

MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 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 Wednesday, October 3, 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 9:35 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: The Roll was called by CLERK ANNIE SUMMERVILLE. There were 37 present and 3 absent. The absent members were Reps. Dixon, Hayes, and Hawe (excused-ill),

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

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

PAGES: Miss Jane Baxter, 42 Field, Stamford, Conn.
Miss Carolyn Hogan, 59 Tremont Ave., Stamford, Conn.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY

MR. MacINNIS: I Move for SUSPENSION OF RULES to take up an item that is not on the agenda, that being the Ordinance pertaining to tax relief for the elderly.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 30 yes; 6 no; 1 abstention.

MR. MacINNIS made a MOTION to take the item out of committee.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DARER: Unless I'm out of order, I believe that Steering voted to take this matter and return it to the Board of Finance for clarification after the Board and the Legislative and Rules Committee decided that in the format that it was put in, that it needed some revision and re-study and re-clarification as to specific matters regarding cost factors and other clarifications so that we could pass this resolution. I think all of us are in favor for some relief for the elderly, but we at the time when it

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY (continued)

MR. DARER: (continuing)...was sent by Steering back to the Board of Finance, agreed, or at least I thought that we had agreed that it does require a re-study and re-clarification of the format of the resolution, whether it should be an increase from \$6,000. to \$8,000., whether we should go with the amount we had with or without a lien. There was a question as to the fiscal ramifications of it and also the inequities as to the amount involved in the resolution as it was put forth to this Board and many of the senior citizens requested this be increased to \$8,000, and go back to the original recommendation of the Mayor's Committee. I don't know exactly what we're voting on tonight and whether this is proper to do so.

MR. FOX: I think that's a valid question. The question has been posed to me earlier. As you might recall at our last meeting, we reviewed the question in general and a determination at that point in terms of the status of that item, that Ordinance as amended at our previous meeting would be published. It had been published in-correctly, it would then be published properly. I do feel that the Motion to take it out would be a proper one at this time. The reason that I say that is that given the fact that a given committee referred an item to another agency, to another board, to another department head, whether it be the Law Department, Public Works, Board of Finance, or the Commission of Finance or whatever does not take it away entirely from the Board; it does not negate the fact that that item is still in committee and still before this body. It has never been denied or voted out or disposed of by this body and would not take it away from action by this body in my opinion. It still would require a vote by this body and it would be this body's right to make that decision. It would still require a vote to take the item out of committee; that motion has now been made; whether this body will pass it or not, it seems to me to be a proper motion to make.

MRS. RITCHIE: What happened to our vote in Steering where we said that it would be sent back to the Board of Finance with figures coming down as to the cost. Does not that committee's feelings or vote stand for anything?

MR. FOX: I think it would stand for something but it wouldn't negate the opportunity and the privilege of this body of considering it and voting on it if it so desired and if that is what this body felt it wished to do.

MR. BERNIER: I would just like to add as a form of comment in consideration for this Board to take the matter out of the committee of which it is in and also to preclude the following through with the action that the Steering Committee previously took, which was to refer this back to the Board of Finance. I think it behooves the Board to consider that previous action at two different meetings of this Board, find the majority of the members in sympathy with the idea of having tax relief however they felt and we all felt that we needed to have more cost impact information. I think it would be a serious mistake now, although the motion may be in order to be stamped for one reason or another. The majority of the members of the Board of Finance feel that they have not had an opportunity to look at this in total,

TAX RELIEF (cont.)

MR. BERNIER: (continuing)...to give this Board the financial and statistical data it needs to make an intelligent decision. Now these members, some of them have passed this information on to the members of this Board this evening and I think it would be a mistake, although we have a right to take it out of committee and to vote on it, to be stampeded into action for any purpose.

MR. BLUM: At the last meeting we voted to have this Ordinance published. It was published with the two deletions. I feel now that we have that right to vote even though we're asking to take it out of committee and there are many times we have asked over a committee head to have a subject brought on the floor. It is the right of the body to vote if they have the majority on the particular Ordinance and the Ordinance has been printed and published and we now feel we are ready to vote for it.

MR. SHERER: I, too, believe in the tax relief for the elderly however, I have been consistent in my voting concerning this issue of the Ordinance as it has been proposed and presently exists before us. This evening I'm not changing my position. About a year and a half ago Mayor Clapes authorized the establishment of an Elderly Tax Relief Advisory Committee. They came in with a full report to the Mayor and as a result, a request was sent to the Board of Finance to come with a policy of tax relief. The Board of Finance in their wisdom saw fit to change what was sent to them and came down with pretty much what we had before us with the inclusion of the lien matter. Last month our Board voted to send the item back to committee and our Steering Committee which is comprised of 19 of the leaders of this Board, a majority of whom are members of the Democratic Party, voted that it be in committee and further voted in Steering that it be sent back to the Board of Finance so that we would have the input that we have not had as to its cost and other important economic issues. As of this day we have not received any of the information. To my knowledge the Board of Finance has not re-addressed itself to this issue. We have no financial statements what-so-ever, the only thing that has changed is that we're one month closer to election, all we're doing is railroading it through, it's an 11th hour politicking attitude that is worse and I'm personally opposed to any effort in this vein.

MRS. MCINERNEY: There has been no mis-understanding on the part of anyone on this Board about the necessity for some type of tax relief for the elderly people in the City of Stamford. The Legislative and Rules has been sympathetic to those needs; however, as it's been stated time and time again, we were legislating in the vacuum, quote, un-quote. We don't know the ramifications, we have no idea what it would do to our committee in total, we have no idea what it will do to the majority of the elderly people in Stamford. Last month with good judgement we agreed to return it to Steering, to return it to committee. Steering voted to send it to the Board of Finance to have re-worked as was requested by many of the senior citizens in this community, to come back with a reasonable plan, one that the City could live with realistically, one that the elderly people in Stamford who would not benefit with, could live realistically, and to my knowledge it has not been done. As a member of

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY (cont.)

MRS. MCINERNEY: (continuing)L&R I am a little bit up-set, greatly up-set to think that something of this magnitude should come before our Board without even being mentioned at a Legislative and Rules meeting last week. I happen to agree with Mr. Sherer, it looks like an 11th hour politicking, clear and simple. Are the Republicans so great in this town that we must fabricate issues. If we go along with this this evening it will be the biggest farce, the biggest act of irresponsible government that the city has seen in a long time and against every principle of sound fiscal management. I cannot support it, I will not support it until we have the data which was requested and I don't truly believe if it's passed that you will find that many senior citizens will be happy with it, because we will have done a great dis-service to those people who need it more, there are more than 200 people in this town who are over 65.

MR. WIDER: I seem to feel that it is about time we take something out of committee for the people who have made this city what it is. I get kind of sick of people putting dollar signs over human suffering, it kind of upsets me a little bit. This City of Stamford is really becoming a place where dollars only count. I would hope that we think in terms of some of these people who had made this city the dollar-making city that we live in, and let's take this out and give these people some kind of hope.

MRS. SANTY: No one feels closer to this than me. I think everyone on this Board will agree that I brought it out; I want some action on it, I want some relief for the elderly. A couple of months ago I didn't have much support, tonight I seem to have some support. I pray and I think our reasons for bringing this out is because we care and we understand and we want to help the elderly. I do not believe in my heart that there is one person on this Board who is doing this tonight for political reasons, we know they need the help. I want it understood for clarification in case there is some misunderstanding, that the Board of Finance has taken no action regarding tax relief for the elderly since this matter has been referred back to them; in fact I understand the position papers being written by one of the members is still in favor of the lien. When I requested this to go back into committee, to go back to the Board of Finance is because what the elderly originally wanted a year and a half, when the Mayor appointed the committee, was to increase the tax freeze from \$6,000. as the cut-off point to \$8,500. or higher, this is what they wanted. In the wisdom of the committee, the Board of Finance came down with this Ordinance to put on the lien provision. I still feel that the senior citizens are the neglected minority of this city and I am very happy that this Board has finally decided that we have to do something about that. I do not want this Ordinance to remain in committee another year and a half for debate, I do not want to see it in the Board of Finance or the Legislative and Rules Committee or here, they need help and they need help now. I would like it known tonight that I do not feel since this is my original deletion of the lien, that anyone is doing this for political reasons. I do not believe that. I hope everyone supports this tonight.

TAXRELIEF - ELDERLY (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: I would just like to say that the senior citizens have given a lot to our community and I think this is very little to ask of this Legislative Branch to do something to help alleviate their particular burdens. I had several calls pertaining to this and it has to be done and it should be taken out of the committee and voted on tonight one way or the other, and I hope it could be passed.

MR. FOX called for a vote to take the item out of committee. The MOTION IS CARRIED, 28 yes; 7 no; 2 abstentions.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I believe since the lien section of the Ordinance was taken out, we also have to remove paragraph 8, which includes lines 61 through 70. These lines pertain to repaying a lien and we no longer have the lien, so I MOVE to AMEND the Ordinance to delete paragraph 8, lines 61 - 70.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 32 yes; 0 no; 5 abstained.

MR. BOCCUZZI: On page 2, line 29, it should read 1979; down to line 31, would be 1980. Also line 72 which mentions the same date, 1978-1979 should be changed to 1979 and 1980. I would like to MOVE to AMEND the Ordinance.

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

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to AMEND the qualifying incomes by adding \$1.00 in those columns where it is needed, such as \$3,000 to \$3,500 to read \$3,001 to \$3,500; \$6,001 to \$6,500, etc.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote) We then have before us and APPROVED by this body an AMENDED ORDINANCE.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to WAIVE PUBLICATION of the Ordinance as AMENDED.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 31 yes; 5 no; 1 abstention.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED for FINAL ADOPTION of that ORDINANCE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. DISCUSSION.

MRS. RAYMOND: I originally was for a tax relief for the elderly as proposed to the Legislative and Rules Committee by the Board of Finance, which include the lien provision that at last month's meeting and this month we have eliminated entirely. The process of taking the other lien provisions out of the Ordinance has been done in a flimsy manner this evening and to vote upon this without having further input of a committee and the Board of Finance is I think very unsound legislation. I would like to also comment that this evening we have heard a number of grand words about the elderly citizens, about how they deserve this kind of gift, that they are the aging minority that strongly need assistance and just because they built this city they deserve it. As I said I feel those are grand words, they are a minority, what we have not taken into consideration is that if we give them this gift, rather than a tax relief or lien provision in this Ordinance, that the majority or the middle income, but the majority of the citizens of the City of Stamford are going to be responsible of picking up that tax bill. I'm sure you all have

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY (cont.)

MRS. RAYMOND: (continuing).....received over the two years many calls from that majority who have said my bills are too high, I cannot afford to live in my home any longer, paying these kinds of Real Estate tax bills. They are in just as bad shape as the elderly citizens, but we are saying here this evening no, let's put that burden onto this class once again, middle income, middle class, the majority. I am deeply concerned . without more prudent in-sight into the cost of this Ordinance upon all of the citizens of the City of Stamford, a more thorough examination by the Board of Finance and their recommendation to this Board on the fiscal impact, to go ahead and pass this this evening would be unwise.

MR. BERNIER: Much of what Mrs. Raymond has said echoes the thoughts that I have on this matter, so I won't go over them again, although in principle I'm in favor of relief for the elderly, based on the reasons I gave earlier, that I feel that we are acting too hastily regardless of what some of my other learned colleagues say, although I'm in favor of the concept, will not vote on this issue.

MR. MacINNIS: I just have a few comments. There are a few things that we have to keep in mind here. We're talking about acting hastily. I would remind the Board that two years have passed by our last Democratic Mayoral candidate, and certainly in this town we've had Republican vacillation and indecision for long enough, not hastily put-together Ordinance. There is no question of need, but let us not at this time put an albatross of a burden somelien on the backs of our elderly. Cost is a legitimate question; I think quite frankly we're not too sure what the cost is, I've seen estimates that they run from 400 to 500 thousand dollars a year, that's a legitimate question, but let's not be among those who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. I think relief for the elderly at this time has a deep need and a deep value. Also there is another thing to keep in mind in this particular question that in this Ordinance there is a sunset provision, that is this Ordinance will die by itself after a two year period, it takes a positive action by this Board to continue it, if indeed the costs are excessive, if indeed it's imprudent legislation, it will die a natural death. There is a need for this legislation and I urge its passage.

MR. DeLUCA: It's really amazing --- some of the comments here tonight. We sit here, we give tax abatement to private developments, we subsidize low income housing for the tenants, yet we say no we cannot give any to the elderly. Some people regard this as a gift, I regard it as something long overdue. These people are the founders of our city, made it what it is today, they have done their share, now it's about time for us to do our share for them. Comments were made that the amendments tonight were handled in a flimsy manner, yet I recall looking through my correspondence, Reps. Blum and Santy made these same amendments known to us months ago. We have looked them over, granted, we may not have discussed them at the L&R meeting, but people are aware what the amendments are. I do not regard this as a gift I regard this as something that is long overdue, it's a step in the right direction, after all these people are living on fixed incomes, inflation increases, not their income. It's about time we have taken the initiative to something for them. I do not consider my vote on this matter as something to help me get elected, that's up to the people, I will vote on this as I have done in the past because I feel the senior citizens deserve this.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: A member of the Board mentioned that there are many other elements in this society who are in the same position as our senior citizens and we are doing nothing for them. I would like to say that virtually no one is in the same position as our elderly. By virtue of the fact that they definitely live on a fixed income with no hope of increasing that income. I would like to say that perhaps the waivering of rules tonight appears un-orthodox, but maybe doing something un-orthodox is what it takes to get this Ordinance through. I am delighted at the unity that has been exhibited here tonight. I think that no one in our society deserves more than the people who have built everything that we are reaping tonight. I hope this Ordinance passes and I would like to say that if we forsake the elderly, one day we will be forsaken by our young people.

MRS. RITCHIE: I feel that this action tonight is purely a political ploy. It seems that it has pulled we people on the Board of Representatives apart. Some of those who are voting yes or doing so only because they are thinking of the senior votes that they will draw in November. This is a funny season for politicians. I'm for tax relief for the elderly, but I want what is best for them and I feel that the Board of Finance in their research might come up with a better plan for them. We the majority here tonight did not even have the amendments before us because we felt that it was put back in committee or in the Board of Finance and only those who plan to bring it out were prepared.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I sat here, listening to people who were trying to turn this issue into a political issue. Why is it when this Board does anything good for this City there are those who say the Board members are doing it for their own purposes. How can anyone make a statement that we're trying to get votes. I just lost a vote because a senior citizen had to sell her house and move upstate. There is a crying need for this legislation. I think if this Board wants to be remembered this legislation will help it be remembered. The last few days watching T. V. and listening to the Pope and he has been saying remember those who are less fortunate than you, reach out your hand and help them, so that's what I'm going to do, to reach out my hand and help them financially, whether they vote for me or not, they have their own prerogatives, but as now I think my vote will be as Mrs. Santy said to help the elderly and not political.

MR. DARER MOVED THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 26 yes; 10 no; 1 abstention. We will now vote on the main motion which is to approve the Ordinance which relates to tax relief to the elderly, which has been amended. I would suggest that we vote by use of the machine. This requires a majority of those present and voting, a minimum of 21 votes. The MOTION IS CARRIED. 32 yes; 4 no; (Ritchie McInerney, Raymond, Sherer) 1 abstention; (Bernier).

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to WAIVE the reading of the STEERING COMMITTEE Report. Seconded. Carried unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met on Monday, September 17, 1979, in the Democratic Caucus Room. The meeting was called to order at 8:07 P.M.

MEMBERS OF STEERING PRESENT (15):

Wayne Fox, Chairman	Lathon Wider, Sr.
John Boccuzzi	Dominick Guglielmo
Handy Dixon	Richard Ferrara
Sandra Goldstein	Donald Sherer
Michael Feighan	Mildred Ritchie
John Zelinski	Marie Hawe
David I. Blum	Alfred Perillo
Annie Summerville, Clerk	

OTHERS PRESENT

Mildred Perillo
Raymond Bernier
Robert DeLuca
Diane Raymond
J. Chasek, Rschr.
Media (2)

STEERING MEMBERS ABSENT (2):

Ralph Loomis	George Hays
--------------	-------------

(1) APPOINTMENTS - None.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS:

Twenty-one items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. The resolution regarding CETA was moved to Education, Welfare and Government Committee. The resolutions regarding sale of property on Broad St. and Pleasant St. were ordered moved to Planning and Zoning Committee. One item was held in committee, being the capital projects close-out recommendations.

(3) LEGISLATIVE MATTERS:

Nine items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ordered moved to Health and Protection Committee was item of proposed ordinance for pigeon control for publication. Ordered moved to Planning and Zoning Committee was item of proposed discontinuance of Crosby Street. Ordered off the Tentative Agenda were: Publication of proposed ordinance to control and regulate excavation, filling and grading; Publication of proposed ordinance providing pension benefits for Registrars of Voters; Publication of proposed ordinance concerning designation of a residential street as a play street; Publication of proposed ordinance amending code Section 18-6 re playing ball, throwing stones, etc., upon City streets; and Final Adoption of proposed ordinance providing tax relief for the elderly, and this last item to receive further in-input from the Board of Finance.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS:

Two items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ordered off the Tentative Agenda were: Matter of nurses, provisional employment of Ms. Marie Gavula; Proposed resolution from Board of Finance re benefits for their permanent Clerk, Mary Holahan; Matter of hiring/placement of provisional employees.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:

The four items on the Tentative Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Also ordered on were: The Crosby St. discontinuance moved from L&R.; and resolutions from Fiscal regarding sale of property on Broad St. and Pleasant St.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

The item re erosion problems at Long Hill and Clover Hill Drives was ORDERED OFF the Tentative Agenda. Ordered HELD were: Publication of proposed amendment to Ord. #314 re private refuse collection; and the transfer of Martha Hoyt School from the Board of Education to the Public Works Dept.

(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS:

Both items on Tentative Agenda were ordered off the agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item from L&R of proposed pigeon control ordinance.

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS:

Two items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ordered off the Tentative Agenda were: Stamford High School request to hang banner; and Bruce Fodiman's letter re Sterling Farms Golf Authority.

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item from L&R, being resolution re CETA.

(10) SEWER COMMITTEE MATTERS:

Both items on the Tentative Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(11) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS:

Ordered Held was the matter of publication of ordinance concerning hydrologic study of Rippowam River to Long Island Sound. Tentative items #2 and #3 ordered ON AGENDA combined into one item due to same subject matter. Chairperson Ritchie would call a committee meeting for the purpose of establishing the lines and powers of authority of the Environmental Protection Board.

(12) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was matter of parking trucks in residential areas. Ordered off the Tentative Agenda was suggested alternate bus routes.

(13) CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE MATTERS:

One item was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. One item was ordered off the Tentative Agenda being the ballot questions which would contain charter revision items.

(14) SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE RE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT:

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of a final report of this Committee.

ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 9:50 P.M.

HMM:MS

JOHN WAYNE FOX, Chairman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon

NO REPORT.

FISCAL COMMITTEE REPORT - Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the following items are to go on the CONSENT AGENDA:
Fiscal Items #2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. 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.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal met on September 25, 1979. Present were Reps. Rybnick, Hawe, Flounders, Ritchie, Esposito, Livingston, Zelinski and Goldstein. Non-committee members present were Reps. Hogan, Maihock, A. Perillo, Markiewicz, Boccuzzi, Raymond, Ferrara, MacInnis, DeLuca and Summerville. Fiscal feels that Mr. Hogan is the tenth member as he has religiously come to every meeting and his input has been excellent and welcome.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said on the Agenda for tonight is \$2,681,684 in Additional Operating Appropriation requests, and \$385,500 in Additional Amendments to the Capital Project Budget. Of the above \$2,198,709 are grants or revenue off-set items and will have no effect on the local tax rate. I have included in that two items which are partial-taxable and partial-grant items. Of the Capital Project Amendments this evening only \$18,500 calls for new bonding.

- (1) \$38,965.00 - YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU - CTE - PROJECT SUPPORT - 794.7551
Additional Appropriation representing LEAA Grant (91% Federal and 9% Local) (\$35,422.00 + \$3,543.00) per Mayor's request 7/5/79. Bd. of Finance approved 7/12/79. Held in Committee 8/6 and 9/5/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 5 in favor with 2 abstentions and she so MOVE

MR. MARKIEWICZ said Education, Welfare & Government ABSTAINED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. RAYMOND said she thinks PROJECT SUPPORT is impracticable and the funds would be better put elsewhere. She thinks this type of program belongs under the supervision of the Board of Education. She has a question about the quality of the requirements for the tutors who will be dealing with these children, and as far as she can tell, they are not required to have either a B.A. or no more than a B.A. and if that be the case, she still thinks we have much better qualified teachers in the schools where they can be much better helped. She does not think this kind of program will do what it is intended and that is to encourage participation of the parents.

MR. WIDER said Mrs. Raymond does not understand the people she is talking about. He said we need real people to deal with this problem, not B.A. degrees. We need people who know how the street feels. There is a great need for this program.

Mr. Fox; MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote - 3 No votes: Raymond, McInerney and Maihock; and 1 Abstention (Markiewicz),

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (4) \$18,518.00 - PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT - Code 270.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund position of ASSISTANT PERSONNEL DIRECTOR now vacant, also to fund a short-fall of \$2,000.00 in the Salary Account. This is a re-submission. Board of Finance approved 8/23/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal cut \$2,700 from the request to reflect a November 1st hiring date. This brings a new total of \$15,818.00. Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. ZELINSKI: No report from Personnel

MR. FOX: Motion is made to Suspend the Rules to WAIVE the report of the secondary committee. Seconded. Carried.

MR. FOX called for a machine vote on Item #4 under Fiscal. The MOTION is CARRIED. 29 yes; 7 no; 1 abstention.

- (5) \$1,500.00 - CULTURAL EVENTS - STAMFORD COMMUNITY ARTS COUNCIL - 730.334 Additional Appropriation requested per Mayor's letter 8/29/79 and Paul Nakian, President Pro-tem of newly-formed Arts Council 8/21/79, to be supplemented by \$1,000.00 from Conn. Comm. on the Arts "to encourage promotion, development and appreciation of cultural activities in the arts and humanities in Stamford". Bd. of Finance approved 9/13/79.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 2 opposed and she so MOVED.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 25 yes; 7 no; 5 abstentions.

- (6) \$158,000.00 - STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER - AMEND THE 1979-1980 CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET by adding a new project to be known as "Stamford Museum & Nature Center - purchase of 12.7 Acres abutting Existing Property", to be financed over 5 years. \$140,000.00 of this first payment to be withdrawn from the CAPITAL NON-RECURRING FUND (LAND BANK) Interest of \$18,000. to be funded by the Land Bank also. Mayor's letter 9/11/79; Budget Dir. Harrison's letter 9/11/79 giving six-year cost breakdown. Planning Bd. on 9/5/79 approved first-year financing. Bd. of Finance approved 9/13/79 with their Resolution to be forthcoming from Joel Freedman with conditions set forth by that Board to include "Buildings to be sold; Title to land ultimately to be in the name of the City of Stamford," etc.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MR. RYBNICK said Parks & Recreation concurred.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the grant expected from the U.S. Dept. of Interior, Heritage of Conservation and Recreation Service, would take care of 75% of the City's cost. Taking everything into consideration, the net purchase price to the City would be down to about \$87,500, plus the interest, which means we are purchasing prime, beautiful open space land for under \$10,000 an acre.

FISCAL (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN went over a financial report sent down from the Finance Department, which all the Board Members received on their desks.

MR. WIDER: I could add nothing to what Mrs. Goldstein said, with the exception of we need a little bit more open space. I feel that if we don't pick this property up at this time, the opportunity will never come down this street again, so I'm hoping that we can vote for it.

MR. ZELINSKI: My original concern pertained to this appropriation based on the selling price of homes and property in that section of Stamford. I have been told that approximately ten homes could be built on that acreage which would bring into the City in taxes about \$30,000. I planned to vote against this appropriation however, after speaking to a member of the Board of Directors of the Museum, I've been told that regardless of our action this evening, the property already is in the hands of the Museum and they will be keeping the property and will not be building homes and so forth, and I have changed my mind and will be voting for it tonight.

MR. DELUCA: Like Rep. Zelinski, I, too, had a little reservation about this item tonight. Two things concern me. The Museum was negotiating for this land approximately six months ago, back in June, without the City fathers knowing about it; all of a sudden they come with the 11th hour they need the funds by October 1st. which was Monday, and here we are tonight appropriating the funds. Hopefully, this will not establish a precedent. Another thing that disturbed me, I was sitting in the Board of Finance and we were discussing this item and comments were made, too bad I don't own a lot up there or a house, my property value will double, it seems that people are benefitting at the expense of the tax-payers. Therefore tonight rather than vote no, I plan to abstain.

MR. FOX called for a vote on Item #6 under Fiscal. The MOTION is CARRIED. 34 yes; 0 no; 3 abstentions.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN MOVED for APPROVAL of the CONSENT AGENDA for Fiscal Items #2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider an item not on the Agenda an item which would be an Amendment to the Capital Project Budget, which will be \$65,400. SECONDED. CARRIED.

(22)	<u>\$65,400.00</u>	<u>AMENDMENT TO THE</u>	<u>1979/1980</u>	<u>CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET</u>	- per Mayor's request. Bid figures over original estimate due to inflation. Additional funding required.
		Hardcroft/Hardesty Road	46,100.	#310.662	
		Middle Ridge Road	19,300.	#310.807	
			65,400.		

MR. FOX called for a MOTION to WAIVE the report of the secondary committee. SECONDED. CARRIED.

FISCAL (continued)

(22) MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Fiscal voted 7-0 in favor and she so MOVED.

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

MR. BLUM MOVED to SUSPEND the RULES to take up an item out of ORDER, under the Health and Protection Committee. SECONDED. CARRIED.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - David I. Blum

(1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR PIGEON CONTROL - Submitted by Rep. David I. Blum 9/4/79.

MR. BLUM: The Health and Protection Committee voted 3 in favor; 1 against and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: This evening I'd like to bring before this Board an Ordinance, the Pigeon Ordinance that was voted on in Committee. This evening, once again I would ask this 15th Board to publish the Pigeon Control Ordinance. I'm presenting this Amended Ordinance because of a letter that I received from Corporation Counsel this evening, that the highest fine that can be on a Civil matter is \$100.00 per day, so therefore I am changing that part which calls for 30 day jail sentence, that's being deleted and I'm presenting a copy of the New Ordinance.

MR. SHERER: This evening I had an opportunity to speak to a gentlemen who is a Special Officer of the Humane Society. I had a discussion with him concerning this Ordinance and the overall effect of trapping. First of all there is numerous reference to the efforts and the assistance by the Humane Society as far as trapping goes. It has been brought to my attention that as the Officer directly in-charge of the local Humane Society that he has never as far as this Ordinance is concerned acknowledge that he would cooperate in that manner; as a matter of fact it would pose a substantial burden on his operation and it would necessitate him charging the City per pigeon brought him. Secondly, I think this is important; in the past we have not been able to come to any understanding with Mrs. Caoli; however, in the last two weeks, Special Officer Eddy has been able to work out an arrangement with Mrs. Caoli, bringing in pigeons on her own to the Humane Society, alive and un-harmed; Officer Eddy has brought these pigeons up-state to the farm area of our State where they have been most beneficial in controlling rodent infestation in some of the farms. I would recommend that our Board not publish the item.

MR. ZELINSKI: I respect Mr. Sherer's opinion on this however, I think the best solution to the problem is to publish the Ordinance and have a Public Hearing on it whereby we can get all the facts and have the people who live in Stamford, who have had trouble with the pigeons over the years, and see the various ways to alleviate the problem and then that is the only way we are going to get this resolved.

HEALTH & PROTECTION (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to speak against putting this back to committee. We seem to toss this item around like a football and to return this item to committee is just to continue this football. The problem is more extensive than the one issue that Mr. Sherer talked about. Last year I asked you to write to Corporation Counsel to determine whether or not the Health Director could use some State Statutes or other city ordinances to enforce a problem in my district. Corporation Counsel wrote back to me saying that there was State Legislation enabling to help the Director to take action. I asked the Health Director to take action and he returned the comment back to me that he needs a pigeon statute. It's all becoming clear to us that the Health Director refuses to do anything unless he has a pigeon statute for whatever reason. Nevertheless, I think we have to deal with this now.

MRS. RITCHIE: I just want to state that Officer Eddy said that most of these birds are not pigeons, they are white doves, wild doves, which we have no jurisdiction over.

MRS. SANTY: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. FOX called for a machine vote on the Motion to return Item #1 under Health & Protection back to committee. The MOTION is LOST. 11 yes; 22 no.

MR. FOX again called for a machine vote on the Motion to Publish the Proposed Pigeon Ordinance. The MOTION is CARRIED. 20 yes; 10 no; 7 abstentions.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Michael P. Feighan

MR. FEIGHAN said his Committee MOVED to the CONSENT AGENDA, Items #1, 2, 5, 8, 9.

MR. FEIGHAN: Legislative and Rules met on Sept. 27, 1979. Present were Representatives Sherer, McInerney, Darer, Baxter, Parker, Markiewicz and Feighan.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR STAMFORD ART ASSN. - their letter 4/2/79; property at 39 Franklin Av
Stamford; purchased from St. Andrew's Parish. Held 8/6/79. Approved for Publication 9/5/79.

MR. FEIGHAN: The Committee voted 6 in favor and 1 oppose and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: Mr. Feighan, I'm informed that Ordinance has not been published. We cannot move it forward for publication; it has been ordered for publication but it has not been published, so I think that item would have to be HELD.

MR. DARER: Since this matter was very carefully scrutinized by our committee if it wasn't published, it was probably due to some oversight. Is it possible to introduce a motion at this time to waive publication? MOVED.

MR. FOX asked if there were a SECOND. No. He also said that he understands that the ordinance is not in final form, that there are certain items which should be put in the text which we do not have and which are not included in the information that we have to date. Consequently we cannot waive publication because we do not have it in final form.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO AMEND DUMPING FEES - submitted by City Rep. David Blum. Held 5/21, 7/2 and 9/5/79.

MR. FEIGHAN said the Legislative & Rules Committee recommended no changes in the fees and voted that no action be taken on this item.

MR. BLUM said he'd like to move it back into committee to look at the fees, but agreed to wait until the next Board to consider this again.

- (6) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO LIMIT TERMS OF SERVICE ON BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AUTHORITIES, ETC. AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ROTATION ON SAME. Submitted by Rep. Fiorenzo Corbo 9/5/79.

MR. FEIGHAN said the Committee discussed this with Rep. Corbo and understood the sincerity which this was introduced, unfortunately the Committee did not agree and recommended denial unanimously, 6 votes against. I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. MOTION LOST, 6 in favor; 25 against; 6 Abstentions.

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION REQUEST OF MAYOR CLAPES 8/21/79 THAT HIS CREATION OF A SHELLFISH COMMISSION BE MADE A PART OF CODE OF ORDINANCES OF STAMFORD.

MR. FEIGHAN: The Committee voted 5 in favor and one opposed and I so MOVE.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED (1 no vote, Blum); rest yes by voice vote.

MR. FEIGHAN MOVED for approval of the CONSENT AGENDA of items #1, 2, 5, 8, and 9 SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - John Zelinski

- (1) RESOLUTION FOR FRINGE BENEFITS FOR COMMISSION ON AGING - 5 EXTRA EMPLOYEES HELD IN COMMITTEE - no quorum.

- (2) MEDICAL BENEFITS REQUESTED BY FAIR RENT COMMITTEE FOR INVESTIGATOR. HELD IN COMMITTEE - no quorum.

MR. ZELINSKI reported that Personnel did have a meeting but no quorum. Present were 3 committee members; Sim Bernstein, Aging Chmn. Cacace, Aging Dir. M. Wah and Diane Crouse, Dir., Fair Rent.

PLANNING AND ZONING -Dominick Guglielmo

MR. GUGLIELMO: Planning and Zoning met on September 25, 1979. Present were committee members Reps. MacInnis, Baxter, Stock, Guglielmo. Also present were Reps. Ferrara, Corbo, Raymond, Building Inspector Mike Macri, Leonard DePreta of Building Dept., Fire Chief Vitti and Acting Fire Marshal Capt. Speranza.

- (1) REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE OF "PONY TRAIL ROAD" AS CITY STREET - from Rowan Construction Corp., 71 Gurley Rd., Stamford, also Atty. Shiffman. Hel 8/20/79.

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

- (2) RE-SUBMISSION - FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO CHANGE NAME OF WALNUT STREET TO NEW NAME "WALTER WHEELER DRIVE".

MR. GUGLIELMO said the Committee voted 3 in favor and 1 oppose and he so MOV

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED TO WAIVE PUBLICATION.

MR. FOX: MOVED, SECONDED. MOTION LOST 26 Yes; 7 No (Livingston abstained).

SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FOX called for a vote on Item #2 under Sewer Committee by use of the machine. The MOTION is CARRIED. 28 yes; 2 no; 2 abstentions.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Lathon Wider, Sr.

MR. WIDER: Everyone has received a Resolution from our committee which met on September 27, 1979. We voted to submit to the Board for its next Steering Committee Meeting the enclosed communication and to move forward and look into the operation of the Housing Authority.

MR. FOX: That will be considered by the Steering Committee at its next regular schedule meeting.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis - NO REPORT.ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Mildred Ritchie

- (1) CITY REP. DeLUCA'S REQUEST RE "ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN COLD SPRING ROAD RIPPOWAM RIVER AREA, outlining serious flood plain area problems which residents are encountering all over Stamford and asking this Committee to take an active hand now as EPB short-handed and short-staffed. Held 5/21, 7/23, and 8/20/79.

ALSO THE MATTER OF THE ESPOSITO CONSTRUCTION CO. PROBLEMS - Letters from John Pirre, Pres. of Rippowam River Protection Committee, 8/26/79, and Mr. DeLuca's letter 8/28 and 9/14/79.

MRS. RITCHIE: First I would like to correct something. Our Agenda tonight should not read as it does. Several people here who were at the Steering Committee may recall that I said our committee was going to investigate the authority or powers of the Environmental Protection Committee regarding problems which residents all over Stamford are encountering. That was what the call of my meeting was and I want it to go on record. I opened my meeting with such a statement that the meeting was to inquire as to what the authority and powers of the Environmental Protection Board were.

We held this meeting on September 24, 1979. Present were myself and Dom Guglielmo. Absent were Lorraine Parker of the Environmental Protection Committee. Of the Environmental Protection Board, Lous Casale, Herb Kohn, Ann Boden and Paul Kuczo were present. Reps. Gabe DeLuca and Fior Corbo were also present. I had invited John Pirre because I felt that I needed his expertise on State Statutes. He brought along Mr. Connell. We are in the process now of arranging a meeting date of the EPC and EPB with Corp. Counsel Mike Sherman. I have been informed by Chairman of the Board Lou Casale that he has called Hartford for certain maps which he sent up to HUD which are there for approval by the State. He also called Congressman McKinney's Office to see if Mr. McKinney could help speed up the process in the HUD office. Mayor Clapes informed me that he also wrote a letter to

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (continued)

MRS. RITCHIE: (continuing)....Washington for some clarification. I expect a copy of his letter in the mail tomorrow. I think we have stirred things up with this meeting for all the people that live in flood-prone areas and wetlands and in flood plains. I hope that all of these energies will produce some sort of an answer for all of us and I hope to report to you further in our meeting in November.

MR. DeLUCA: As regards to EPB, I would like to recommend that the 16th Board of Representatives initiate an investigation of the EPB under Section 204.2 of the Charter, in view of the recent actions. Back in September 6, the EPB had a meeting to discuss the problems along Cold Spring Road, primarily Application #7907. Our Chairman Mildred Ritchie, Reps. Goldstein, Parker and myself pleaded with the EPB to hold up on their approval of this application until further questions could be answered, our pleas fell on deaf ears; they approved the application, but a month earlier they had rejected it; they disregarded an opinion sent down by a State soil Scientist, they claimed it wasn't a wetland before the construction started, therefore they had no jurisdiction. Chairman Casale of the EPB said the only recourse for these residents of the Cold Spring Area is to bring it to the courts. Before you tonight I dropped off a copy of an article appearing in the 9/13/79 Weekly Shopper. I'd like to quote from certain paragraphs of this article, "originally, according to Flounders, the EPB came to High Cliff residents seeking an agreement and cooperation against allowing construction to be built on the property in the Westover Road because of existing swamplike conditions, the citizens group agreed with the Board's position on the wetlands, and were assured by EPB that no application would be approved without hearing residents views". Later however, the EPB changed its position without conducting a public hearing and gave partial approval to the Builder L. Sansone. Action of this sort, combined with the action of the Cold Spring Road cannot be tolerated by members of a City Commission. This citizens action group has a law suit against the EPB and the contractor; I don't believe the City can afford to hire a battery of lawyers to protect itself against further law suits. Therefore I believe an investigation should be made or should go on record as recommending that a full investigation be instituted.

MR. FOX: Your MOTION is a Sense-of-the Board Resolution directed to the 16th Board of Representatives indicating that this Board feels there should be an investigation of the Environmental Protection Board. MOVED. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED. (voice vote)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Just to address Mrs. Ritchie about the comment she made in the beginning about the Agenda being incorrect. I think we all have received this Agenda in time to go over carefully, especially the Chairman of committees and I think it would be helpful to all of us if in the future, if you would happen to find a typographical error in anything concerning a Chairperson of any committee give the office or myself the courtesy of correcting this before we come on the floor of the Board, so we can run this Board of Reps like a business.

MR. FLOUNDERS asked to let the last vote show that he did not vote but abstain

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock — NO REPORT.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTEE - Jeremiah Livingston — NO REPORT.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Paul Esposito

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION RE PARKING OF TRAILER TRUCKS IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS. Request Zoning Board to investigate problem. From Reps. Hawe and Esposito, 9/14/79.

MR. ESPOSITO: Transportation met on this Reslution and approved it 2-0 and I so MOVE.

MR. GUGLIELMO: The topic that this Sense-of-the-Board Resolution addresses that is, the parking of trailer trucks in residential areas is a topic that is very—is quite sensitive in my district. They are a safety hazard, cut down on visibility and are dangerous to children's safety where they are parked. They are a nuisance and detract a great deal from the residential character of any neighborhood and I would strongly urge the Board to act favorably on this resolution.

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

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Ralph Loomis

- (1) CITY REP. RALPH LOOMIS' LETTER 9/13/79 RE "REPORT - CODE OF ORDINANCES REVIEW" Complete report on specific recommendations will be sent to all Board members next week. FOR PUBLICATION will be offered those ordinances to be deleted. Public Hearing to be held.

MR. LOOMIS: I'd like to present a MOTION to MOVE for PUBLICATION those Ordinances cited in a letter of September 20 signed by Barry Boodman. The purpose for the motion would be to delete some 250 Ordinances, which we have gone over; I say we, a Special Committee comprised of myself, Diane Raymond and Mr. Boodman in determining what Ordinances on our books are obsolete or unnecessary, redundant or superseded by State Statute.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. Your intention, Mr. Loomis, is to have a Public Hearing on that.

MR. LOOMIS: That's correct. We have taken some 3 to 4 months going over all these Ordinances and we've taken the time to contact everyone of the City Heads of the departments affecting these Ordinances. While I can't say that all have been approved by them, I'd say the vast majority concur that these should be deleted. We will however have a full public hearing and at our next meeting in November we will be prepared to take final action.

MR. BLUM said he could not vote on this matter unless he can see reasons for wanting to delete these particular ordinances. There are 250 so-called obsolete ordinances. Well, the question was raised to me that you didn't do your homework, Mr. Blum. Well, I think there are quite a few of us who do not have the time, but I know one thing, even when we were talking about Charter Revision, and we had quite an amount of paperwork to read, at least we got that to read. We have nothing in this case,,nothing..only that we get certain numbers that have to be deleted because they are said to be obsolete or have to be revised. I congratulate them for spending all this time, but also that lawyer who had so much time to spend on this, through a letter to me said he had no time for certain things, opinions on issues on our agendas, so I hope that.,.,.

MR. FOX: I'm really not going to let you get into that...you're out of order.

MR. FOX called for a vote. MOTION CARRIED. (voice vote). Mr. Blum voted NO.

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

(1) DRAFT REPORT

MR. FEIGHAN will give a report at the next meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE.

PETITIONS - NONE.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

MAY 7, 1979 - Regular Board Meeting - Held 8/6 and 9/5 for Mrs. McInerney.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to accept the May 7, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

AUGUST 6, 1979 - Regular Board Meeting - Held 9/5/79 by Wayne Fox.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to accept the August 6, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1979 - Regular Board Meeting.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to accept the September 5, 1979 Minutes.

MR. FOX. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS

MRS. MAIHOCK MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider a Resolution submitted by the Mayor, dated September 27, 1979, RE UCONN.

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Zelinski voted No)

(1) MAYOR'S LETTER 9/27/79 RESOLUTION TO RETAIN UCONN AS 4-YR. SCHOOL.

MR. FOX CALLED called for a vote on the approval of the Resolution. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Esposito abstained) (voice vote)

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

NONE

OLD BUSINESS

MR. DARER: In the September 5th meeting we approved for publication, the Proposed Ordinance Supplemental for tax exemption of the Stamford Art Assoc. We were informed tonight that it was not published. Our Clerk told us tonight to try to get incorrections to her so that we can run this like a proper business. I don't understand why that matter wasn't published, these people have been waiting since April 2 for a tax exemption, they are entitled to it, they have done their work and I just think it was laxity on someone's part, I won't say who but I would like the record to show that we did vote and approve that matter for publication on September 5, and I was only informed tonight by you that this matter was not in its proper form and has not been published. I think it's not correct.

- MRS. SUMMERVILLE: To answer Mr. Darer's question, I made several attempts to contact Mr. Feighan and I also spoke to the President of the Board in reference to this and up until this week, I was still wondering why it was, because of some of the L&R reasons, that it hadn't been submitted properly to the Clerk of the Board. We were concerned and we were constantly calling and asking when we were going to get it. If that answers you.

MR. DARER: No, it doesn't. If this item was approved for publication, what did we approve? I mean if it wasn't correct, how did we approve something that wasn't correct, and if we did approve something that was correct, it should have been published. I don't mean to make a mountain out of this, but tonight we voted on something none of us had papers in front of us because we thought it was returned to the Board of Finance, I mean I almost felt tonight like, and I'm not using any political words or anything, but we're either running this Board as a Board when we see something that has been voted, approve something for publication and we come in and find out it wasn't published and you don't have the material; we vote on things that come up suddenly, nobody knows about it; I was in L&R meeting Thursday, nothing came up about the senior citizens tax for the elderly; I kind of feel very funny tonight, I really do, and that's my reason for raising this point.

MR. FOX: The point has been noted and I don't think there is any further discussion on it. I would suggest that you discuss it specifically with Mr. Feighan.

MR. PERILLO: Mr. President, under Old Business and it's getting old. Rep. DeLuca and Perillo request, for the 6th time, to Corporation Counsel for an opinion on what we requested before. We have met with the Coporation Counsel about a month ago and re-requested specifics and we did give him specifics. Now he pushes it out to the Police Commission and Finance Commission and everybody else who-ever he can think of, but that's not our point. Our point was an opinion on one item and one item alone; these other commissions have nothing to do about the one item which we're seeking an opinion on. For the 6th time we'dlike to re-submit that request.

NEW BUSINESS:

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED to have the November meeting date changed to the 14th of November . (Nov. 5th, Election Eve, and Nov. 12th, Veterans' Day)

MR. FOX: MOVED. SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION duly MOVED, SECONDED, AND CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 12:35 A.M.

By:

Helen M. McEvoy
Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Asst.
(and Recording Secretary)
Board of Representatives

APPROVED:

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

CMT

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

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

MEETING Regular Board Meeting
Wednesday, Oct. 3, 1979

Changes in Seating

CODE:

O = Absent.

A = Abstaining.

Y = YES vote.

N = NO vote.

	VOTING SUBJECT; MOTIONS; ETC.
TESTING	
TESTING	
#1	Motion to Suspend Rules to take up item not on Agenda by Macinnis (Tax Relief-Elderly) Approved: 30 yes; 6 No, 1 Abstention. #1
#2	Motion to take Out of Committee Tax Relief for Elderly. Approved 28 Yes; 7 No; 2 Abstain #2
#3	Boccuzzi Motion to delete Para.#8, lines 61-70 referring to lien/payback. APPROVED 32 Yes; 0 No; 5 Abstain. #3
#4	(Voice votes approving other amendments.) Boccuzzi Motion to waive publication of Elderly Ordinance as amended by Boccuzzi. Approved 31 yes; 5 no; 1 abstention. #4
#5	Motion-Move Question FINAL ADOPTION of Tax Relief for Elderly; Approved 26 Yes; 10 No 1 Abstention. #5
#6	Boccuzzi Motion for Final Adoption of Tax Relief for Elderly - APPROVED 32 Yes; 4 No; 1 Abstention. #6
	(4 No=Ritchie, McInerney, Raymond, Sherer.) (1 Abstention=Bernier.)

24