6/18/79. City Engineer Wm. Sabia's certification dated 7/23/79.

MR. GUGLIELMO: Planning and Zoning voted 3-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

- (2) MATTER OF WORDING OF ABANDONMENT OF GARFIELD AVENUE - letter 7/13/79 from Nancy Mitchell, Comm. Dev. Dir., relating to development of Housing Authority's Lawn Avenue Recreation Area.

MR. GUGLIELMO: Planning and Zoning voted 3-0 in favor to correct the wording of the Minutes of January 8, 1979. In talking to Christine Evans, Project Co-ordinator of the Stamford Community Development Program, the Housing Authority has conducted a title search on Garfield Ave. and has the certificate of Title. As a public record I would like to correct the Minutes of January 8th, I don't believe we need to take a vote on this matter, to read:

"The Housing Authority would like to request the abandonment of Garfield Avenue from the southern property line of Parcel A as shown on Map #7158, north to the property line of Parcel A."

MR. FOX: That is the extent of it.

MR. GUGLIELMO: That is the extent of the correction.

MR. FOX: In the letter of July 13, 1979 from Nancy Mitchell, she indicates that Corporation Counsel's office felt that a correction could be read into the next minutes which you have done and a resolution passed approving that correction. I would suggest we do that for the record.



PLANNING AND ZONING (continued)

MR. GUGLIELMO: It is my understanding that the Corporation Counsel at that time was not, at the time of that letter, was not aware a title search had been conducted and in making that determination he said that it was not necessary to pass the resolution.

MR. FOX: All right, if you are satisfied we don't need that.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL RE ABANDONMENT OF YORFINO LANE AS A CITY STREET AND GIVING IT STATUS AS PRIVATE ROAD. Published

MR. GUGLIELMO: The Committee voted 3-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

- (4) PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO CHANGE WALNUT STREET TO NEW NAME: WALTER WHEELER DRIVE. FOR PUBLICATION.

MR. GUGLIELMO: This is for publication, and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Mr. Livingston not participating in vote) (Mrs. Maihock voted no) (voice vote)

MRS. MAIHOCK: I just wanted to say that the reason I'm voting no is that I am not against Mr. Wheeler's memory, but I am against changing streets to persons' names. I think that they should remain as they are.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Alfred C. Perillo NO REPORT

HEALTH AND PROTECITON COMMITTEE - David I. Blum NO REPORT

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - George V. Hays NO REPORT

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Marie J. Hawe NO REPORT

SEWER COMMITTEE - John J. Boccuzzi NO REPORT

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Lathon Wider, Sr. NO REPORT

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Ralph C. Loomis      NO REPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Mildred S. Ritchie

MRS. RITCHIE: Environmental Protection Committee met on July 26, 1979. Present were Dom Guglielmo, Lorraine Parker and myself.

- (1) Letter 6/1/79 FROM ATTY. FRANK D'ANDREA, JR. OF D'ANDREA & SELSBERG asking for this Board's approval for a technical encroachment regarding Tishman Stamford Associates' development of Long Ridge Office Park and their west parking structure.

MRS. RITCHIE: We voted for approval and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. This is not in a form of an Ordinance as I recall. We don't need to publish this?

MRS. RITCHIE: No, it's a waiver of a technicality, waiver of the encroachment line, building on the encroachment line.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I have recently been at some EPB hearings and it is a very traumatic experience to hear homeowners' reports of what can happen when flooding occurs on their properties. I was therefore very concerned about this and I did investigate and I did find out that the Turn-of-River Fire Department had no objection to this and that also certain measures would be taken according to the EPB to provide degreasers and things of that nature to prevent any contamination of the water and that the capacity of a 25-year storm has been anticipated for this. So I am voting for it, but as I say I realize that some people who live in the area may have fears about it yet.

MR. FOX called for a vote. The MOTION is CARRIED. (Mrs. McInerney voted No). (voice vote)

MRS. RITCHIE: I would like to say that the members of the Environmental Protection Committee of the Board of Representatives would like to put the Developers and Contractors in Stamford on notice not to plan buildings over the encroachment line. We the Committee realize that each piece of property is different from one another and we do not want you to misunderstand that the waiver of this application will set precedents for the future.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock      NO REPORT

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE - Jeremiah Livingston

MR. LIVINGSTON: I am hoping that this whole Board understands the intent of my resolution and it is very basic and that is to extend this service to Governmental employees. (Mr. Livingston read the Resolution)

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. SHERER: I agree in principle with Mr. Livingston's resolution that an expansion of this program would be greatly appreciated and beneficial to the efficiency of our Government; however, I think that we have to be a little more reflective on the impact of this resolution, because what we are doing is we are opening up a small target group, we are opening up the parameters to include basically every city employee.

After the Grants office completed their analysis and investigation, they determine that they could best service a target group for \$22,000. I think now if we resolve and of course we would have a serious effect on the operation. If we resolve to expand that to include the entire, all the employees in the City, I think we probably would be doing a dis-service to the program. I think perhaps we can have a Sense-of-the Board Resolution that the Grants Office ought to request more money or put in for a new grant, but I don't think we should be directing the Mayor to issue an executive order to let everyone come in and utilize this grant which has been well thought out. I request all of you to think seriously about approving the Resolution tonight.

MR. MacINNIS: What employees are excluded?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Employees from the Commission on Aging, Housing Authority.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I appreciate what Mr. Livingston is trying to accomplish with this resolution and it is with great reluctance that I have to say that I disagree with him. This \$22,000. grant is not an enormous grant. The numbers of this cooperative program will encompass many, many employees. I mean these are enormous numbers of people for one occupational consultant to deal with in one year. Now, if we ultimately get this grant, then we will have another program year to apply for another grant of the same order and then perhaps based on experience we can expand the program.

MR. FOX: Motion has been made to MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED. CARRIED. I would suggest that we vote by use of the machine. The MOTION is LOST.  
11 Yes; 22 No; 2 abstentions.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Paul A. Esposito

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL RESTRICTING PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES IN RESIDENTIAL STREETS.

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

CHARTER REVISION - Ralph C. Loomis      NO REPORT

- (1) LETTER 7/9/79 FROM CITY REP. BLUM RE TRANSLATING CHARTER AMENDMENTS INTO BALLOT QUESTIONS.

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

MR. FEIGHAN: I, at last month's meeting of the Committee asked the Committee for their initial comments in writing to me and I am awaiting those memorandums.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask a question of Mr. Loomis as to what he's doing about my letter. RE CHARTER REVISION.

MR. FOX: I'm quite certain that as we get closer to that November election and we have to narrow down just how those proposals will read. Mr. Loomis will have that for us in plenty of time.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE

PETITIONS - NONE

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

April 18, 1979 - Special Charter Revision Meeting

Mr. Esposito MOVE for acceptance of the April 18, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Corbo Abstained)

April 2, 1979 - Regular Board Meeting

Mr. Esposito MOVED to accept April 2, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

May 7, 1979 - Regular Board Meeting

Mr. Esposito MOVE to accept Minutes of May 7, 1979.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like a correction please under Transportation Committee, Line 5 on page 26, I would like the word "Committee" changed to "Commuters".

MR. FOX: You are moving to amend the Minutes. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like the Minutes amended on page 20, Personnel Committee item, Labor Contract between the City and the Teamsters Local. I made a motion to reject all those in total and unfortunately the rest of my reasons for rejection were not included in the Minutes, and I think it is important that I be quoted properly as to the reasons why I was hopefully planning to have those rejected, so I would like the minutes to reflect my reasons.

MR. FOX: I would suggest it may be best to HOLD these until we know precisely what you are referring to.



ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY: Mrs. McEvoy and I can get together on it.

MR. FOX: Mr. Esposito if you would withdraw your motion.

MR. ESPOSITO: I withdraw it.

May 9, 1979 Special Budget Meeting

Mr. Esposito MOVE to accept May 9, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

May 10, 1979 - Special Adjourned Budget Meeting

Mr. Esposito MOVE to accept the May 10, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS - NONECOMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - NONEMOMENTS OF SILENCE - NONEOLD BUSINESS:

MR. FOX: Keeping in mind that with respect to these I have indicated at our last meeting we would deal with them as any other Committee matter and that we should have an item on the Agenda if we wish to deal with it.

MR. DeLUCA: This is an item that we have been bringing up for the last 3 or 4 months. Mr. President, for the fourth time Representative Perillo and I are requesting an opinion from the Corporation Counsel on the following question: Is it legal to have funds which are appropriated for a City operating department account withdrawn from the city account and issued to a city employee to establish a private checking account without accountability to the city? Our interpretation of the City charter, specifically Section 618 Control of Operations, states that this cannot be done. The Corporation Counsel refuses to give an answer to our request to a hypothetical case, such as can the Law Department set up a private checking account as noted in our question. He, the Corporation Counsel, continues to ask for details. In recent weeks the local news media has mentioned and publicized a case similar to the question we are asking. We, as the Legislative Body of the City have a right to receive an opinion on the question as stated.

OLD BUSINESS (continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing)...Continued refusal on the Corporation Counsel's part to render an opinion leaves the Board of Representatives with only one alternative. You, as our President should immediately prepare the necessary paperwork to obtain the services of an outside unbiased attorney as a means of getting an opinion to our question. Also, if need be, we should have a permanent attorney employed by the Board of Representative. We vote on and investigate issues which are important to the City without the assistance of an attorney. Let us not forget the fact that the Corporation Counsel has failed to cooperate with our Sewer and Investigating Chairman, Representative Michael Feighan. It is time we obtained our own attorney. If not for this Board, at least for future Boards. We are asking you to use the powers bestowed on you by the City Charter to obtain an opinion to our question as presented without further delay. On the grounds of being redundant, this is our fourth request.

MR. FOX: Mr. DeLuca I probably let you go further than I should have, you had the group mesmerized, so I didn't want to interfere with that. That's a rare occasion.

MR. FEIGHAN: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE PLEASE. I was not consulted and I would like to have my name stricken from what was just mentioned.

MR. FOX: That will be noted, Mr. Feighan. Let me say, Mr. DeLuca, I do not believe that is a matter which should be taken under Old Business. If you have a specific request that you wish to make which you want this body consider, then I will ask that you submit that to the Steering Committee in the normal course of events. That's the only comment I would have on that.

NEW BUSINESS

MR. ZELINSKI: In as much as the next Board Meeting is scheduled for September 3, which is Labor Day, I would like to MOVE that our next Board Meeting be held on Monday, September 10th.

MR. FOX: I believe we have difficulty with the September and the October meeting. Let's deal first with the September meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I believe that September 10th would be the day before a possible primary.

MR. FOX: Let me ask you this, if we were to put it over until September 17th, are we beginning to get into the religious holidays?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Well, yes indeed we are. However, we don't have to have it on a Monday.

MR. FOX: The 3rd is Labor Day, how about Wednesday, September 5th. Do I have a general consensus on that? Then I would entertain a Resolution that the September Meeting of the Board of Representatives will be held on Wednesday, September 5th. SECONDED. CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board of Representatives, upon MOTION duly MOVED, SECONDED, AND CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

jb:cmt

By:

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

APPROVED:

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

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

### Changes in Seating

0 = Absent.  
A = Abstaining.  
Y = YES vote.  
N = NO vote.

**VOTING SUBJECT; MOTIONS; ETC.**

①

Re sale of City-owned parcels; (#1)  
L&R #1 Motion to Approve but Committee rec-  
ommended rejection; DENIED 3 Yes; 33 NO.

L&R #2 tax exemptn Nazarene Church-motion to approve; L&R Comm. recommended denial. DENIED: 1 Yes; 33 NO; 2 abstentions. (#2)

LER #8 Santy's amendment to Elderly Tax Assistance; APPROVED 22 Yes; 13 NO; 1 Abstention. (#3)

#2 Personnel re Bd. of Ed. Administrators (44)  
Labor Contract (re-submission w/no change)  
DENIED 33 NO - 3 abstention; Zero Yes votes.

Drug & Alcohol Abuse Comm. re Livingston's proposed sense-of-board resolution re extending program to other agencies; DENIED: 11 Yes; 22 No, 2 abstentions. (#5)

HMM:MS

24.	5	4	3	2	1	Seat No.	Members	Dist./ Party
	N	N	N	N	N	1	DARER, Stanley P.	R - 13
	N	N	N	N	N	2	MAIHOCK, Audrey	R - 19
	N	N	N	N	N	3	BERNIER, Raymond	R - 8
	N	N	N	N	N	4	DIXON, Handy	D - 2
	N	N	N	N	N	5	CORBO, Fiorenzo	R - 8
	N	N	N	N	N	6	HAWE, Marie J.	R - 1
	N	N	N	N	N	7	TIANI, Charles J.	R - 15
	N	N	N	N	N	8	PERILLO, Alfred J.	D - 9
	N	N	N	N	N	9	GOLDSTEIN, Sandra L.	D - 16
	N	N	N	N	N	10	DeLUCA, Robert C.	R - 14
	N	N	N	N	N	11	FERRARA, Richard	R - 10
	N	N	N	N	N	12	FLOUNDERS, Burtis	R - 14
	N	N	N	N	N	13	POLLARD, Everett K.	R - 17
	N	N	N	N	N	14	LOOMIS, Ralph	R - 19
	N	N	N	N	N	15	SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	R - 18
	N	N	N	N	N	16	PARKER, Lorraine	D - 16
	N	N	N	N	N	17	RITCHIE, Mildred S.	R - 10
	N	N	N	N	N	18	HAYS, George	R - 20
	N	N	N	N	N	19	FEIGHAN, Michael P.	D - 1
	N	N	N	N	N	20	SUMMERVILLE, Annie (Clerk)	D - 6
	N	N	N	N	N	21	MARKIEWICZ, Henry R.	D - 3
	N	N	N	N	N	22	ESPOSITO, Paul A.	D - 6
	N	N	N	N	N	23	WIDER, Lathon	D - 3
	N	N	N	N	N	24	RYBNICK, Gerald J.	D - 4
	N	N	N	N	N	25	VENTURA, Joseph F.	R - 17
	N	N	N	N	N	26	McINERNEY, Barbara A.	R - 20
	N	N	N	N	N	27	BOCCUZZI, John J.	D - 12
	N	N	N	N	N	28	LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	D - 5
	N	N	N	N	N	29	BAXTER, Mary Pat.	D - 7
	N	N	N	N	N	30	BLUM, David I.	D - 12
	N	N	N	N	N	31	ZELINSKI, John R., Jr.	D - 11
	N	N	N	N	N	32	FIORDELISI, Salvatore	R - 18
	N	N	N	N	N	33	HOGAN, JR., John J.	D - 12
	N	N	N	N	N	34	GUGLIELMO, Dominick	D - 5
	N	N	N	N	N	35	RAYMOND, Diane	D - 11
	N	N	N	N	N	36	SCHLECHTWEG, Adelaide	D - 4
	N	N	N	N	N	37	PERILLO, Mildred J.	D - 9
	N	N	N	N	N	38	MacINNIS, William	D - 7
	N	N	N	N	N	39	HERER, Donald B.	R - 13
	N	N	N	N	N	40	FOX, John Wayne (President)	D - 15

24.